serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes: 

(b) TRANSITION PERIOD.—Any small bank holding company that was excepted from the provisions of section 171 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act pursuant to subparagraph (C) of section 3(b) of such Act shall be excepted from the provisions of section 171 pursuant to subparagraph (C) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), and any small savings and loan holding company that would have been excepted from the provisions of section 171 pursuant to subparagraph (C) (as such subparagraph was in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) if it had been a small bank holding company shall be excepted from the provisions of section 171 until the effective date of the Small Bank Holding Company Policy Statement issued by the Board as required by section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act:

(a) BANK HOLDING COMPANY.—The term "bank holding company" has the same meaning as in section 2 of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 161). The term "bank holding company" has the same meaning as in section 10(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a).

(b) SAVINGS AND LOAN HOLDING COMPANY.—The term "savings and loan holding company" has the same meaning as in section 10(a) of the Home Owners' Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1467a).

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 3329), as amended, was passed.

CREDIT UNION SHARE INSURANCE FUND PARITY ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3468 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3468) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to extend insurance coverage to amounts held in a member account on behalf of another person, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DURBIN. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action thereon.

The bill (H.R. 3468) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTING VOLUNTEER FIREFIGHTERS AND EMERGENCY RESPONDERS ACT OF 2014—Continued

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LEE. As we all know, President Obama recently announced Executive action on immigration, what he refers to as deferred action, for millions of aliens who are here illegally but who have no criminal record in the United States and by virtue of their birth in the United States are U.S. citizens.

Now the President has repeatedly assured the American people that he is not creating a pathway to citizenship for those individuals, but that isn't true. He and his administration have cleared the pathway to citizenship for millions of people who have crossed into our borders illegally. They know that is what they have done, and it is illegal.

Immigration law is quite complicated, but here is the bottom line on this issue: If you are the parent of a U.S. citizen, when that child reaches the age of 21, assuming you haven't committed certain crimes or done other things that might exclude you from what the law generally allows, you can get a green card and eventually you can get citizenship. But there is a catch. If you are in an illegal status inside the United States because you crossed into our borders illegally and that is how you became an illegal alien—that is, you entered without inspection, as that term is known in immigration circles—then in order to get back on the path to citizenship you are first required under existing law to leave the country and then to come back across the border into the country legally. Because you broke immigration laws before you came into the country, the law says you have to wait either 3 years or 10 years to return, depending on whether you were inside the country illegally before you left.

When we talk about clearing the path to citizenship for this set of immigrants—that is those who are close relatives of U.S. citizens—that is what we are talking about: getting around the rule that those who cross our border in secret must leave the country, wait a period of years outside the country because they broke our laws, and then return.

So when the President says he isn't clearing such a path to citizenship, that is Washington shorthand for, don't worry, I am not circumventing the law. What stands between these people and citizenship is to enter the country lawfully, which they cannot do until they leave, wait a period of time that Congress has set by law, and then and only then come back. The President claims he is not touching this rule, but that is exactly what he is doing and exactly what he has done, and he is doing it through a program called advance parole. Advance parole is essentially a form of permission for an undocumented immigrant to travel outside the country and then return. When he gets back to the country and approaches the border, he presents an advance travel document to border officials and they will parole him into the country.

What's more, the President has announced if you leave the country under a grant of advance parole, the administration will treat you as though you never left at all, waiving the 3-year to 10-year wait mandated by Congress for people who have come here unlawfully and have left the country.

When that is done, as it turns out, the illegal immigrant will become eligible to take advantage of a different way to become a citizen: getting what is known as adjustment of status. Adjustment of status, which gives you a green card without having to leave the country, is available to parents of U.S. citizens so long as they crossed our border lawfully, which advanced parole lets them do.

So how hard will it be to get advance parole which leads to a green card, which in turn leads to citizenship? Well, it is supposed to be very hard. Parole is kind of a temporary emergency pass that lets someone into the country for an extremely urgent reason, even though the law says that an immigrant in that circumstance cannot be admitted for one reason or another.

In fact, there is a Federal statute passed by Congress that restricts the power of the executive branch of the Federal Government to use parole to a very narrow, very confined set of circumstances. That law, INA section 212(d)(5)(a), says that the executive branch may parole individuals into the United States "only on a case-by-case basis for urgent humanitarian reasons or significant public benefit."

That term "urgent humanitarian reasons" means conditions such as getting medical treatment or perhaps attending a funeral of a close family member. "Significant public benefit" usually means circumstances such as one being a witness in a crime and as such needing to come into the country to testify at trial.

To be clear, it is illegal—illegal—to parole people into the country who don't meet that standard. But for deferred action recipients, here is the standard the President is using: A person wanting advance parole, which again also eventually leads to citizenship, must file a form I-131 with USCIS. The instructions for this form explain that deferred action recipients can get parole for "educational purposes, employment purposes or humanitarian purposes . . . ."

I continue:

Educational purposes include but are not limited to semester abroad programs or academic research;

Employment purposes include but are not limited to overseas assignments, interviews, conferences, training or meetings with clients;
In no universe is a meeting with a client or a conference an urgent humanitarian reason. Nowhere in the universe are those circumstances for a significant benefit to the American public.

Imagine this scenario. Imagine that a foreign national approaches our border. The border officials ask the individual for a visa, and he says, oh, I don’t have a visa, but I do have a business meeting in Denver. Can I come in, even though I don’t have a visa? There is no doubt he would go by the book; but for the new deferred action recipients under the President’s Executive action plan, so long as you have a business meeting in Toronto or an overseas assignment in Buenos Aires, you can get permission to leave and be paroled back into the country immediately upon your return, along with the government’s promise to ignore the 3-year or 10-year bar that is supposed to keep you out of the country. And once you do this, you can adjust your status and get a green card and eventually citizenship.

How do I know this? Well, in 2010 the American Spectator published a leaked Department of Homeland Security memo which purportedly reached the Secretary of Homeland Security—then-Secretary Janet Napolitano—exploring the administration’s options on immigration. That memo explicitly contemplated using parole as a way to sidestep Congress and give citizenship to illegal immigrants who are relatives to U.S. citizens.

It says “individuals could . . . be paroled into the U.S. for purposes of applying for adjustment of status to render immediate relatives of U.S. citizens eligible for parole. DHS could issue guidance establishing that family reuniﬁcation constitutes a signiﬁcant public beneﬁt.”

So let me be clear. Advance parole leads to citizenship for relatives of U.S. citizens. The administration knows that, and they are giving advance parole for reasons such as client meetings that clearly violate Federal law.

This is the danger of unilateral Executive action, drafted in secret and announced to the American people as a fait accompli. In our system, policies are debated in the legislature and their consequences need to be explored through debate. Here, the President’s action has avoided that constitutional law but it has broken existing laws passed by Congress.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

SERVING AS PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have been in the Senate just a few weeks shy of 40 years. For the past 2 years I have had the distinct honor of serving this Chamber as the President pro tempore. Just four Senators from Vermont have held this title. I am the first in more than a century.

It has been among my greatest privileges to represent Vermont in the U.S. Senate, something I dreamed about as a child, and it has been day after day after day a privilege to represent my very special State of Vermont in this body.

It has also been an honor and privilege to serve as the President pro tempore in this institution, the U.S. Senate. This is an institution for which I will always have the greatest respect and affection.

When I assumed the position of President pro tempore, something I had not realized would happen, Marcella and I welcomed into our family over time nearly 20 invaluable members of the U.S. Capitol Police. As President pro tempore and third in the line of succession, the office comes with a security detail. It is not something I had asked for. In fact, I said, well, I don’t really need that, and they said: You don’t get any choice in the matter.

I got to know them well. I had a background in law enforcement before I came to this body, but I have never served with such professionals as those who comprise this team. They sacrifice time at home. They sacrifice time with their families and weekends and holidays. I could not be more grateful for their dedication and their service and their sacrifice for their professionalism and good nature. They are an example of what the best in law enforcement should be.

The U.S. Capitol should be very proud of our U.S. Capitol Police and especially of those in the unique dignitary protection division. Those who serve on such details are trained to blend into the background. You might forget they are there, but they are, and they miss nothing. When I try to give them credit for the work they do, they say: Well, that is just our job. It is a lot more than their job. It is true professionalism and it is something that makes everybody in law enforcement and should make everybody in the U.S. Senate proud.

