



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2016

No. 37

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 10, 2016, at 11:30 a.m.

Senate

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2016

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, You are the source of all life. You have challenged us to number our days, not our weeks, months or years. Give us the wisdom to comprehend the brevity and uncertainty of our life's journey, motivating us to plan not only for time but eternity.

Lord, forgive us when we boast about tomorrow, forgetting that our times are in Your hands.

Today, bless our lawmakers and their staffs. Remind them that they belong to You and that You will order their steps. As they wrestle with complex issues, help them seek Your wisdom and guidance. Empower them as stewards of Your bounty to serve You and humanity, striving to be faithful in the vocation to which You have called them.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the junior Senator from New Hampshire delivered a powerful address to our Nation this weekend. She spoke about the need to tackle a heroin and prescription opioid epidemic that is impacting not just her State, not just my State, but communities all across our country.

Senator AYOTTE correctly called this a "life or death issue" and talked about what she has been doing to address it. She also talked about important legislation the Senate is considering that would help address the problem.

I was proud to see the Senate vote yesterday to advance the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. It is bipartisan legislation that colleagues in both parties—like the junior Senator from New Hampshire, her colleague from Minnesota, and, of course, the lead sponsors from Ohio and Rhode Island—have worked hard to advance.

I want to especially thank the lead Republican sponsor of this bill, the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, for all the work he has done on this critical legislation. The same is true for the senior Senator from Iowa, Mr. GRASSLEY, who worked to move this bill quickly through the committee that he chairs.

Let's not forget the Senators in both parties who worked with the bill managers to process the kind of amendments both sides agree would make a good bill even better. Because of the dedicated leadership of Senators from both sides of the aisle, we will soon have the opportunity to actually pass this important legislation.

I urge colleagues to join me in voting to do so. The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act is important legislation that will help tackle this crisis at every level. It is a good bill, it enjoys strong bipartisan support, and it builds upon a foundation we laid just a few months ago when we appropriated \$400 million to opioid-specific programs—money that still remains available to be spent.

This bipartisan legislation also comes at a time when our Nation needs it most. My home State of Kentucky has been among the hardest hit by this epidemic, with more people dying from drug overdoses than car crashes.

As the junior Senator from New Hampshire reminded us in her address this weekend, these are not just numbers. "Behind every statistic and behind every headline is a life that has been lost," Senator AYOTTE said. "This is not a Republican or Democratic issue—it affects all of us."

I want to thank her and the lead Republican sponsor from Ohio for their important work. I thank their colleagues across the aisle from Rhode Island and Minnesota and the Judiciary Committee chairman from Iowa as well. Let's keep working together to pass the bipartisan CARA bill and take

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S1323

another step towards ending this devastating epidemic.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the Republican leader's direction, this Senate continues to make history for all the wrong reasons. Despite proclaiming that the Senate is back to work, the Republican majority is on pace to become one of the least productive Senates ever.

By now, most Americans are aware of the Republican leader's decision to block consideration of the Supreme Court nomination that President Obama will soon make. But the historic obstruction of a Supreme Court nominee is the most recent and prolific example of the Republican leader's abdication of his constitutional duties and that of the whole Republican caucus. What is that? To provide advice and consent to Presidential nominations.

Since his party assumed the majority in the Senate last January, the Republican leader and his colleagues have ground the nominations to a halt. According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the pace of judicial nominations being confirmed this Congress is the worst. To date, this Republican-controlled Senate has confirmed a total of 16 judicial nominations. That is about one a month. Since the beginning of the year, we have confirmed just five judges.

We have 11 judges pending on the Senate calendar, and there would be a lot more, but the chairman of the committee simply is not holding any hearings. He canceled the meeting last week. Maybe they will have one the day after tomorrow. They are not even holding hearings for the people in the pipeline whom the President has nominated. The 11 judges pending on the Senate calendar is not definitive of the real problem we have in this country. But even on the 11, the Republicans refuse to schedule votes—even on judges such as Waverly Crenshaw from Tennessee, who is supported by the two Republican Senators from Tennessee.

If the Republican leader will not even schedule votes on consensus judges recommended by Republican Senators, how can Democrats expect a vote on their recommendations?

While the Republican leader and the chairman of the Judiciary Committee seem content not to do their jobs, the American people are being robbed of justice. There has been a spike in judicial emergencies. If there aren't enough judges to hear the cases that arise, it is deemed to be an emergency because the judges there are unable to do the work because there are too few judges.

When the Republicans assumed control of the Senate last year, there were 12 judicial emergencies nationwide. Now there are 31—1 year later, 31. They are going up almost by the week. As I have indicated, that number will only grow as Republicans continue to refuse to process important judicial nominations. But the obstruction isn't limited to Supreme Court nominees or judges to fill these judicial emergencies. There are other matters that we should be concerned about.

Take, for example, the Banking Committee. It is setting records for doing nothing. The committee has been operating under the leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama. In that time, the committee has not yet reported a single nomination. This is unprecedented.

According to the Congressional Research Service, which is a nonpartisan group, the Banking Committee has reported out at least one nomination every year for the past 50 years—not now. It is the only Senate committee not to consider a single nomination last year. When asked why, he said he had other things to do.

What are those nominations that the Senator has put a hold on? What positions have gone unfilled as the chairman pursued his political career with the primary election just having been completed? The Under Secretary of Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence is really important and two seats on the Securities and Exchange Commission. We know that Wall Street needs to be monitored very closely. We have two seats that need to be filled. There are two seats on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, and we know how important that is. There are the Director of the U.S. Mint and the Export-Import Bank Board of Directors. They can't do their work now because we need to fill those spots. There are the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, the inspector general, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and others.

