

satisfaction in all of this. It means that before July 4, the President will have signed TPA, TAA, and the AGOA and preferences bill, and we will be well on our way toward enactment of a robust Customs package. All of that together would be quite an accomplishment. All it is going to take is some hard work, some faith in one another, and everybody voting the same way the next time they voted the last time.

TRIBUTE TO BOB LAWSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to one of Kentucky's greatest teachers, and a man who has served the public good and the law for 5 decades. My friend Professor Bob Lawson, who has taught law at the University of Kentucky College of Law for 50 years, will be retiring this July 1.

Over the course of his 50 years of teaching, Professor Lawson has become one of the most respected lawyers and teachers in the Commonwealth. He is also well known and admired for his work outside the classroom as the author of much of the Commonwealth's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence.

Professor Lawson was born in a small town in southwestern West Virginia, not far from the Kentucky border, in a coal community. Encouraged by his father to get an education and escape life in the coal camps, he attended Berea College in Kentucky and then earned his law degree at UK in 1963.

In 1965, he was asked to teach law at UK, which he has done ever since. His specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. In the 1970s, he worked with the State legislature to rewrite Kentucky's penal code, which was in need of an overhaul.

I would point out that of Professor Lawson's thousands of students, I was one of them. Bob Lawson was one of my favorite professors, and I still recall his teachings today. I am also proud to call him a friend over the years. UK has greatly benefitted from having him as a member of the faculty for all this time, and he will be sorely missed.

I want to thank Professor Bob Lawson for his five decades of service to the University of Kentucky and to the Commonwealth. For 50 years he led Kentucky's brightest young minds into the legal profession, and his many thousands of students serve as a fitting tribute to his legacy. I wish him all the best as he retires from UK and begins a new stage in life.

The Lexington Herald-Leader published an article detailing Professor Lawson's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFTER 50 YEARS AT UK, PROFESSOR WHO WROTE MUCH OF KENTUCKY LAW AND INVESTIGATED UK ATHLETICS IS RETIRING

(By John Cheves)

Robert Gene Lawson, who is retiring July 1, wrote much of Kentucky law and taught thousands of the people who practice it.

Lawson spent 50 years as a professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law, and he was dean twice. Among his students were U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Gov. Steve Beshear, U.S. Reps. Andy Barr and Ed Whitfield, and most of the Kentucky Supreme Court.

"It's been really interesting watching my students go on in life," Lawson, 76, said Friday, sitting in a cluttered campus office that showed no sign of getting packed up any time soon. "They've done important things and mostly have done them well."

Lawson built an equally large reputation for himself outside the classroom. He authored the state's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence. He harangued the General Assembly, with what he considers limited success, for packing the state's jails and prisons with the mentally ill and the addicted. He led investigations into ethics violations at the UK Athletics Department, which didn't win him many friends, and into the nightmarish Beverly Hills Supper Club fire in 1977 that killed 165 people in northern Kentucky.

"He was Kentucky law," said Allison Connelly, a onetime Lawson student who later joined him on the law school faculty. "He has done so much, when you look at his lifetime of work, to make Kentucky a better place."

The son of a coal miner, Lawson was born in 1938 in a tiny Logan County, W.Va., community almost entirely owned by Island Creek Coal Co. His father urged him to escape the coal camp through an education. He worked his way through tuition-free Berea College and then earned a law degree at UK in 1963.

After two years of practicing law, which he enjoyed, Lawson accepted an invitation in 1965 to teach at UK.

"I never thought I'd stay here," he said. "I thought I'd try teaching for a little bit, see what it was like, and get back into my law practice. But it was a wonderful experience from day one—for one thing: being around all of these bright young people."

Lawson's specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. He wrote the books on those subjects, books that occupy the shelves of law libraries and judicial chambers. In the 1970s, he worked with the legislature to rewrite the state's penal code, which was hugely disorganized at the time. "We had never reformed our criminal laws in Kentucky, so you had offenses that had been added one by one over a period of, what, 150 years, 180 years, and a lot of inconsistency in how these offenses were treated," he said.

To Lawson's frustration, within a decade of his penal code work, the national "war on drugs" and concern over urban violence led politicians in Kentucky and elsewhere to enact much tougher sentencing laws.