I want to recognize their commitment and acknowledge their service. The members of this detail include Sergeant David Ribb, Thomas Andriko, Henry Smith, Shane Powell, Eric Boggs, Robert Schultz, Antonio Carofano, Amy McDaniel, John Jastrzebski, Ryan Rayball, Ryan Andrews, Jay Schmid, Austin Reinschuttle, Sean Keating, Anthony Ravelin, Gideon Maran, John Brito, Luis Pimentel, Jose Ramirez, Jr., Robert Clarke, James Nelson, Edward Wojciechowski, and Marc DesJames, who recently retired.

Next year when Congress reconvenes, we will elect a new President pro tempore, my friend Senator Orrin Hatch. I will continue as doan of the Senate, and a future President pro tempore emeritus. I wish Orrin Hatch the best, and I know he is going to be in safe hands with the dedicated members of the President pro tempore’s security detail.

Again, having served in law enforcement, having considered that a very significant part of my career, I have never seen more professional police officers than these men and women. Every one of us as Senators should be glad they are there.

Madam President, on another matter, after 9 months of hearings and hearings, many long days and nights of negotiations, this week the Appropriations Committee completed work on the fiscal year 2015 Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act. Earlier this year many of us came to the floor and praised Chairwoman Mikulski for her heroic efforts to pass the fiscal year 2014 omnibus. While many in Washington thought that feat could not be repeated 2 years in a row, as the most senior Member of the Appropriations Committee I knew she would prove them wrong, and she did. Chairwoman Mikulski ralled her 12 subcommittees and reached across the aisle to negotiate this omnibus and avoid another shutdown. Without her, the Republican Party would not have had the will or ability to pass a budget. Similar to Chairwoman Mikulski, my friend Senator Shelby from Alabama, the committee’s vice chairman, also deserves a great deal of praise for the role he played. Without Senator Shelby’s recognition of the importance of passing appropriations bills rather than continuing to fund the government on autopilot, we would not have reached this point.

As chairman of the Department of State Appropriations, and Related Programs Subcommittee, I also wish to thank the ranking member, Lindsey Graham, chairwoman Kay Granger, and ranking member Nita Lowey in the other body. They were always able partners, whose wealth of experience—I will emphasize that—wealth of experience is invaluable to the subcommittee’s work, and it is reflected throughout the final agreement.

I look forward to working with the incoming subcommittee chairman, Lindsey Graham next year to continue to fund the diplomacy and foreign aid programs that are essential to protecting U.S. interests around the world in a manner that reflects American values.

The State, Foreign Operations portion of this omnibus was negotiated with the full participation of representatives of both parties in both Houses of Congress as a balanced, bipartisan bill. Every word was discussed and agreed to by Republicans and Democrats, and our respective subcommittee bills have been publicly available since they were reported out of committee in June.

My Democratic clerk of the subcommittee, Tim Rieser, made sure everyone in both parties was kept apprised of everything we did. I want to thank him, Janet Stormes and Alex Carnes of the Democratic staff, as well as Paul Grove, the Republican clerk, and Adam Yezerski of the Republican staff. They all played an essential role.

Others who were indispensable and deserve our thanks are Valerie Hutton, Celina Inman, Elmer Barnes, and
Penny Myles of the editorial and printing office, who worked long hours to produce draft after draft of the bill. They do an outstanding job.

Division J of this omnibus for the Department of State and Foreign Operations provides a total of $51.8 billion in discretionary budget authority to protect U.S. security, humanitarian, and economic interests around the world.

Anybody who doubts that these funds are indeed think about the devastation being wrought by ISIL in Syria and Iraq and its impact on neighboring Lebanon and Jordan, in addition to what is happening in the Central African Republic, South Sudan, and other areas where hundreds of thousands of people have been displaced by ethnic and tribal violence. Part of this funding will support aid for refugees and other victims of disasters, and we provide $1.5 billion above the budget request. The bill also includes additional funding to help Ukraine and other former Soviet republics counter Russian aggression.

It provides $2.5 billion in emergency funding to respond to the Ebola epidemic, which reminds us all that a deadly virus is only one airplane trip away from our shores.

The bill includes full funding for diplomatic security, which unfortunately we need today.

As far as U.N. peacekeeping, the bill provides funding and authorities to fully meet our commitments.

It includes an increase above the budget request for PEPFAR and other global health programs, which I was very pleased about considering that those increases did not require cuts to other critical programs.

The bill includes additional funding for educational and cultural exchanges. It provides funding to address the gang violence and poverty that contribute to the migration of unaccompanied children from Central America. That problem ebbs and flows but cannot be ignored. We have seen the flood of young children across our southern border, risking their lives rather than staying and being attacked and raped in their own country, or forced into gangs and made to shoot and kill and rob.

I am very pleased we were able to include the amounts requested for programs to protect biodiversity and tropical forests, to clean energy to reduce global warming, combat wildlife poaching and trafficking. These are important national security issues.

I am also pleased that provisions relating to our commitments to the international financial institutions, particularly relating to evaluations, beneficial ownership, human rights, industrial-scale logging, and financing for large dams, were included. I look forward to discussing them with the Treasury Department, State, and USAID.

The provisions relating to a Small Grants Program to provide small, multi-year USAID grants to small entities; timely feedback from beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance, and reforms to provide incentives for Foreign Service Officers to support sustainable, locally-driven development, are also important.

There is more in this bill to support friends and allies so they can combat disease, hunger, poverty, strengthen the rule of law, and protect human rights. These are all programs that are directly linked to our national security. They fulfill our moral obligation as Americans as members of the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth.

There are some things that I wish were not included, particularly a House provision carried from last year that would weaken limits on carbon emissions from projects financed by the Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation. Our European partners are wisely ending public subsidies for subsidies for cleaner, healthier, renewable energy, but the House continues to block such progress here.

I am very disappointed the Senate provision to bring the United States into compliance with the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations was rejected again this year by the House. The Bush administration spoke of the necessity of this, as has the Obama administration.

Mr. President, no bill is perfect, and this one is no exception. But the State, Foreign Operations portion of the omnibus is a whole lot better than a continuing resolution that ignores the changing global realities and challenges we face.

It was a collaborative effort from beginning to end with Republicans and Democrats alike, and it should be supported overwhelmingly.

I see my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas on the floor. It provides funding and authorities to see him back.

Mr. CORNYN. It is good to see the good people at Fort Hood.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President.

Mr. CORNYN. It is good to see the senior Senator from Texas on the floor seeking recognition, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. It is good to see the senior Senator from Vermont back and in good health. I know he has been struggling a little bit with this crazy weather we are having, and we are glad to see him back.

On November 5, 2009, a radical jihadist, by the name of Nidal Hasan, who happened to also be a major in the U.S. Army, opened fire at Fort Hood, TX, claiming the lives of 12 U.S. soldiers, one civilian, one unborn child, and wounded more than 30 other people. It was a shocking tragedy and event.

Shortly after the attack, it became clear that Hasan was motivated by the same poisonous ideology that spurred the attacks on September 11, 2001; in other words, this was an act of domestic terrorism. Yet due to the narrow and outdated definition of “international terrorism,” the Fort Hood victims have not been awarded the same medals and recognition as other military victims of terrorism.

Furthermore, the Obama administration took the position of claiming that the 2009 Fort Hood victims were not eligible for Purple Hearts because this was workplace violence—believe it or not. They further said they didn’t think Hasan was acting under the explicit direction of a foreign terrorist group, so they were not qualified for these Purple Hearts and this recognition.

When our men and women in uniform come under hostile fire from a terrorist, they and their families should receive the full honors and full recognition and benefits that accompany such courageous service. That is why I have authored legislation in the Senate making these victims of the November 2009 attack at Fort Hood eligible to receive the Purple Heart or the civilian equivalent.

Last week I was pleased that the House of Representatives passed the Defense authorization bill, which includes the legislation I authored awarding Purple Hearts to victims of this terrorist attack.

I wish to thank my good friends Congressmen WILLIAMS and CARTER for their steadfast dedication to seeing this to conclusion and to fruition.

While long overdue, this is welcome news to the wounded, the families of the fallen, and the entire Fort Hood community, because even after 5 years, the wounds from this horrific attack are still there, especially for the families of people such as Michael Cahill, a civilian physician’s assistant and retired soldier, and Army CPT John Gaffaney, both of whom charged the shooter and sacrificed their lives to save others around them.

The close-knit community at Fort Hood has endured great loss in recent years, and I am pleased we are now just one step closer to delivering this important piece of justice to the victims and their families. It is my hope that once the Defense authorization bill clears this Chamber, that the President will move quickly in legislating this provision into law because any further delay is a continuing injustice to all of the victims from that day and indeed all of the good people at Fort Hood.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mrs. HAGAN. Madam President, it is with great honor and gratitude that I rise to reflect on the last 6 years, which have been some of the most rewarding and transformative of my life, and to thank the people who have been by my side as we worked to make our great State and this great country even better.