From the Republican leader to his committee chairs and the rank and file, we continue to hear that the Senate is working again. This is a figment of the Republicans' imagination. It is not working again. It appears the Republican Senate isn't interested in doing its job. There no longer seems to be a voice of reason coming from the Republican side.

Isn't there a single Republican who will stand against the Republican leader's nominations blockade? Isn't there a single Republican willing to put an end to this historic obstruction? Providing advice and consent on the President's nominees is a constitutional duty. I say: Do your job.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I have an article here from CNN. It is quite illuminating.

When I was a boy growing up in the town of Searchlight, we didn't have people of color—no one, ever. When I went away to high school, we did have people of color. There were not many, but certainly we had African Americans, and we had Hispanics. It wasn't until then, when I went to high school, that I had a wonderful Spanish teacher, Marlan Walker. I was able to visit with him when I went home last time to see him. He had lost his wife Colleen. He made such a difference in my life. But he is a fine man and was a great Spanish teacher. It was the first time I had ever heard anything about pinatas. What is a pinata? Traditionally, they have them in Mexico, where they have a figure. It can be all kinds of things, but let's say it is a horse. You blindfold young people. They have a stick in their hand, and they can't see. They know it is hung there; they saw it before they were blindfolded. They try to find the pinata so they can hit it because presents come out of it. Things come out of the pinata. But, boy, the pinata gets beaten until it starts dumping little presents on everyone's head.

This article, which came from what happened on CNN, would be illuminating for people to read. It is written by Ted Barrett, dated yesterday. When asked about Presidential nominees to the Supreme Court, the assistant Republican leader said: "I think they will bear some resemblance to a pinata."

Think about that. They don't know who the nominee is. They don't know anything about the person, but they already have in their mind that they are going to beat this person like a pinata. These are his words, not mine. Direct quote: "I think they will bear some resemblance to a pinata."

Think about that. He is saying Republicans are going to do all they can to hurt this person's reputation, to beat on them, like a pinata. He went on to say: "Because there is no guarantee, certainly, after that time they're going to look as good as they did going in." Think about that: to say to the American people that they refuse to meet with somebody they don't know, refuse to have a committee hearing on someone they don't know, refuse to have a vote in the committee, and refuse to have a vote on this floor.

Now the assistant Republican leader has told us that it doesn't matter who it is. It doesn't matter if the nominee is a man, woman, old, or young. It doesn't matter what their education is or what their experience is, they are going to beat that person like a pinata. I think they have been listening to Donald Trump too much. The Republicans need to stop and listen to the disgusting rhetoric they are spewing. They are going to treat someone they don't even know like a pinata?

Now the Republicans are reduced to acting like big, tough people and threatening to destroy the reputation of someone they don't even know. They

haven't even seen them yet. This is vile behavior that is beneath the dignity of this institution. If Republicans continue down this path of destruction while working on this process, it is going to reverberate in the wrong direction for decades to come. They have to get their senses back.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the CNN article written by Ted Barrett, to which I referred, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From CNN, Mar. 7, 2016]

SUPREME COURT NOMINEE WOULD BE A
'PIÑATA,' CORNYN SAYS

(By Ted Barrett)

The No. 2 Senate Republican warned Monday that potential nominees to the Supreme Court should consider the battle they will be forced to endure if they are picked for the post, suggesting a high-stakes slugfest could damage their reputations in a fruitless pursuit of the top court.

"I think they will bear some resemblance to a piñata," said Sen. John Cornyn of Texas.

"What I don't understand is how someone who actually wants to be confirmed to the Supreme Court would actually allow themselves to be used by the administration in a political fight that's going to last from now until the end of the year," Cornyn told a small group of reporters in the Capitol.

He added: "Because there is no guarantee, certainly, after that time they're going to look as good as they did going in."

Cornyn, a member of the Judiciary Committee, adamantly opposes confirming President Barack Obama's Supreme Court pick to replace the late Justice Antonin Scalia, a conservative stalwart on the bench who died last month.

Obama is expected to name a replacement any day.

"There is no question Democrats would do the same thing if the shoe was on the other foot based on their prior conduct and I don't think the voters are really interested in seeing the ideological balance of the court changed for the next 30 years by a lame duck president," Cornyn said.

The tension between the parties was on full display on the Senate floor when Democratic Leader Harry Reid continued his weeks-long tirade against the Republican chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Chuck Grassley of Iowa, for vowing not to schedule a confirmation hearing for an eventual nominee.

"He is allowing himself and his committee to be manipulated by the Republican leader for narrow, partisan warfare. He is taking his orders from the Republican leader and, sadly, Donald Trump," Reid said. "Donald Trump on this issue, when asked about it, his words were three: 'Delay, delay, delay.' Grassley must have been listening."

Democrats believe that under enough pressure Grassley, who is up for re-election, could crumble and open the door to a hearing and a vote for a nominee. But Grassley didn't sound like he was ready to fold when he responded to Reid.

"The tantrums on the other side continue," said Grassley. "But I guess it shouldn't surprise anybody as everyone knows around here nothing makes the minority leader more mad than when his side is forced to play by its own rules."

Grassley also compared Obama to King George III for "executive overreach," which he said frustrated the founding fathers then and frustrates the Senate Republicans now.

Also Monday, Reid met in his Capitol office with Patty Judge, a Democrat and former lieutenant governor of Iowa who just announced she will challenge Grassley this fall.