It's one thing to imprison a murderer for decades, but these new laws put even minor criminals behind bars for long stretches, Lawson said. For example: In dozens of Kentucky cases Lawson researched, people were convicted of the felony of "drug trafficking within 1,000 yards of a school" after police caught them with a small personal stash of drugs in their homes or cars several blocks from a school.

"Bob Lawson's philosophy was always, 'You lock up the people who genuinely scare you because they're dangerous, they're violent, and for the other people, you see if you

can't rehabilitate them and make them productive members of society,'" said Fayette Family Court Judge Kathy Stein, a former chairwoman of the state House Judiciary Committee.

In 1974, the year Lawson's penal code changes took effect, Kentucky spent \$11 million housing about 3,000 inmates at two prisons. This year, the state expects to spend about \$500 million to keep about 22,000 inmates in 12 prisons and dozens of county jails that are paid to hold the state's felon spillover.

The General Assembly's effort four years ago to cut the inmate population—at Lawson's urging—has fallen short "because they aimed too low," he said. "They tinkered; they did too little."

Some county jails are so overcrowded that state inmates who are serving five to 10 years must sleep on the floor and seldom leave their cells, he said. There is little education or addiction treatment provided, so felons are no better off when they're finally released, and in many cases, they're probably harder than ever, he said.

"We got mad at the people who were committing criminal offenses, and we veered away from a philosophy of trying to correct them, which originally had been the thrust of our justice system," Lawson said. "We jacked up the penalties on everything. As a result, we've created this huge problem of trying to pay for all of this. We're just making things worse for ourselves than they were."

One of Lawson's other crusades over the years was trying to be a watchdog of UK's lucrative and popular sports programs. At the request of various UK presidents, he led investigations into possible ethics violations, including cases that brought about the departures of basketball coach Eddie Sutton in 1989 and athletics director Larry Ivy in 2002.

In 2002, as a member of the UK Athletics Administration's board of directors, Lawson cast the sole dissenting vote against hiring Mitch Barnhart as athletics director. Lawson said he didn't object to Barnhart, but the \$375,000-a-year salary was "ridiculous" compared to the more modest sums paid to other UK faculty and staff. (Barnhart remains in the job and now makes \$600,000 a year.)

Over the past 50 years, the UK Athletics Department evolved into its own universe with its own rules, Lawson said.

"They have become an independent entity, separate from the rest of the university, which is a problem," he said. "Their budget is their budget. The athletics department regards the money that comes in for athletics as their money, not the university's money."

"And I guess I have felt, watching it through the years, that they sort of lost what I would consider to be a reasonable connection of these students to the university as compared to athletics. Let me just give you an example. When I first came here, the basketball season was 20 games. It's now 40. I have my doubts about how they can be a legitimate college student when they've got that problem."

Lawson said he also regrets the explosion in tuition costs at UK and other state universities around the nation, largely because of shrinking public support from state governments. The next UK budget will get just eight percent of its revenue from state appropriations, the smallest share ever.

"I think everyone who is 50 years old and older—including me—ought to be ashamed of themselves for what we're doing to our young people, making an education all but unaffordable," he said.

"When Mitch McConnell and Steve Beshear were in my classroom, I doubt they paid much more than \$100 a semester for

their tuition. They went to school almost without any cost, substantially free," Lawson said. "A resident law student next year will pay between \$21,000 and \$22,000 in tuition. You can't work your way through school at that level. I have students graduating with \$100,000 or more in loan debts that will affect them for the rest of their lives. Shame on us."

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week Egyptian government investigators working on behalf of a judge who is overseeing a 4-year-old case against international and Egyptian nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, visited the main office of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, or CIHRS, and asked for registration and financial documents. The investigators reportedly tried to pass off an informal search warrant as legal cover, but CIHRS staff made clear they couldn't search the office without an official one. The investigators left, but their message was clear: a new crackdown is on the way.

According to information I have received, CIHRS is the second organization to receive such a visit this year. The same investigators previously visited another organization, the Egyptian Democratic Academy, and looked into their activities and funding sources. Four members of the academy have since been banned from leaving Egypt.

Some Senators may remember this case: it is the same one that led to the conviction of 43 foreign and Egyptian NGO workers, including 16 Americans, in 2013. The fact that the Egyptian authorities have decided to resuscitate this old case against these NGOs shows that President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi's administration is confident that it can silence critical voices with little international objection.