First and foremost, I wish to thank the people of North Carolina for allowing me to serve them in the Senate. Six years ago you sent me to Washington to fight for the priorities that make our State great, and I have put North Carolina first every single day. I have...
been honored to stand up for our teachers, our students, to fight for our seniors, to help create a business climate that promotes job growth, to build an economy that works for everyone, and to make sure we keep our promises to our servicemembers and to our veterans.

I am extremely proud of what we have been able to accomplish, and I am forever humbled and grateful for the opportunity to serve.

I wish to thank my family; my husband Chip, who is my rock, and my three children, Jeannette, Tilden, and Carrie, and my two great sons-in-law, Will and Martin.

These past 6 years have been extremely full of exciting milestones for the Hagan family. Since my term began, my two daughters have both gotten married and they both had babies. I have a 1-year-old grandson Harrison and a 1-week-old granddaughter Charlie. I said earlier that these past 6 years have been transformative, I wasn’t kidding.

I also wish to thank my dad Joe Ruthven, who is one of my most trusted advisers and a constant source of inspiration for me, as is his wife Judy, my stepmom, for all of her love and support.

I wish to thank the Capitol Police here in Washington. I don’t think we recognize these people enough for the incredible work they do to keep us safe.

And, of course, I wish to thank my unbelievably hard-working staff whom I consider to be a part of the official Hagan family. These folks are top-notch. Their commitment to our State and the people we serve is unmatched. They are passionate and compassionate, and I am so grateful to have had them by my side over these last 6 years. I ask unanimous consent that a list of their names be printed in the RECORD.

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

**STAFF OF SENATOR KAY R. HAGAN**

Michelle Adams, Ayo Adeyeye, Tyler Allen, Natalia Aldana, Stephanie Allen, Patrick Ayers, Devan Barber, Sue Wink, Marla Wambu, Brandy Warwick, Timothy Webster, Karen Wade, Brittany Wakefield, Muthoni Wasike, Alissa Sadie Weiner, Mesha White, Andrew Wilkins, Johnnie Williams, Sue Wink, Margaret Winslow, Abigail Youngken, Tracy Zvanyak.

Mrs. HAGAN. My staff knew how important it was to me that my office be open and as accessible as possible to the people of North Carolina, and my team worked every single day to help us reach that goal. Over the last 6 years, we held a townhall in every 100 counties across North Carolina. In DC, we have held a Carolina Coffee every Wednesday and we welcomed thousands of North Carolinians to come visit us. We have also resolved more than 36,000 constituent concerns.

North Carolina is proud to be the most military-friendly State in the Nation. As a member of a military family, it is important to me to work every single day to keep our State the most military-friendly. My husband is a Vietnam veteran. My dad and my brother served in the Navy. My father-in-law was a major general in the Marine Corps. I have two nephews on active duty. One is an F-15 fighter pilot and the other one is a Navy SEAL. So when I say one of my top priorities was ensuring Federal policies worked for our veterans in active-duty military, they are not just words, it is truly a personal obligation.

That is why 6 years ago, when Jerry Ensminger, a retired marine, shared with me the story of his daughter Janey, my heart broke for him. Janey died of leukemia at the age of 9 because of contaminated water on the base at Camp Lejeune. He dedicated his life to seeking justice for his daughter and other Camp Lejeune victims. I found it absolutely unconscionable that the Federal Government had denied this man, who served our country, the answers he needed after all he had been through. I wanted to do whatever I could to help, and it was one of the greatest honors of my life to work alongside my North Carolina colleague Senator Burr to pass the Janey Ensminger Act, to help Jerry and the servicemembers and families affected by water contamination at Camp Lejeune and to give them the answers and the health care they deserved.

It was also important to me that all Americans remembered and understood the sacrifices made by our military and their families. During my time in the Senate, I had the opportunity to speak on the Senate Floor of the brave servicemembers from North Carolina, many of whom made the ultimate sacrifice, and many of whom lost their lives while trying to make the world a better place and safer for the rest of us. I had the opportunity to speak with many of their families and their stories were both moving and heartbreaking.

I spoke with Terry Marquez, whose son Justin died from small-arms fire in the Wardak Province in Afghanistan just 1 month after he arrived in the theater. He was only 25 years old when he died.

According to Justin’s mom Terry, as Justin grew up in the Army, he was like a fine wine, he just kept getting better with age. He believed in protecting others. He believed in making the world a better place. He believed in standing up so that others might not have to. Justin embodied the selflessness and courage that defines the men and women of our armed services.

Shortly after sharing Justin’s story on the Senate floor, I invited his mother to be my guest at the State of the Union Address. Her presence reminded not just me but so many of the Senators that she met that night—and she knew them all—how important it is that we uphold our promises to the men and women who put their lives on the line for each and every one of us. It has been an honor to help be one of those voices for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families in Washington.

As one of 20 women in the Senate, I have also enjoyed being a voice for women and children. As women Senators, we bring a unique perspective to the policymaking dialog. We understand the issues facing women and families because we have been there. Some of us are moms and some are grandmoms. We know what it is like to balance that family checkbook and simultaneously run the business and a household. We know what it is like to raise kids and to work, and to try to maintain a beachable future not only for our children but for all the children throughout the United States.

More important than that, the women of the Senate know how to bridge the partisan divide to get the job done.

Together we passed the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, the first bill I cosponsored as a U.S. Senator. We kept student loan rates from doubling. We pushed for initiatives such as my newborn screening bill to ensure that every child has a healthy start in life. I am proud of the work we have done together to support our families and to
set this country on a path to a brighter future.

But the fact is we need a lot more of that in Washington. If we are going to address the biggest challenges facing our country, we have to break through the usual quick and the clock and confront these issues together—head on, united; not as Republicans and Democrats, but working together on behalf of the American people. We need to work together to tackle the rising cost of college that is putting higher education out of reach for many students and then burdening them with unsustainable debt. We need to reform our education system to ensure that every child has the tools and the technology we have to have today and that we have to understand and be an expert in that technology in order to be successful in this competitive environment.

The economy is improving, but wages are stagnant. We must find ways to ensure that Americans working full time are not living in poverty.

We need to help middle-class families get ahead and ensure that working women are receiving the support they need, whether it is fair pay, affordable childcare, or time to care for new babies or seriously ill family members. There is so much work to be done. It is my hope these issues can be addressed in the 114th Congress, but doing so is going to take cooperation from all 100 Members of this body.

The men and women I have worked with during my time are some of the most dedicated, passionate people I have ever met. And there are so many, I am only going to name a few.

BARBARA MIKULSKI was my first mentor, the dean of the women. She wafted me down the aisle to get sworn in. She is one of the greatest advocates for women and for families. And I know that PATTY MURRAY, the mom in ten- nis shoes, is a dynamite negotiator.

Barry G. Brown, one of my 2008 classmates, is a leader in seeking bipartisan solutions. SUSAN COLLINS is a great friend and a proven consensus builder.

CHUCK SCHUMER is a trusted adviser who embodies what it means to be a fighter.

There are so many to name, and I love them all. But I know the Members of the Senate can make progress on these issues that matter so long as we put politics aside and work together. One of my guiding principles is “to whom much is given, much is expected.” Six years ago, North Carolinians gave me an opportunity to be a voice in Washington, and I have put North Carolinians first every single day. I urge my colleagues to do the same—to remember who they are fighting for, not who they are fighting against, to see past the deed, to see past the d or the r, to work together in a bipartisan fashion as I have tried to do to carry forward this country.

Working with all of my colleagues and serving North Carolina in the U.S. Senate is a huge honor.

God bless you all, and God bless the U.S. Senate. Thank you. I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, has the floor, and we are in order now to continue our business.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, first let me commend my colleague from North Carolina, Kay Hagan, who has been an extraordinary asset in the U.S. Senate. She has shown political brav- ery to the highest degree over and over again, taking what she knew were the right votes even when they were politically tough votes. I just listened to her farewell address and I couldn’t agree with her more, that she put the people of North Carolina ahead of everything else in terms of her service in the U.S. Senate. It has been an honor to serve with her, to get to know her husband Chip and her family, and I wish her not just the best for whatever her future undertakings may be.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on Tuesday I was pleased to chair an important hearing in the Judiciary Subcommittee on the Constitution, Civil Rights and Human Rights that took a look at the state of civil rights in America today.