Cornyn said he has no doubts about the 82-year-old Grassley's ability to withstand political pressure from Democrats.

"They don't know Chuck Grassley," Cornyn said. "He's like a rock."

Interest groups on the left and right are lined up to champion their causes in what is expected to be an expensive and protracted battle that could undermine the candidate, no matter how well qualified or liked he or she is.

"As a practical matter, there would be no requirement on the part of a Democratic president to reappoint the same person. So I think they need to realize we're serious about the position we've taken," Cornyn said.

Mr. REID. I yield the floor and ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, equally divided, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the Democrats controlling the first half and the majority controlling the final half.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, several weeks ago, the untimely passing of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia created a vacancy on the Supreme Court, which now has only eight Justices. It called into question the constitutional responsibility of the President of the United States when such a vacancy exists and the constitutional responsibility of this Senate.

This morning in the Washington Post, there was speculation about six possible nominees the President could send to the Senate. It was speculation in the paper, and we don't know if any one of those would actually be the nominee suggested by the President, but it is very obvious—and having spoken with the President personally on this issue, I know he is carefully weighing the options.

Why will the President move forward on this nomination? Because the Con-

stitution requires it. In article II, section 2, it says the President shall appoint a nominee to fill a vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court—shall; not may, shall appoint—and the Senate shall perform its advice and consent duties with respect to that nomination. So there are two constitutional responsibilities: for the President to suggest a nominee and for the Senate to act on that nominee.

There have been instances in American history where argument could be made that that constitutional responsibility should be ignored or at least delayed. One that comes to mind dates back to 1942. On October 3, 1942, a vacancy arose on the Supreme Court of the United States. On that day, Justice James Byrnes on the Supreme Court resigned his seat to become Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization in the Roosevelt administration.

On January 11, 1943, President Roosevelt nominated Wiley Rutledge, a Kentucky native and former dean of the University of Iowa College of Law, to fill that vacancy. At this point in 1943, the United States was fully engaged in the Second World War. When the President sent up this nomination, battles were raging in Europe, Asia, Africa, and in the Atlantic and the Pacific. It was unclear whether we would prevail or the enemy would prevail. Each day brought alarming, stunning news about developments in the war.

Three days after making his Supreme Court nomination, President Roosevelt flew to Morocco to join Churchill and de Gaulle at a Casablanca conference on the future of the war. At this conference, the Allies coordinated their strategy against the Axis powers and decided to launch an offensive in Sicily and in Italy.

On January 27, 1943, American bombers from the Eighth Air Force conducted the first American air raid over Germany. On January 30, Japanese aircraft torpedoed and sank a cruiser named the USS *Chicago* in the South Pacific. Sixty-two men lost their lives. Over a thousand survived due to a daring and swift rescue.

The Nation was clearly engaged in war. There was every reason in the world for the President and even the Senate to say: This is no time to talk about a Supreme Court vacancy. Instead, the President and the Senate, even in the midst of World War II, understood their obligation under the Constitution. The Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing for Rutledge on January 22, 11 days after his nomination had been sent to the Hill by President Roosevelt. The committee reported Rutledge's nomination to the floor on February 1, and he was confirmed by the full Senate on February 8, 1943, 28 days after his nomination.

Mr. President, I wanted to put this set of facts on the record to make it clear that there is absolutely no excuse for what the Senate Republicans are doing with this vacancy. There is no excuse for the Senate Republicans to

ignore their constitutional responsibility, a Constitution which they have sworn to uphold and defend. We are not in the midst of a world war; we are in the midst of a Presidential campaign. And that in and of itself explains why Senator McCONNELL, just hours after the announcement of the death of Antonin Scalia, made it clear that the Senate would not accept its responsibility under the Constitution to fill this vacancy on the Supreme Court.

It is a sad reality that the Republicans have made this decision to leave the Supreme Court for over a year with this vacancy. When was the last time the Senate left the Supreme Court with a vacancy for over a year? It goes back to the Civil War, when we were at war with ourselves, with thousands being killed on a daily basis. It was in that turmoil that we left a vacancy on the Supreme Court for over a year.

Now the Senate Republicans point to the turmoil of a Presidential election campaign as their reason for not accepting their constitutional responsibility. They make a vacuous argument that we should wait and pick a new President and let this new President, in his next term or her next term, fill this vacancy. Well, that is an empty argument because in the year 2012, in November of 2012, there was a Presidential election. The two major party nominees were, of course, President Obama running for reelection and Mitt Romney running on the Republican side. In that election, the American people made a clear choice. By a margin of 5 million votes, they reelected President Barack Obama, and they reelected him for a 4-year term. So it turns out that even in this year of 2016, Barack Obama is still the President of the United States. This may come as news to those on the Republican side of the aisle, but he was reelected for 4 years by a 5 million-vote margin, and their refusal to give this President due consideration of his nominee is a rejection of that verdict of the American people in that election.

So for the first time in history, we find a nominee presented by the President about to come to Capitol Hill, and the promise of the Senate Republicans? They will not even hold a hearing, will not even consider this nominee, and won't bring it to a vote. In fact, Senator McCONNELL went further. He said he would refuse to even meet with any nominee sent by the President. That is unheard of, unprecedented, uncalled for, and an embarrassment to this institution of the United States Senate.

I call on the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I am proud to serve, to step back and reassess the letter they signed 2 weeks ago. It was a letter accepting Senator McCONNELL's strategy, saying they would not do their job. They would, in fact, walk away from their job, walk away from their constitutional responsibility. I would hope they would realize they are leaving a mark in history which is indefensible, a mark in his-

tory which is unprecedented, and one which sadly will leave the Supreme Court with only eight Justices.