Since the 2011 revolution, the government has made several efforts to replace a harsh 2002 law on associations—unevenly implemented under former President Hosni Mubarak—with even more draconian regulations, including a draft law that would have given the government and security agencies effective veto power over NGO boards of directors, foreign funding, and very existence. Although a new law has yet to be passed, the authorities have previously raided or detained staff from respected organizations such as the Hisham Mubarak Law Center, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights.

I am deeply concerned with the reinvigoration of this 4-year-old case and the message it sends about Cairo's intent to restrict independent NGOs. I am similarly concerned with recent press reports alleging that the authorities have disappeared a significant number of young people, some of whom later died, in a coordinated campaign, activists say, to silence dissent. Such actions, if true, are deplorable and are

no way to effectively combat terrorism and related insecurity.

Support for a strong and flourishing independent civil society is a critical part of any pluralistic society, but we are seeing the reverse in Egypt. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations which provides assistance for Egypt, I am dismayed by the al-Sisi government's rejection of basic freedoms, whether it is the right to express oneself or the right to assemble. Such repressive tactics are not likely to contribute to greater security or stability in Egypt—instead they are likely to do just the opposite.

VOTES ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND MOTION TO PROCEED TO DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the honorable men and women in Maryland—including the 28,939 men and women on Active Duty, the 6,223 in the National Guard, our Reservists, and our civilian employees and contractors—who are serving our Nation.

When I go around the State to bases such as Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Fort Meade, Fort Detrick, the U.S. Naval Academy, and others, I see the people who put their lives on the line every day to defend America.

I support you. I am fighting to make sure you and your families have the resources you need, from equipment, to training, to fresh, healthy food at our commissaries. That is why today I voted against the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act and the motion to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill. My vote was not a vote against our national defense; it was a vote for our national defense. It was a vote to end sequester and a vote for military readiness.

How will voting against a funding bill help end sequester? Because it brings us to the table now—in June—to agree on how we are going to fund the vital programs that we all agree are necessary to protect our Nation. Not in September. Not in November. Not when another funding deadline looms or when there is a clock ticking until the government shuts down. We are going to address this now, so the Senate can do its job to support our troops, our military families, our veterans, and our national security.

National security is more than the Department of Defense. We need diplomacy around the world to prevent conflicts when we can and end them once started. So we need our State Department. We need embassy security to keep our Foreign Service safe—and that is not funded by the Department of Defense.

Our law enforcement agencies here at home also protect our national security. The FBI, tracking down "lone wolf" terrorists; the Coast Guard, pro-

tecting our coasts from smugglers and drug traffickers; Customs and Border Patrol; the Drug Enforcement Administration; Immigration and Customs Enforcement—all standing sentry to protect America. Yet none are funded by the Department of Defense.

Nation states and organized crime are infiltrating our cyber networks, and we need the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to help us protect dot-com and dot-gov. Those key cyber warriors are not funded by the Department of Defense.

Finally, we need troops ready for duty. Sadly, only one in four recruits can pass muster, many for lack of education or lack of physical fitness. We need great schools turning out great graduates ready to work. We need childhood nutrition to feed them healthy meals that build healthy bodies. But education and nutrition are not funded by the Department of Defense.

In order make the Department of Defense successful, we need to stop hollowing out America. This means making sure our other agencies have the resources necessary to meet national security needs at home and abroad.

However, the Republican Budget uses two sets of rules—first, pretend funding for basic, essential military operations—things that are supposed to be in the base budget—taken from the Overseas Contingency Operations, OCO, account that was created for funding wars. This gimmick allows \$38 billion of extra defense spending by evading the budget caps. The second rule the Republicans are using is saying: We are going to apply the sequester budget constraints to the rest of the Federal agencies. That is not acceptable, but we can fix it.

We need to end sequester for defense, without gimmicks, and we need to end sequester for the rest of our agencies. We need to make sure defense has the right resources, but we also need to make sure that the other agencies that protect our country and make it great and are not included in the Defense bill have the resources they need too. Today, I voted no to moving to the Defense appropriations bill, but that no is meant to speed up the process of getting a better outcome for our troops and our country.

Many of my colleagues fail to mention that we in Congress can go through these motions: We can pass funding bills, go to conference, and send them to the President's desk. But that will do no good if the President vetoes these bills, which he has said he will do if they include budget gimmicks.

I hope that after having this vote, our leadership will sit down and negotiate a new budget deal, now in June. We need to have a real solution for the budget constraints that impact all of