We heard compelling testimony from our colleagues, including Senator Cory BOOKER of New Jersey, Congressman Luis Gutierrez of Illinois, and Congressman Keith Ellison of Minnesota. We also heard from civil rights leaders Wade Henderson and Laura Murphy, and from Dr. Cedric Alexander of the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives.

It was a powerful hearing. We talked about Michael Brown of Ferguson Missour, Eric Garner of Staten Island, and the growing sentiment across our Na- tion that the criminal justice system needs to be improved.

In particular, we talked about chal- lenges that our Nation faces when it comes to restoring the trust of the mini- ority communities in our govern- ment. Every witness, every Senator at the hearing agreed. We need to do more—not just wring our hands but to hold hands together and find solutions.
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soon going to be finishing his term. Mark’s sister Doty describes him as an
OK politician but an extraordinary person. Mark credits most for his pas-
tage to good government. He has been vocal, active, and effec-
tive in his fight against climate change and in his promotion of renew-
able energy. He was the statewide co-chair of the successful 2004 campaign
to pass Colorado’s amendment 37. This measure required Colorado’s power
companies to generate most of their electricity from renewable sources.
Mark Udall was the first State in the Union to take the issue to the voters.
Amendment 37 passed. Mark Udall was the driving force behind that ef-
fort. After his victory in the State, Mark took this issue to the House of Represen-
tatives. The House has twice passed the national renewable elec-
tricity standard championed by Mark.

In 2008, when Mark was elected to represent Colorado in the Senate, his
cousin Tom—Stu’s son—was elected to serve the Second District of Arizona.
When President Kennedy asked Stu to serve as the Secretary of Interior, Mo won
Stu’s seat in Congress.

Unlike his son Mark, Mo never ran for the Senate. He explained why. He said:
I told the Arizona Press Club with [Barry] Goldwater present that there were three rea-
sions I was not running for the Senate: 1. I love my wife and family and am against it. And 3, I have taken a poll and you are going to beat the hell out of me.

Although, he did run for President.

The New Republic reported on that:
The Arizona Congressman, Morris Udall liked to tell a story about a response he got at a barber shop in Maine: He looked in at a barber shop in Maine: He looked in at a barber shop and said to the barber: ‘‘I am the Senator from Arizona and have a hard time getting a decent haircut.’’ The barber replied: ‘‘Wow, you must have a really tough client.’’ The Senator said: ‘‘Yes, generally I have a hard time getting a decent haircut, but when I come in here I know I can depend on you.’’

It is not hard to know where Mark acquired his self-deprecating approach to politics, as it not hard to know where he inherited his commit-
tment to civil rights, to conservation, and to good government.

Mark has said it was during this time that his political views were formed. He himself went on to seek of-

In 2008, when Mark was elected to
represent Colorado in the Senate, his
cousin Tom—Stu’s son—was elected to
serve the State of New Mexico and is
one of our colleagues today.

Mark Udall’s connection to the West and to public service comes from both sides of his family. Mo Udall, a man of many talents, met Patricia Emmons for the first time while playing baseball in Colorado. Patricia or ‘‘Sammie’’ Udall was a sharpshooter, pilot, Peace Corps volunteer at the age of 56. She was a native Coloradan and the person Mark credits most for his passion for the outdoors, for backpacking and climbing.

Today in the 21st century we face a
profound set of challenges and a dra-
matic test of our democratic institu-
tion. Can what Mark Udall often calls this glorious experiment in self-govern-
ment continue to thrive into the next century and beyond?

Mark has carried the tradition of his family and the collective service of the Udall family have represent the very best of our western way of life. They have em-

Mo and Stu Udall, Mark’s uncle and father, both served our country during World War II. Stu was elected to serve the Second District of Arizona. When President Kennedy asked Stu to serve as the Secretary of Interior, Mo won Stu’s seat in Congress.

Unlike his son Mark, Mo never ran for the Senate. He explained why. He said:
I told the Arizona Press Club with [Barry] Goldwater present that there were three rea-
sions I was not running for the Senate: 1. I love my wife and family and am against it. And 3, I have taken a poll and you are going to beat the hell out of me.

Although, he did run for President.

The New Republic reported on that:
The Arizona Congressman, Morris Udall liked to tell a story about a response he got at a barber shop in Maine: He looked in at a barber shop and said to the barber: ‘‘I am the Senator from Arizona and have a hard time getting a decent haircut.’’ The barber replied: ‘‘Wow, you must have a really tough client.’’ The Senator said: ‘‘Yes, generally I have a hard time getting a decent haircut, but when I come in here I know I can depend on you.’’

It is not hard to know where Mark acquired his self-deprecating approach to politics, as it not hard to know where he inherited his commit-
tment to civil rights, to conservation, and to good government.

Mark has said it was during this time that his political views were formed. He himself went on to seek of-

In 2008, when Mark was elected to
represent Colorado in the Senate, his
cousin Tom—Stu’s son—was elected to
serve the State of New Mexico and is
one of our colleagues today.

Mark Udall’s connection to the West and to public service comes from both sides of his family. Mo Udall, a man of many talents, met Patricia Emmons for the first time while playing baseball in Colorado. Patricia or ‘‘Sammie’’ Udall was a sharpshooter, pilot, Peace Corps volunteer at the age of 56. She was a native Coloradan and the person Mark credits most for his passion for the outdoors, for backpacking and climbing.

Today in the 21st century we face a
profound set of challenges and a dra-
lead the fight to end don’t ask, don’t tell.

MARK truly is the very best of what it means to be a public servant: independent, responsible, tough, focused on the future, and possessing an abiding can-do spirit. His calm presence, his unassuming nature, and his ability to see pure good in those around him are exactly what we so desperately need in our process today.

Sir, if I may, MARK UDALL has fought for Colorado families in the most constructive way possible—by pushing thoughtful commonsense solutions—but has never ever fought to achieve a partisan political fleece.

When Colorado was struck with a series of natural disasters, from wildfires to floods, MARK was at his very best, standing up for our State and our families to lead the efforts to ensure that our communities had the support they needed. Whatever the challenge, he was there for the threats we faced next. He has strengthened the way we respond to the growing threat of wildfire by emphasizing preservation efforts that will save lives, property, and tax dollars. We would expect nothing else from a man who has dedicated himself and his career to standing up for Colorado families, the middle class, and the values of the American West.

As a Senator, a Representative, a State legislator, director of the Colorado Outward Bound school, MARK has been a model public servant. He has lived up to and exceeded the high standards his family has set for more than a century. Throughout all of his career to standing up for Colorado families, the middle class, and the values that define us. We can and must do both. History will remember his invaluable role in making it possible for the American people to have this great and necessary debate.

Madam President, my dad once said that, in the end, it is not the awards you receive, it is not the trophies in the garage, or the honors on the shelf, it is what the people who know you best really think of you. To those of us who know MARK—in our family, here in Washington, and in his beloved State of Colorado—he is the real deal.

I remember when I’d say to my dad, Mo, ran for President in 1976. Mo lost the nomination to Jimmy Carter. In his concession speech, he recalled the words of Will Rogers, “Live your life so that whenever you lose, you are ahead.” Mo went on to say: “And I am ahead. I am ahead in staff people who love me and believed in me. And I’m ahead because I have love, respect and admiration for all of you in this room.

That was true of MARK. In his years of public service, and in the years to come, that will always be said of MARK. Whatever the task, whatever the challenge, he meets it head on. In the Congress, and in his day to day life, he is practical, independent, and always generous of himself.

MARK, wherever you go, wherever you are, win or lose, you are ahead— and we all are ahead whenever you are in the room. Or I might say whenever you are on the trail, or the mountainside. We find you out on the trail as likely as anywhere else.

But, then, that has always been the case with MARK, and with all our family. If you are a Udall, you spend a lot of time outdoors, and gladly so. And we never know when we will run into each other. A number of years ago, I was hiking up a mountain in Argentina. All of a sudden, there on the trail at 16,000 feet, I saw MARK, 8,000 feet from the summit. So, I never know when I’m going to run into him, but Madam President, let me say, I am always glad when I do.

MARK, for me, you have always set an example. You have always been true to the legacy of our family. I know that will never change, whatever your endeavors. So, to you, and Maggie, and Jed and Tess, and Jill and I wish you all the best, in this new chapter in your lives.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY for allowing me this courtesy. It is always wonderful to work with CHUCK. He is a first-class Senator.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GREENHOUSE GASES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I have said before on the Senate floor that the proposed Environmental Protection Agency regulations to limit carbon dioxide are an example among far too many of Executive overreach by this administration.
As Professor Tribe points out on his treatise in this matter:

The Regulatory Impact Analysis (RIA) for the Proposed Rule states that the impact of “reduced climate effects” has been “mone-

tized” but not “quantified.” In other words, the EPA does not claim that the Proposed Rule would affect the climate. The mismatch and lack of social benefit distinguish the Proposed Rule from other actions by EPA under the Clean Air Act.