The American people have spoken. They have chosen the President. The President has accepted his constitutional responsibility. The Senate, under Republican leadership, can do no less.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am pleased to be on the floor to speak again in support of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, which the Senate will consider and I hope approve this week. It is a long overdue measure to address the public health hurricane, a crisis we face in this country. It is every bit as real and threatening as threats from abroad. In fact, I have just now come from a hearing of the Armed Services Committee, where I had the opportunity to question some of our Nation's leading military experts, including the head of our Special Operations Command, General Votel, about the threat posed by illicit substances, such as heroin, to this country. The testimony was that those substances, when they come to this country, follow the same route as terrorists, illicit arms, and other military threats to this Nation.

The bipartisan support for the measure before us is a sign of the meaningful strides that this Nation has taken, but more is necessary to be done toward ending the epidemic of heroin addiction and prescription drug abuse. It is a danger to every community across the country, big cities and towns in Connecticut, suburban and urban. Every race and religion, ethnic group, and demographic is potentially a victim.

I have heard from our colleagues across the country that this crisis truly has proportions on a par with any of the tornadoes, floods or hurricanes we have seen as natural disasters. Abuse and addiction are crippling communities around the country, shattering families, and imposing enormous financial and human costs.

In my home State of Connecticut, overdose deaths have steadily increased, as they have throughout the Nation, and they now surpass auto-

mobile crashes as the leading cause of injury-related death for Americans between the ages of 25 and 64. Connecticut saw more than 700 overdose deaths in 2015. Without a doubt, we must act.

Many communities across Connecticut and our country already have taken steps and have dedicated resources to stopping the epidemic of heroin addiction and prescription drug overuse. I am very privileged to welcome a number of those communities to the Senate today. They are represented by mayors from major cities in Connecticut: Mayor Joe Ganim of Bridgeport, Mayor O'Leary of Waterbury, Mayor Moran of Manchester, along with local officials from Bridgeport, Groton, Manchester, New Haven, South Windsor, and the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of officials I just referred to.

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

BRIDGEPORT CITY COUNCIL

Joe Ganim (mayor), Evette Brantley, Scott Burns, Milita Feliciano, Tom Caudett, Jeanette Herron, Michelle Lyons, Gina Malheiro, Tom McCarthy, Aides Nieves, John Olson, Anthony Paoletto, Richard Salter, Neenah Smith, AmyMarie Vizzo-Paniccia.

GROTON

Bonnie Nault, Harry Watson.

MANCHESTER TOWN COUNCIL

Jay Moran (mayor), Margaret Hackett, Patrick Greene.

NEW HAVEN CITY COUNCIL

Delphine Clyburn, Frank Douglass, Alberta Gibbs, Rosa Ferraro Santana, Brian Wingate.

SOUTH WINDSOR TOWN MANAGER

Matt Galligan.

CONNECTICUT CONFERENCE OF MUNICIPALITIES

Ron Thomas, Kevin Maloney.

WATERBURY

Neil O'Leary (mayor).

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. They have shown by their actions they are willing to not only talk the talk but actually walk the walk. I participated with Mayor Ganim over the weekend in a public press conference, noting the truly extraordinary and excellent work by their drug task force to stop, apprehend, arrest, and prosecute a major drug ring in the city of Bridgeport.

I have talked to Mayor O'Leary about efforts in Waterbury and throughout his region—a very responsible and effective action he took as police chief of Waterbury—but we know we are not going to arrest our way out of this crisis. Law enforcement needs more effective support and resources. There is no way around the need for supporting and enhancing the operations of our local, State, and Federal law enforcement officials—in fact, increasing the partnership and cooperation among them, as was so dramatically shown by the successful law enforcement in the city of Bridgeport against this drug ring last week. All have a role and all of their cooperation is necessary.

All of us have a responsibility to support their work, but the bill before us also recognizes that we are not going to arrest or jail our way out of this crisis. In fact, it provides resources for treatment and services and a more effective means of delivering Narcan, which can literally be a lifesaver, bringing overdose victims back from the brink of death.

What I have heard in roundtables I have conducted around the State of Connecticut is the need for those additional steps, not focusing on any one of them but a multifaceted effort, as this bill reflects. In the roundtables I have conducted, I have heard from law enforcement professionals, first responders, doctors, addiction specialists, elected officials, and many others, including recovering addicts and their families. Their stories are riveting and heartbreaking about the effects of addiction, beginning with powerful prescription painkillers for routine surgery, broken ankles or wrists, and wisdom teeth that have been removed. There was overprescription of 20 pills, 30 pills, when 2 pills or 3 pills would have been sufficient, and those pills are the gateway to more serious addiction or they find their way onto the street where they fuel the addiction of others and lead to addiction to heroin, which often is cheaper than the prescription pills.

Those stories I have heard from around our State, stories from people struggling with addiction or who have lost a loved one to this disease, add to the public record that exists. That record includes a story that appeared within the past week or so in the *New London Day*. It talks about two childhood friends, Nat and Joe. Both of them struggled with heroin addiction, but they are now in recovery. Between them, they have lost several friends, a former girlfriend, and a stepbrother to overdoses, and each has a sibling who has also become an addict. Nat is now 27 and the father of two. He said:

I started taking pills when I was 19 or 20 and was stressed out when I was going through a custody battle over my son. Somebody said to try one, and then I was taking them a couple of times a week and then every day I was buying off the street. It was out of control. It got so that I couldn't work without drugs.