This isn’t news. President Obama’s first EPA Administrator, Lisa Jackson, confirmed in testimony before a Senate committee that: “U.S. action alone will not impact world CO2 levels.”

So these regulations will have no measurable environmental benefit, but will have tremendous costs, particularly for the Midwest, given our energy mix.

The EPA rules are all pain and no gain.

This is not an argument about envi-

ronmental policy. I am proud to be a leading advocate for renewable energy, and I believe there is room for some bi-

 partisan agreement about diversifying our Nation’s energy mix. However, I would all to know that I agree with Professor Tribe that regard-

less of the underlying policy goals, the rule of law must be respected and the proposed rule should be withdrawn.

I hope President Obama will learn from his former Harvard professor and end with the President of the United States doing the right thing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I wish to speak for a few moments about one of the most significant events in my 36 years as a U.S. Senator, the war in Iraq. I want to speak about important historical records crucial to our understand-

ing of the Iraq war.

I want to enter into the public record recent revelations not yet made public, and I make one more public call for a key document to be made fully public.

I will begin by renewing a request to the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, John Brennan. It is a request I have also made to his predecessors: I ask Director Brennan to declassify fully a March 13, 2003 CIA cable dis-

cussing the content that 9/11 hijacker Mohammad Atta had met in Prague with an Iraqi intelligence offi-

cial named Ahmad al-Ani.

Earlier this year, Director Brennan wrote to me, refusing, as did his prede-

cessors, to fully declassify the CIA cable. But in his letter to me he makes public for the first time a few lines from that document. While this is a significant addition to the public record, and I will discuss that in a mo-

ment, it is still not the full cable, and I am calling on him to declassify and release the entire document.

In order to understand why I am making that request, we need to return to early 2003.

On March 6, 2003, just two weeks before U.S. troops would cross the Iraqi border, President Bush held a prime-
time televised press conference. In that press conference he mentioned the Sept. 11, 2001, terror attacks eight times. In the same breath as Iraqi dictator Saddam Hussein. There was a concerted campaign on the part of the Bush administration to connect Iraq in the public mind with the horror of the Sept. 11 attacks. That campaign suc-
cceeded, according to public polls in the week before the Iraq war, half or more of Americans believed Saddam was di-
rectly involved in the attacks. One poll taken in September 2003, 6 months after we invaded Iraq, found that nearly 70 percent of Americans believed it likely that Saddam Hussein was personally involved in the Sept. 11 attacks. Americans who believed in a link between Iraq and 9/11 overwhelmed the public call for a key document to be declassified.
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might of our Armed Forces, the strongest military on the planet. It commits the men and women of our Armed Forces to fight, and perhaps to die, on the battlefield. The decision to go to war must be careful, considered, and based on the facts.

Such careful consideration was tragically absent in the march to war in Iraq.

Here is what the Vice President said on December 9, 2001, in an interview on "Meet the Press." It's been pretty well confirmed that he [Atta] did go to Prague and he did meet with a senior official of the Iraqi intelligence service in Czechoslovakia last April, several months before the attack.

Far from "pretty well confirmed," there was almost no evidence that such a meeting took place. Just a single unsubstantiated report, from a single source, and a mountain of information indicating there was no such meeting, including the fact that travel and other records indicate that Atta was in Texas, certainly in the United States at the time of the purported meeting in Prague.

It was highly irresponsible for the Vice President to make that claim. Calling a single, unconfirmed report from a single source "pretty well confirmed," as he did on Dec. 9, 2001, was a reckless statement to make on such a grave topic as war, in the face of overwhelming doubt that such a meeting occurred.

Yet Vice President Cheney's reckless statements continued, even as evidence mounted that there was no Prague meeting. In September 2002, he said Atta "did apparently travel to Prague on a number of occasions. And on at least one occasion, we have reporting that places him in Prague with a senior Iraqi intelligence official."

The Vice President made those statements in the face of a then-classified June 2002 CIA assessment that said the alleged meeting was "not verified," called the information about it "contradictory," and described assessments of Iraqi cooperation with al-Qaida or "know" that [Atta] was in Prague.

In the years since I have sought declassification of the March 2003 CIA cable on numerous occasions. Twice, in 2011 and 2012, I wrote to then-CIA Director Michael Leon Panetta requesting the field release to declassify the cable. Then in February 2013, I asked Director Brennan during his confirmation hearing whether he would contact the Czech government to ask if they would object to declassification of the cable, and he responded, "Absolutely, Senator, I will."

Despite his commitment, I heard nothing from Director Brennan for some time. Finally, in March of this year, more than a year after his public commitment, I received a letter from Director Brennan.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Director Brennan's March 14, 2013 letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

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


HON. CARL LEVIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, SENATE

As you requested in your confirmation hearing you requested that I pursue declassification of a 2003 communication related to an alleged meeting between Mohammed Atta and an intelligence officer, which was referenced in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence's September 2006 report entitled Postwar Findings about Iraq's WMD Programs and立志 to Interrogation and How They Compare with Prewar Assessments.

I understand that your principal concern is that the historical record be as complete as possible. As a member of the Senate, and on this point we are in agreement. The American people deserve as full an understanding as possible of these historical events, consistent with the national security interests of the United States. Consequently, having worked with our declassification requirements, I can confirm the information, which describes the substance of what the communication relayed with respect to the meeting at issue, without compromising national security.

On March 13, 2003, CIA headquarters received a communication from the field requesting a request into a single-source intelligence report indicating that Muhammed Atta met with former Iraqi intelligence officer al-Ani in Prague in April 2002. In that cable, and he expressed significant concern regarding the possibility of an official public statement by the United States Government indicating a meeting took place. The communication noted that information received after the single-source report raised serious doubts about that report's accuracy.

In particular, the field noted that while it remained possible that a meeting between Atta and al-Ani took place, investigative records subsequently placed Atta in the United States just before and just after the date on which the single-source report said the meeting was to have occurred, making it unlikely that Atta was in Prague at the time of the alleged meeting. The field also warned that both FBI and CIA had previously told foreign intelligence officials that they were unable to verify that Atta was in Prague. Finally, the field observed that "identifications" like the one that was made by the source of the earlier report, during a period of high emotion four months after the September 11 attacks, could be faulty and would require further evidence.

The field added that, to its knowledge, "there is not one USG [counterterrorism or FBI] expert that . . . has said they have evidence or 'know' that [Atta] was indeed [in Prague]. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite."

I hope this letter answers any outstanding questions about the correspondence in question and addresses our shared interest in creating an accurate and complete historical record.

Sincerely,

JOHN O. BRENNAN.

Mr. LEVIN,

The letter contains no indication that he had asked the Czech Government for its view, as he committed to do. But Director Brennan's letter includes, and therefore finally declassifies, this very clear statement from the cable: "[T]here is not one USG [counterterrorism] or FBI expert who . . . has said they have evidence or 'know' that [Atta] was indeed [in Prague]. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite."

Again, that cable was sent to CIA headquarters on March 13, 2003—a week before our invasion. It was the Vice President of the United States, Dick Cheney, continued to suggest the meeting may have taken place. He said the following about the meeting on "Meet the Press" on September 14, 2003—6 months after CIA received that cable: "We've never been able to develop any more of that yet either in terms of confirming it or discrediting it. We just don't know." Here is what he told the Denver Post newspaper on January 9, 2004: "We've never been able to confirm that meeting. That was the one that possibly tied the two together to 9/11." Here is what he told CNN on June 17, 2004: "We..."
have never been able to confirm that, nor have we been able to knock it down. We just don’t know.’’

Mr. President, those statements were simply not true. We did know. We did know that there was no evidence that such a meeting had taken place. We did know there was ample evidence it did not take place. We did know that there was, as the CIA cable says, “not one” government expert who said there was evidence that Atta met with Iraqi intelligence. The Vice President recklessly disregarded the truth, and he did so in a way calculated to maintain support for the administration’s decision to go to war in Iraq.

There is a second recent revelation about how the “Prague meeting” progressed from unsubstantiated report to justification for war. It comes from Jiri Ruzeck, who headed the Czech counterintelligence service on and after 9/11. Mr. Ruzeck published a memoir earlier this year, and we have had transcripts translated from Czech. It recounts the days after the terror attack, including how his nation’s intelligence services first reported a single-source rumor of a Prague meeting between Atta and al-Ani, how CIA officials under pressure from the White House took him at his word, and how U.S. officials pressured the Czech government when Czech intelligence officials failed to produce the confirmation that the Bush administration wanted.

Mr. Ruzeck writes:

It was becoming more and more clear that we had not met expectations and did not provide the right intelligence output.

Mr. Ruzeck continues:

The Americans showed me that anything can be violated, including the rules that they themselves taught us. Without any regard to us, they used our intelligence information for propaganda purposes. They wanted to mine certainty from unconfirmed suspicion and use it as an excuse for military action. We were supposed to play the role of useful idiots—that to whose initiative a war would be started.

That is chilling. We have a senior intelligence official of a friendly nation describing the pressure that he and other Czech officials were under to give the Bush administration material it could use to justify a war.

When it came to the most serious decision a government can make—the decision to commit our sons and daughters to the Bush administration was playing games with intelligence. The full, still classified cable includes critically important, relevant information, and it has been redacted and denied to the public in order to protect those in the Bush White House who were responsible. The Vice President had firsthand knowledge of what the Bush administration knew and did not do—to ask the Czech government if it knew that there was no evidence of or “know” that Atta was indeed an FBI expert that . . . has said they have evidence or “know” that [Atta] was indeed an FBI expert. In fact, the analysis has been quite the opposite.

In my statement just entered into the record, I also discussed recent revelations about the report of that Czech intelligence agency about U.S. pressure to confirm the report of that meeting. The American people deserve to know the full truth about this episode and particularly in light of the new revelations from a top Czech official.

I have renewed my request to Director Brennan to declassify the entire cable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana, MADAM PRESIDENT. Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, it is my pleasure to take a few minutes on the floor to give a farewell message, and I thank you for your courtesies. I begin with a Scripture, Philippians 4:7, New American Standard Bible, that reads: “And the peace of God, which surpasses all comprehension, will guard your hearts and your minds in Christ Jesus.”

Truly for the first time in my adult life I have felt that extraordinary peace about something that was unexpected, but is certainly something that I accept. It has really been amazing as a Christian, as an adult, and as a leader to find myself in this place in a time that should be a time of sadness, but all I can feel is actual joy. It is quite amazing.

It had never happened to me before, so I thought it would be wonderful to share—with so many of my friends, supporters, family, staff, and colleagues listening in—for a few minutes to say that it is absolutely true, and I am determined to be an extraordinary peace simply just a few days before the election and since then. I think it is because I feel and know that God has called me to another place.

Before being a Senator, a wife, and a daughter, I am a Christian, and my faith really is central to my life. My parents always taught me to put my faith where it belongs—in God himself. So it is really with that sense of gratitude and joy that I have been given an opportunity to serve my state, my re-election, and my country against 34 years—which is quite amazing—having started at a very young age and still being relatively young.

So let me just share some remarks about that time, and particularly the time that I have chosen to begin by thanking my family, and particularly my extraordinary husband Frank, who has been a partner and, as I said on election night, not only an encouraging and supportive partner but someone who has literally held the fort. When I wanted to quit, he would say: No, you have to continue to serve. He is not only an accomplished lawyer and professional, but also an elected official in his own right, he came from a family that was dedicated to public service, having both of his parents being very active in party politics—first the Republican Party and then the Democratic Party. But that is a whole other story. They are both strong civil rights leaders—my husband as well—and always encouraging me and being willing to share the burdens of public life as well as sharing in the great joy.

Our son Connor is now 23 years old, and our daughter Mary Shannon is now 17. The reason I mention that is because Connor was 5 when we were elected to the Senate. Mary Shannon was adopted the first year we were here. On election night, she looked at me, she is just months old, and she said: Mom, it is going to be a little strange. I have only known you as a Senator. So I warned her that now that I am going to be a full-time mom this is going to be a real problem for her. She is not looking forward to it.

To our new daughter-in-law Emily, and especially to our precious little Maddox Parker Smellings, who many people saw on election night—now, Maddox gets the distinction. He is 10 months old, but he gives me the most joy, and I used to keep a picture of him during all my debates. There were only three, as you all will remember, but I would keep a picture of him because
my staff kept telling me: You have to smile more. I kept saying: But I can’t, because I am really aggravated. They said: No, you have to smile. So my solution was to put a picture of Maddox on my podium and, of course, I then smiled through the whole debate. That is a trick that those who will be continuing to debate.

To my mother and father, who are the light of not only our family but the light of our community, the light of the world in many ways—they had 9 children, 37 grandchildren, and now 6 great grandchildren. They are in wonderful health, they are watching right now, and I can only say they are two of the most extraordinary individuals I have ever known. Our family is truly blessed by their sacrificial leadership.

Let me also mention my eight siblings—eight brothers and sisters: Mark, Melanie, Michelle, Mitchell, Madeleine, Martin, Melinda, and Maurice, Jr.—all m’s. That is another story. There are all of my nieces and nephews, who campaigned with me up until the last day. My godchild Sasha literally knocked on doors with me. I was teaching her how to knock on doors before the campaign was over so the tradition is in our own neighborhood where we have lived since I was 5 years old—Broadmoor in New Orleans.

When I first got here 18 years ago, I literally could not find the side door. I didn’t know anything. I wasn’t even expecting to be here. It was kind of like a dream that I got here, because I had run for Governor, wanted to be the Governor, and served 16 years in my State. I knew that was what I was being called to do—and I see LAMAR ALEXANDER—to change our education system, to do some coastal work, and then I landed here. But I literally knew nothing of how to be a Senator. I stumbled a great deal in my first years. But I would like to thank my chiefs of staff, Norma Jane Sabiston, Ron Faucheux, Jason Matthews, Jane Campbell, and Don Cravins. I had five of the most remarkable chiefs of staff, who, with me, learned how to do this job and to do it well. We never forget where we came from, and they are still—all of them—with me, and all of us are still working to make our State the very best that it can be and to make our country the very best that it can be.

To three staffers who have been with me for almost 20 years—Alícia Williams is the longest serving office manager, I think, in the Senate. She was here when I arrived and stayed with me. She was with Bennett Johnston. T. Bradley Keith has been with me for 22 years as a former staffer in a former life, before I was a Senator, and now as my long-time State director. And Shannon Langlois has been, I think, with the Senator for the most 30 years. She is our webmaster. She was very close with Bennett Johnston and stayed with me. She has literally given her life to thousands, hundreds of thousands of cases in Louisiana and trained every caseworker that I had for 18 years, and they just did phenomenal work.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD my current staff, all of whom are here—my personal staff, my energy staff, and my home-land security staff.

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

PERSONAL STAFF OF MARY LANDRIEU


ENERGY COMMITTEE STAFF

Elizabeth Liz Craddock, Afton Zaunbrecher, Ashley Johnson, Alan Paul Stayman, Bryan Petit, Caroline Bruckner, Clayton Allen, Dan Adamson, Darla Ripchensky, David Brooks, David Gillers, Dominic Taylor, Elizabeth Fayanis Mathews, Herman Bubba Gesser, III, Jan Brunner, Jonathon Burpee, Kristen Granier; Lindsay Moulcqghugh, Mark Tiner, Megan Buetow, Monica Campbell, Paul Davis, Renae Black, Sallie Derr, Sam Ed- ward Fowler, Sa’Rah Hamm, Will Dempster.

HOMELAND APPROP STAFF

Stephanie Gupta, Drenan Dudley, Scott Nance, Chip Walgren, Colin MacDermott, Eric Bader.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Madam President, I want to thank Don Cravins, again, as my chief of staff; Liz Craddock, Staff Director of my energy committee; and Stephanie Gomend and security. I know I am leaving them in good hands with what they are going to be doing in the future and with the great leadership that remains here.