The same happened to Nat's friend Joe with Percocet. He described how he took a few pills, liked the feeling, and rapidly began to take drugs with other friends, including OxyContin and heroin.

Another article in the *Waterbury Republican American* told the story of Thomas Obst, who was prescribed OxyContin for an eye injury. When he later suffered from withdrawal symptoms, he turned to heroin to keep himself from suffering. He explained:

You never know what a street drug is mixed with, but it's less expensive . . . someone mentioned heroin. I thought I could control it.

Thomas eventually overdosed, but his life was saved by a brave State

Trooper named Josh Sawyer, who was able to administer naloxone. This drug can be a lifesaver if it is available to police—as it was in this instance—and first responders and firefighters. Unfortunately, its price has skyrocketed, and it is increasingly in short supply.

These stories from Connecticut are hardly unique. Our colleagues know they are happening in their communities. They know overdose deaths are skyrocketing, that addiction is increasing, and that the toll taken on their States and our communities is absolutely horrendous.

During our roundtable in Bridgeport last Friday, a manager of the Bridgeport Recovery Community Center explained the obstacles that people afflicted with addiction face in trying to obtain treatment this way:

Insurers will dictate what they will and will not pay for. You have to continually prove that this person is allowed to stay. You must make daily phone calls to plead your case.

When treatment is made available, there should be no wrong door; there should be no harassing need to demonstrate the problem and the need for treatment. We need more availability of insurance and increasing recognition that addiction is not a stigma, it is an affliction, a disease, every bit as much so as any other disease. And supplies of the drugs that can help treat that addiction—SUBOXONE, for example—have to be made available.

The legislation before us would provide more treatment, more beds, but it is only a down payment, only a beginning. There is truly a need for recognition that we face a public health hurricane and that this crisis, a spreading epidemic, will only become worse if we fail to provide more assistance.

This bill strengthens State programs like Connecticut's that are already in place, including State prescription drug monitoring programs as well as training for law enforcement and emergency responders in the use of Narcan. It provides important recovery support services for those struggling with addiction, and it would strengthen existing Federal programs, such as the DEA's drug take-back program.

The bill also provides more support for substance abuse treatment services for incarcerated individuals. We know a lot of people in prison today are there because of their addiction. If they are to emerge successfully from incarceration, they need that support and assistance to break the grip of addiction.

As important as this bill is, I agree with many of my colleagues—and they have spoken on the floor—that it is far less effective than it could be without the \$600 million supplemental appropriations that I have advocated and fought to pass. I am disappointed the amendment of Senator SHAHEEN, which I spearheaded and cosponsored, was not included in this measure, and I look forward to continuing to fight for the resources necessary to make this fight real.

I want to thank all of my colleagues, including Senator WHITEHOUSE and others, for incorporating a bipartisan provision I wrote with Senator COATS called the Expanding Access to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs Act. This provision will allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to access the information they need. Specifically, they would be able to access State prescription drug monitoring programs to consult a patient's prescription opioid history and thereby determine if a patient has a history of addiction or receiving multiple prescriptions from multiple sources.

I know from my decade and a half of work in this area how doctor shopping and other abuses can in fact exacerbate this problem of addiction and prescription drug abuse. Although nurse practitioners and physician assistants wrote over 7 million opioid prescriptions in 2013, few States permit them to consult and submit prescribing data to these important State databases. Allowing these providers to access more information about patient history enables them to address potential addiction before—and I stress “before”—it becomes a serious problem.

I hope this body will adopt a number of other amendments that I have proposed, including the one Senator MARKEY and I have spearheaded, amendment No. 3382, prescriber education. Prescriber education is crucial.

In a roundtable I held at the Yale medical school, a number of the docs told me that now—only recently—are there sufficient education and training and specific courses devoted to pain management and prescription discipline. Many doctors now lack that education, and our amendment would require that training as a condition for continued—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a few more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. It would provide as a condition that this training be conducted before any doctor receives a renewal of his or her license by the Drug Enforcement Administration.

To help our veterans, an amendment that I have offered, No. 3438, would eliminate naloxone copays for our veterans. As ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have seen how the opioid epidemic has affected our veterans. It is truly devastating. Safe prescribing of opioids is vital because many veterans, especially those returning from combat, have serious pain issues that must be addressed, but they must be addressed safely, with care and caution about the dangers of addiction.

I appreciate our dedication to addressing this problem. I hope that it will be bipartisan and that our approval this week will match the urgency of this problem in communities around the State of Connecticut and around this country. The solution to this problem is long overdue for action,

and I look forward to this next step—only one of many that have to be taken—in aiding our law enforcers, our health care providers, our public officials, such as our representatives today on the Hill, in moving forward and addressing this problem.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 524, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 524) to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

Pending:

Grassley amendment No. 3378, in the nature of a substitute.

Grassley (for Donnelly/Capito) modified amendment No. 3374 (to amendment No. 3378), to provide follow-up services to individuals who have received opioid overdose reversal drugs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the entire country knows, it was about 1 month ago that we lost Justice Antonin Scalia. Our country is still dealing with the loss of this man, whose contribution to our highest Court and the health of our Constitution cannot be overstated.

Justice Scalia understood the actual words in the Constitution were important. He famously said that if the American people realized what the Supreme Court did on occasion, which was to substitute their value judgments instead of interpreting the Constitution and laws—rather to substitute their value judgments for those of the people and their elected representatives—they might well feel their values were superior and preferable to those of an unelected lifetime member of the United States Supreme Court. That is an important reminder.

Justice Scalia was known for expressing himself very colorfully and clearly, and he clearly was no fan of making it up as you go along, which, unfortunately, can happen when the Supreme Court chooses to substitute their values for those of the American people rather than interpret the law and the Constitution.

Justice Scalia was also a key figure when it came to making sure the Court policed the check of Executive power on legislative power. In other words, he believed in the separation of powers and checks and balances. I don't think it is an exaggeration to say that Jus-

tice Scalia helped resuscitate our constitutional principles and inspired the next generation of lawyers and legal scholars and judges to care deeply about our Constitution as originally written. Because of Justice Scalia, our Republic is stronger.

Mr. President, I have listened to and read about comments made by our friends across the aisle who are questioning our intention to allow the American people to help choose who the next Justice on the Supreme Court is going to be by selecting the next President who will make that appointment. It is abundantly clear that the Constitution gives the President the authority to make a nomination, but it is just as clear that the Constitution gives the U.S. Senate the authority to determine how or whether to move forward with any nominee proposed by President Obama. There is ample precedent to support the decision made by Senate Republicans to withhold consent on the President's nominee and to allow the American people's voices to be heard.

That is not to say it will not be a Democratic President making that appointment or it could be a Republican President. We don't know at this early stage in the Presidential election. But we do know it would be improper to allow a lame-duck President to forever change the balance on the Supreme Court for perhaps the next 30 years as he is heading out the door.

There is a lot of precedent for what we have decided to do. Not since 1932 has the Senate, in a Presidential election year, confirmed a Supreme Court nominee to a vacancy arising in that same year—1932. One would have to go back even further—to 1888—to find an election-year nominee who was nominated and confirmed under a divided government, as we have today. So what Senate Democrats are actually insisting on, and the President is insisting on, is that we do something we haven't done for 130 years.

Of course, the position being taken by Senate Republicans is not a new idea either. As a matter of fact, the Democratic leader in 2005 said this—of course, this was when President George W. Bush was President. Senator REID said:

The duties of the Senate are set forth in the U.S. Constitution. Nowhere in that document does it say the Senate has a duty to give presidential appointees a vote.

Senator REID was entirely correct. That is what the Constitution says. As I mentioned earlier, the President can nominate anybody he wants, but the Constitution does not say the Senate is obligated to give a vote to that nominee.

I would note that I read some of the remarks of the Democratic leader this morning, and I just want to say he was apparently critical of a story written that included my name and the word "pinata" included in the story, suggesting this was somehow a threat.

I would be surprised if any person who actually aspired to be on the U.S.

Supreme Court—a current judge or a legal scholar or lawyer—would allow themselves to be used by this administration in making a nomination to the Supreme Court for a seat that will not be filled during the remainder of President Obama's term, knowing they will not be confirmed. And even if a member of the same political party as the President is elected President next year, there is no guarantee that same person will be renominated. So I likened the nomination process and confirmation process to a pinata, which is only to say the confirmation process around here has gotten pretty tough.

But I am not going to be preached to by the Democratic leader, by the Democrats who have been responsible for filibustering judges, creating a new verb in the English language—"Borked"—when they blocked Robert Bork's appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court, when the Democratic leader invokes the nuclear option, breaking the Senate rules for the sole purpose of packing the DC Circuit Court of Appeals with like-minded judges so that the President wouldn't have to worry about judges who might question overreaching his authority under the Constitution by issuing Executive orders or otherwise circumventing the role of Congress. This is a playbook that has been written by the Democratic leader and our colleagues across the aisle. Do they expect us to operate under a different set of rules than they themselves advocated for?

Here is what Senator REID's successor in the Democratic caucus said in 2007. This was 18 months before President George W. Bush left office. Senator SCHUMER, the Senator for New York, said: "For the rest of this President's term [18 months] we should reverse the presumption of confirmation."

I don't really know what he is talking about. There never was a presumption of confirmation. But I guess he is assuming the deference some people show when a President does nominate a Supreme Court Justice. We haven't seen much of that deference lately, I might add. But this is what Senator SCHUMER goes on to say: I will "recommend to my colleagues that we should not confirm a Supreme Court nominee except in extraordinary circumstances."

Essentially, what Senator SCHUMER was saying is that 18 months before President George W. Bush left office, if there were a vacancy created, they would presume not to confirm that nominee.

Of course, we know that back in 1992 when he was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, Vice President BIDEN said: "The Senate Judiciary Committee should seriously consider not scheduling confirmation hearings on the nomination until after the political campaign season is over." That is what Vice President JOE BIDEN said in 1992.

I see the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee here on the

floor, and I want to tell him how much I appreciate his steadfastness in supporting the decision we have made collectively to allow the voters in November, who choose the next President, a voice in who is actually nominated to fill this important vacancy.

I wasn't in the room when Chairman GRASSLEY and Majority Leader MCCONNELL were there with the Vice President and the President; Senator LEAHY, the ranking member; and HARRY REID, the Democratic leader, but I have heard that the question came up: How can you do this? How can you not allow President Obama to fill this vacancy?

I heard that it was pointed out to the President, to the Vice President, to the ranking member, and to the Democratic leader that they were the ones who filibustered judicial nominees by a Republican President. They are the ones who created this environment in which what used to be fairly routine confirmation hearings have become so polarized.

Again, I believe it would be foolish of us to say, "Well, these are the policies the Democrats, when they are in the majority, will employ when there is a Republican President" but somehow to act aghast or surprised when we say, "Well, if the rules are going to apply to you like this, then they ought to apply when Republicans are in the majority and we have a Democratic President."