I only have a few minutes, so I will just run through a couple of the highlights of some of the accomplishments that I am most proud of and really take this opportunity to thank so many who helped, because the one thing I have learned that most certainly is true, is that if you want to ac-

The cosponsors of that bill, amazingly, were Frank Murkowski from Alaska, Trent Lott from Mississippi, John Breaux from Louisiana, and Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN from California. Chris Dodd joined me a few days later after we introduced it—and RON WYDEN, Chris Bond, John Warner, and THAD COCHRAN, just to name a few. That was the end of that because through this particular bill didn’t pass; we missed it literally by inches, and I will describe what that was in a minute—we had 4,500 organizations throughout the country, from the Sierra Club to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and everyone in between in a broad coalition to fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund—and LAMAR ALEXANDER knows more about this than I could ever know, and he will tell you one day the details about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Udalls and the Udalls’ fathers were very instrumental in the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It was a promise made but never kept—that this country would set aside $900 million a year to purchase and purchase our parks, and to secure recreational opportunities. This country is so blessed—more than any on Earth—with the amount of natural resources we have, and we have not lived up to that promise. So I introduced this bill as a young legislator. John Breaux said you don’t even know what you are doing; how are you introducing a bill like this? I said: I don’t know, but I am just going for it because I know it is right. We passed it, but it has been in part of almost every piece of energy legislation—in pieces and parts since that day we introduced that. I am very hopeful that war will go on under Senator MURKOWSKI, the daughter of Frank Murkowski, and MARIA CANTWELL, who in many ways got to the Senate because she defeated one of the gentle-

The bill did three things. It fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, a trust fund that will go on for generations. It would fully fund coastal restoration, which is so impor-

So I have been committed to finishing the work.
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lost—that he directed, literally with the stroke of a pen, $1 billion to the gulf coast in the energy bill for 2005. That money was divided 50 percent to Louisiana and 50 percent to the other States.

Now I can promise everyone here that for the $500 million that went to Louisiana, we can account for every penny of it. We know exactly where it went, and we put that down as a down-payment to restoring our coast, which doesn’t belong to us—it belongs to the whole Nation. This is the greatest, the seventh largest delta on the planet. It is what Thomas Jefferson leveraged the whole entire Treasury of the United States to purchase. It is something worth fighting for: We would not be a country without the Mississippi Delta, and we could never have found our way west if we couldn’t have supplied the great center of this Nation with the commerce they needed.

Every State along this river—19 of them—does not understand what I am talking about. AMY KLOBUCHAR understands this. She is at the top of this river, and I am at the bottom, and we have talked a lot about how important that corridor is. That needs to be kept alive.

Then there was the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which I finally passed with Pete Domenici’s help, who was my dear friend and one of the most wonderful leaders I have ever worked with. He came from a family with eight children. We had nine, and we are both Catholic and came from the same sort of background. He served with such passion. So he joined with me in passing the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which finally secured a permanent stream of revenue for coastal restoration and protection.

But as LAMAR ALEXANDER knows, it left out the land and water, and it left out wildlife. We just couldn’t lift it all, so the修正ed.

Finally, there is the RESTORE Act, which I worked on with my colleagues when the BP oil spill killed 11 people in the gulf and spilled 5 million barrels of oil in the gulf. Thanks go to BARBARA BOXER, this extraordinary woman who has been a partner with me. We think very differently. California is very different from Louisiana. But I will say one thing about BARBARA BOXER, and I believe she would want to be with her because she never stops fighting. She and I are very much alike in that regard. Once we set our minds to something there is no dividing us.

People asked why did I send her money for her reelection? Why did I raise so much money from Louisiana? I said that I would do it again because when no one would stand up—well, not no one, but if she hadn’t stood up when that BP oil spill went down, and said, I am one of this committee and I believe the gulf coast deserves this funding, we just wouldn’t have had it. It is as simple as that. People do not know how powerful a chairman is here. When a chairman makes up their mind and they say this is what we are going to do, the rest of the committee, for the most part, goes along. And so BARBARA said that.

With Senator VITTER, of course, who is the ranking member on that committee put his shoulder to the wheel, and we were able to get—well, it is still in court, but we think—a serious down-payment to one of the great ecological disasters of our State, of our country, which is the loss of the gulf coast. This just isn’t in Louisiana. This is Texas and Mississippi, and it is going to affect parts of the whole country. But we are on the mend.

I came here to do that work. I came to find money. I found it, and we are going to continue that work. I am thrilled to work with so many of you to get that done.

On education—LAMAR has to leave, but I am glad he is here because I found a great soulmate in LAMAR ALEXANDER—former Secretary of Education, former Governor, a Presidential candidate, and extraordinarily committed to finding a better way for our children in America to be educated. As proud as we are of the public school system, at the turn of the century, when people in the world were wondering how to build the middle class in the world and lots of countries were struggling with how to do that, America knew. America knew that if you educated your citizens—women, boys, and girls; not just boys, which is what the world has issued—a tragedy—if we open up our schools for universal, free education, along with other things, it would lift your country to greatness unsurpassed in the history of the world.

What breaks my heart is to walk into schools today—and MARK WARNER knows this because he was Governor of Virginia—and see children’s eyes just completely dulled, sitting there completely bored, teachers who are just going through the motions. It breaks my heart because I know that not only does it limit their lives but it limits the potential of our Nation.

With LAMAR ALEXANDER and a handful of Democrats, I was proud to work with Presidents Bill Clinton and George Bush to pass a series of laws. Evan Bayh comes to mind, Joe Lieberman, John Breaux, and a group of us stood up and said: It is time to stop sending money to the States without accountability. If we need to send money, we need to hold States accountable, and we need to give opportunities for choice to parents and public charter schools.

I am reluctant to go too far on vouchers. You have heard my speech on that. You heard Senator FEINSTEIN’s speech on that. But both of us have agreed to support some kinds of strategic vouchers that help poor kids get out of failing schools until we can fix them.

Most importantly, I support high-performing public charter schools, and I will continue to fight that for the rest of my days. I thank all of you who helped on that and particularly TOM CARPER on the Democratic side and LAMAR ALEXANDER. Cory Booker has been an amazing leader and will hopefully continue on that. I thank DICK DURBIN, who is on Appropriations. I had to twist his arm a little bit on some of it, but he ended up coming around and has been an amazing fighter for the right kinds of public schools that serve the children first and the bureaucracy and politics second. I respect teachers. I respect administrators. But our schools should work for the children and their families who so desperately want them to have a great education.

The third issue I wish to speak about, which is a legacy issue, is adoption. I hope I can get through this without tearing up. I don’t know why I have always had such passion for this issue.

My mother had nine children without adoption. She had the problem. As a young child, I remember my aunt adopted two children. I think it might have been that; I can’t remember exactly. I started to think about all the children in the world who don’t have parents. Maybe I was always so proud when I filled out those forms in Catholic school. I can remember sitting there filling them out: Are your parents divorced or married? I loved checking “married.” How many siblings do you have? I loved putting “eight.” I was always so proud of my family.

I thought, what do children without parents do? I just could not imagine. So I got very passionate about it. I ended up, of all things, marrying an orphan. My husband was adopted out of an orphanage. So I thought, yes, this is going in the right direction. I thought I would adopt children. I thought he could not say no since he himself was adopted, and so this would work out. Not surprisingly, we ended up adopting two children.

But this was my passion before I met my husband and before I even thought about adopting. It was as if God put this in my heart, so I have taken it and carried it.

I thank DAVE CAMP; Jim Oberstar, who is deceased; Tom Bliley from Virginia, who is a great leader among us; Larry Craig, who is no longer here, who served as my cochair; and Senator JESSIE HELMS. Amazingly, I didn’t know to be afraid of Jessie Helms; I thought he was a really nice guy. Later, everybody had to tell me how hard he was to get along with. But I went up to him, and I thought he would surely want to help because he had adopted a child. I don’t think a lot of people realize that. Sure enough, we passed a great treaty together that serves as the model for international adoption today. JOE BIDEN was the ranking member on the committee. With Jesse Helms and Joe Biden’s help, we passed a great treaty years ago, and we are still in the process of making that possible and working it through.
The accomplishments are really quite long, so I am going to submit them for the RECORD. I will only say that the adoption tax credit which Bob Casey worked on and took up that cause when he got here—I am thrilled and hope it stays. I would like to say to my KLAMATH friend, I appreciate her agreeing to step in and take over the leadership of the adoption caucus on this side and Roy Blunt, who I think will take it up on the Republican side and continue this great work.

There are over 100,000 children who are waiting for families in the United States. There are over 500,000 children in foster care. These children think it is their fault they are there, and it is not. It is not their fault that their family disintegrated around them. It is not their fault that they got pregnant at 11 and were kicked out of their house. Instead of the family wrapping that child in their arms and helping them to grow, they put them out on the street. It is not their fault.

We need to realize that God does not make trash. He never has, and he never will. Everybody he has made has a purpose and dignity, and we need to honor that and do better work. I have spent a lot of time here on it. I am going to continue to do so. I will never stop working on it. I am very proud of the work we have done.