At the end of a lame-duck Democratic President's time in the White House, all three of these individuals—the Vice President; the Democratic leader, Senator REID; the heir apparent to the Democratic leadership, Senator SCHUMER—all three of them are quick to criticize Republicans on the Judiciary Committee, insisting that different principles ought to apply. But that is hypocritical. It is the height of hypocrisy to say: Well, one set of rules applies to us and a different set of rules applies to you.

This is more than just about hypocrisy; this is really about an important principle. It is important to allow the voters, in choosing the next President of the United States, to make that decision and make sure their voice is heard rather than just 100 Members of the Senate. I don't know why that should be objectionable.

So it is pretty clear to me—it is absolutely clear to me that Senate Republicans stand firmly behind the idea that the people should have a say in this critical issue when they vote in November because there is a lot at stake here—a lot. Depending on who ultimately fills this vacancy next year, the next Supreme Court Justice could tip the ideological direction of the Court for a generation—Justice Scalia served for 30 years—and thus fundamentally reshape American society in the process.

Given President Obama's previous Supreme Court nominees, the question before the American people is whether they want someone with the same or similar ideology to dramatically

change the current balance on the Supreme Court, because if President Obama were allowed to nominate someone who is confirmed in the same mold as those he has already nominated and who have been confirmed, it would for a generation change the ideological balance of the U.S. Supreme Court.

You have to wonder whether the real goal—much like it was when the nuclear option was invoked and we saw nominees to the District of Columbia Court of appeals, which some people call the second most important court in the Nation—when there was literally a packing of nominees on that court because they wanted to tip the ideological balance of the DC Court of Appeals because most of the important legal decisions made which ultimately go to the U.S. Supreme Court go through that court.

I have no doubt in my mind that the President and his allies wanted somebody who is going to rubberstamp the President's actions. This Court with Justice Scalia I think has rebuked the President on numerous occasions when he overreached his authority—for example, on recess appointments. We have seen an injunction granted by a district court in Brownsville, TX, upheld by the Fifth Court of Circuit Appeals, on the President's Executive action on immigration. The Court has often—led by Justice Scalia—stood strong against attempts by the President to grab power for the executive branch away from Congress and, more importantly, from the American people.

So at this critical juncture in our Nation's history, the American people should have a voice in deciding who selects the next Justice on the Supreme Court. I and my colleagues are absolutely committed to making sure they have that voice.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor today to speak on the same subject, but before I do, I want to very briefly discuss two other subjects.

REMEMBERING DYLAN HOCKLEY

First, Mr. President, I noticed online today that today would be Dylan Hockley's 10th birthday. Dylan Hockley was one of the 20 first graders who were gunned down in a flurry of bullets at Sandy Hook Elementary School in 2012.

Dylan's mother Nicole has become a crusader for this body to do something, anything in the wake of that tragedy to lessen the possibility that it might visit another community.

Dylan was an amazing little kid, struggling with a fairly severe learning disability but loving every day that he went to school under the care of a great special education professional who died that day as well with Dylan in that classroom.

Dylan would have been 10 years old today. In the 3 years since his death,

we have done nothing, absolutely nothing to honor his memory.

MENTAL HEALTH LEGISLATION AND THE TREAT ACT

Second, Mr. President, I want to note that we are moving forward in the HELP Committee on a very important markup next week on a mental health bill Senator CASSIDY and I have been working on for over a year, and we hope that will eventually find its way to the floor of the Senate and in some measure be a very partial answer but an answer nonetheless to this epidemic of gun violence. We hope we will be able to have that debate this year.

I also note that we have a bill in the HELP Committee that I think is a very important complement to the discussion we are having now on the opioid crisis all across the country. As my colleagues know, there is a limit on the number of patients to whom providers can prescribe Buprenorphine, which is really the most effective, least addictive of the heroin substitutes. As a physician, you can only prescribe this drug to 100 clients. If you are a physician assistant or a nurse practitioner, you are not allowed to prescribe. In Connecticut, that is the biggest obstacle we have—we don't have enough physicians who can prescribe this very effective drug.

The TREAT Act, which is a bipartisan bill, removes that cap for physicians and allows nurses with higher levels of training and PAs to prescribe that drug as well. I hope the HELP Committee will take up this bill as part of our markup next week. If it were up to me, we would include it as part of our mental health initiative and move it to the floor en bloc. The CARA bill is very important this week, but let's be honest: There is no money in it, so there are a bunch of new programs but no new resources for us in Connecticut to try to take on this fight.

If we were to pass the TREAT Act next week in the HELP Committee and move it to the floor, that would be real, tangible relief for communities in Connecticut. It would mean that more addicts coming out of detox would have access to true elements of recovery—in particular, this very effective drug.

I am hopeful that the HELP Committee will move on this bill next week and that we can bring it to the floor perhaps as part of this broader mental health package. In one fell swoop, we could have a partial answer to the epidemic of gun violence that plagues this country and a passage of the TREAT Act or a version of it that by itself might actually be more substantive than anything in the piece of legislation that is before us today.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. President, I do want to spend a few moments talking about this crisis that is gripping the U.S. Senate with respect to a vacancy that looks to remain for the next year on the Supreme Court.

I have only been in the Senate for 3 years. This is my first term. I can't

claim to hold any special status as a guardian of this institution, which has stood the test of time for over 200 years, but I am a student of history, and I did choose to run to be a Member of this body because of the enormous respect I have for it and its unique role in the unique system of U.S. Federal governance. That is why I do believe we are at a moment of crisis right now in which the Republican majority is blocking President Obama's constitutional responsibility to name a Supreme Court nominee, a ninth Justice.