I will put this into the RECORD. On energy very quickly and then finally disaster recovery, I couldn’t have been prouder when I became the chair of this committee. It was quite a miracle. I didn’t expect it. I never thought I would last long enough to become the chair because there were so many people ahead of me. It kind of worked out when Max Baucus left to go to China and Lisa Murkowski as my ranking member. Of course, I worked with her father. I didn’t sit next to him because I was a junior member, but I worked with him closely, and it has been wonderful working with her. I am so proud that Maria Cantwell will step up and take that leadership. I know the two of them work beautifully together. They do see the world differently, but they are two women who know how to compromise and who will be respectful of each other and find a way for our country to move forward.

I can tell you all that in my whole life—which isn’t that long, but it has been a pretty good run in public office—there has never been a time when America has been closer to energy independence. What that means to our country is beyond description. We don’t have to listen to parts of the world that don’t hold our values. We can lift up our country. We can move forward. And it has to be with a combination of fossil fuels, wind, and solar energy, a way to a greener, cleaner environment, and manufacturing right here in America.

I hope you all will put down the words and pick up the plow and really plow together because this is an amazing opportunity for our country. I sure hope we don’t miss it. It is going to benefit and make the whole country, not just our part of the country, more prosperous.

People desperately want to move up into the middle class and stay there and not feel so fragile and feel as if they can have the manufacturing jobs and good energy jobs lost, really eliminate the geopolitical nightmares we have been in, fighting wars for oil. It has to come to an end.

Finally, I will say a word about disaster recovery. When I got to the Senate, my husband and I were looking at each other saying: How did we even end up here? We had no idea. When Katrina hit, it became very clear that this is why I needed to be here.

I had been an appropriator since I was 23 years old, a little bit about budgets. I knew a little bit about how the system worked. I knew how the State and local governments depended on the Federal Government so much funding. I understood the power of HUD and the power of housing and the power of levees and the Corps of Engineers. So I was perfectly positioned to be able to lead the effort for my State, and they desperately needed a leader. I wasn’t perfect. I made lots of mistakes. But I wasn’t afraid to try because that is all you can do.

The devastation was so great and it was so unbelievable. Eighty percent of the east bank of the city and much of Jefferson Parish—not quite as bad as New Orleans—and all of St. Bernard—67,000 people in St. Bernard lost everything. Everyone in the Lower Ninth Ward lost everything, which is like a small city unto itself. In New Orleans east, which is like a small city unto itself, 60,000 people lost every school, every house. It was unbelievable.

I say to my colleagues: Thank you for being there for us. I know I agitated you to death. I know I never stopped asking. But you were the only ones who were there, fighting for us. The city is going to stay there. The region is going to stay there. And had this government just invested a little bit of the money back that we have given it over time—from our energy resources, from our manufacturing, from the wealth we have created along that great mouth of the river—if the government had just given us a little bit of money—$500 million here, $500 million there—and built levees that wouldn’t have broken in 26 places, we wouldn’t have had $140 billion in damage.

So when I came to Robert Byrd because President Bush was not that forward-leaning—I will just leave it at that. There will be a lot more in my book about it, but I will just leave it at that, not very forward-leaning. The person I went to was Robert Byrd. In his old age, he was so wise. He just looked at me. He didn’t say much at that time, but he just took my hand and said, ‘I will help you.’

He was the chair of the Appropriations Committee, so that meant something. Boy, he was. He helped me write things in a bill that could probably never be present today. That was when President Bush and I worked together to help people to heal wounds and to bring hope and to be compassionate. That is what government is there to do. If government is not there when you have lost everything, then what is the use of having it?

So we hope we will be able to repay this country for the investments that have been made, and we will. We will do our best. With all of the people who come to New Orleans and all the concern that there is, ‘Can we bring joy and happiness when people come—we hope to pay our way and to pay this back over time for what you have done to help us. We are doing a good job of helping ourselves by planning, doing more smart-growth, sustainable development, building our levees to the point where they won’t break again, and we will continue to do that.

So those are some of the legacy pieces I have worked on. It is kind of amazing that these were the things that were in my heart when I was a little girl. I didn’t learn this when I was a Senator. I can remember taking a bus when I was in the eighth grade down to the coast and looking at LaFourche Parish for the first time, and for a girl from the poor part of uptown, I kept looking at the nuns who took me, and I said: What world is this? I had no idea about Bayou LaFourche.

I got to be a Senator. I remember LaFourche, the bayou, and I remembered how fragile it looked to me even as a child, and I thought, if I can do anything to save this place, I will. I have spent a lot of my time saving it, and it is stronger now. It is still not completely safe, but it is much stronger now.

I tutored in public school. My passion started when the nuns of Ursuline sent me to tutor in a public school, and the little girl whom I tutored, who was my age, couldn’t read. I had a member going home to my mother and saying: This is the strangest thing. I just met a little girl. She is my age, and she can’t read. Mama, is that possible, that children don’t know how to read?

I can remember her sitting me down and explaining to me why some children couldn’t read, and I said: That doesn’t seem right to me. I made up my mind then that I would work.

The reason I say this is because there are a lot of young people listening to this, and I just want you to know, just listen to your heart because God puts these things in your heart at very
They encouraged me to run when I was 23 years old, and I tried to never leave them. Only 8 percent of my State is now organized. I have never left them. I think you should leave with the people who brought you to the dance, and they most certainly did.

I thank Harry Reid, who has been an amazing friend to me and who most importantly, has been a great friend to my family. He has honored us in so many small ways, and I just love him for his tenacity and his leadership.

I thank you all. I hope I didn’t leave anyone out. It has been a joy, but I know God is calling me to a different place. I am not the least bit sad and I am not the least bit afraid because it has been a remarkable opportunity to serve with all of you, and I thank you very much.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH). The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO MARY LANDRIEU

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to thank Senator Landrieu for her tireless service to our State and to the country. I have had the pleasure of knowing Mary for a long time. She was in her second year of service in the Senate when I first came to Washington to the U.S. House, but I would bet that Senator Landrieu has probably known me longer than anyone in this Chamber realizes. Both sets of my grandparents live all of 3 blocks from where Mary grew up, and I grew up all of 10 blocks from there. Mary and my brother Jeff were grade school classmates starting at kindergarten.

Of course, here in the Senate I had the honor of working with Mary on so many important issues and challenges. From the moment we worked together on key Louisiana issues, we determined on those issues to put aside any partisan concerns when those crucial priorities were at stake.

As she alluded to, the most challenging and trying time in all of that experience was just a few months after I first came to the Senate when Hurricanes Katrina and Rita struck. Neither of us could have ever imagined facing the challenges our State and Mississippi and others faced and facing the challenges we faced in the Senate trying to respond in a robust and full responsible way. I am sure it was the most trying work for both of us in our careers.

Louisiana faced unprecedented disaster and deprivation, and that brought us together all the more to work for those crucial Louisiana needs and priorities. We traveled together, of course, to see the damage and meet with our neighbors and local leaders all around the State. Her staff and mine worked directly together around-the-clock, really, for months, sometimes in my office, sometimes in hers, always with the same goal of doing everything possible to help our neighbors and Louisiana citizens get through that disaster and get through to a full recovery.

Those trials, of course, didn’t end with Katrina and Rita. There were other similar challenges which brought us together and on which Mary was a distinguished leader. She was always a champion for domestic energy production, and Louisiana will enjoy a fair share of oil and gas revenue under the legislation currently before us as Senator Landrieu.

After the infamous BP oil spill in 2010, Mary pushed for the RESTORE Act legislation to dedicate revenue from the fines to oilspill recovery in the affected areas.

As Louisiana fights continually against the loss of coastal wetlands, major restoration work is moving forward because of Mary’s years of hard work directly related to that.

Due to Mary’s strong support of our Nation’s military, our fighting men and women are better off. The bases in Louisiana, which are important to our communities and to the Nation’s defense, continue to have what they need for their vital mission. Our veterans face challenges and most recently faced the cries of those seeking new health care clinics in Louisiana, and Mary helped make those finally happen, finally move forward, including pushing the case fervently and directly to administration officials.

In a very personal and dramatic way, Mary is enthusiastic in promoting children’s welfare and supporting adoption. Her dedication internationally was recognized when Russia banned her travel after her direct and well-founded criticism of Russian action to curb adoption by Americans.

In all of this work, one thing is always crystal clear—certainly crystal clear to me—with Senator Landrieu: Louisiana has always been first in her heart and her top motivation, and she has had a distinguished career of service in the Senate on all of those issues I mentioned and many more. All of us in Louisiana gives her our sincere thanks for that.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

With Senator Mary Landrieu’s permission, I want to do a quick interlude to send a bill over to the House.

CENTRAL OREGON JOBS AND WATER SECURITY ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the energy committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2640 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2640) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to adjust the Crooked River boundary, to provide water certainty for the City of Prineville, Oregon, and for other purposes.