I think this is a watershed moment for the U.S. Senate. I say that with a connection to a State that has had a particularly important role in the creation of this body. Right outside this Chamber, there is a relatively new painting above the door leading into the Reception Room of Oliver Ellsworth and Roger Sherman, who were delegates to the Constitutional Convention. They were the authors of what is referred to today as the Connecticut Compromise. Roger Sherman was the primary author of it; it is sometimes called Sherman's Compromise. This was the compromise that established the U.S. Senate, established the premise that this body would be made up of two Members from each State and that because of its 6-year term would be much more immune to the political tempest of the moment that often grips the Chamber down the road, that we would have a unique ability to rise above the partisan fray and make decisions that are in the best long-term interests of this country.

Frankly, those have been the best traditions of this body going back to the fifties and sixties when this Senate led the fight to expand civil rights laws or just 2 years ago when we were able to come together and pass an immigration reform bill, with the Presiding Officer's leadership, that I think will set the platform for resolving that issue in a commonsense way down the road. But the crisis that is gripping this place today, I fear, has no end because of the new rule that is being established. I just heard Senator CORNYN talk about the illegitimacy of a lame-duck President making a nomination to the Supreme Court. Once something like that is established, it will be difficult to unravel.

If you accept that argument, then this Senate will never again act on the nomination of a President in his second term. I suppose a second-term President will be perceived by his lame-duck status to be illegitimate for the purposes of nominating Justices to the Supreme Court, and by that argument, likely illegitimate for the purposes of nominating anyone to the Court because he is a lame-duck, and thus the people need to have their say in the next election.

That is a radical transformation of the U.S. Constitution, and it sets up perpetual crises in which there could be long stretches of time equaling 4 years where we will have eight, seven or six Justices.

Just simply accepting the assistant leader at his word, we would be establishing a new precedent in which the Supreme Court would have less than nine individuals for enormous stretches of time. But I think this is about something more. This is about an unwillingness to allow this President, a Democratic President, to replace a Justice on the Supreme Court while Republicans are in charge. They say it is because it is the last year of his term—or perhaps the last 4 years of his term. But if this is simply about a Democratic President replacing a Justice on the Supreme Court who tended to be more conservative, then that precedent has no end either. I think Republicans are naive to believe that Democrats wouldn't avail themselves of the same precedent at some point in the future and hold up nominees being offered by Republican Presidents. That is certainly not our hope nor is it the stated intention of anyone on this side of the aisle. But once you cross that Rubicon, I think it would be very hard to come back. All of a sudden we will have entered an era in which no Senate will want to take up the nomination of a President of the opposite party.

Senator CORNYN talked about how there is very little precedent for this. Well, there is very little precedent because there are very few instances over the course of the last 100 years in which there has been a vacancy created in an election year. It is not because there is a history of past Senates blocking the replacement of a Supreme Court Justice when a vacancy occurs in an election year. It is because the very scenario we are faced with today has not happened. In fact, over the course of the last 100 years, the only time in which the Senate has not acted on a vacancy created in an election year was, A, very late in an election year and, B, with respect to the elevation to the position of Chief Justice. The reality is that in the last 100 years the Senate has taken action on every pending Supreme Court nominee to fill a vacancy, regardless of whether the nomination was made in a Presidential election year.

Over the course of our Nation's history, there have been 17 Justices confirmed in a Presidential election year. Not since the Civil War has it ever taken more than a year to confirm a nominee for a Supreme Court vacancy. The average, of course—we heard it over and over—has been 67 days from nomination to the final Senate vote.

But what Senate Republicans are proposing is that this President—with over 300 days left in his term—will not even get the courtesy of a vote in the Judiciary Committee, never mind a vote on the Senate floor. They contend that this nominee will be rejected sight unseen, which is why we think all America is saying to Senate Republicans: Just do your job. Go through the hearing process, meet with the nominee, and bring that nominee to a vote on the Senate floor.

There were lots of Democratic Senators who opposed Clarence Thomas when he was nominated, but that didn't stop them from allowing a vote on the Senate floor. You can oppose this nominee once you take a look at their credentials and assess their suitability for the Court, but do your job and show the respect for the institution of the Presidency such that his choice will at least get a fair hearing in the Judiciary Committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I hope that for my sons' sake the effect of our actions over the next year doesn't effectively rewrite the Constitution and that pages don't need to be added to their textbooks in order to place caveats on the obligations of the President and the responsibilities of this body. I hope we don't all of a sudden create a new rule in which you only get a vacancy filled if the Senate and the Presidency happen to be of the same party or you only get a vacancy filled, as Senator CORNYN would suggest, when you have a nomination in the first 4 years of your potential 8-year tenure.

Lastly, what I worry about most greatly is the effect of this decision giving credence to the belief among some that this President is illegitimate. I don't think that is held by Members of this body, but I do know there are many in this country who don't recognize the legitimacy of this President, and the way in which we treat this office often gives purchase to those arguments. There is a standard of review that we have created for diplomatic agreements that we never held previous Presidents to. There is a furor over the Executive actions taken by this President even though previous Presidents have taken similar Executive actions—such as with the issue of immigration—and have taken far more Executive actions than this President has. I worry that, by disrespecting the institution and not even allowing for meetings to be held between this nominee and Members of the Republican majority, we feed this belief that this particular President doesn't share the legitimacy of previous Presidents.

For all of those reasons, I hope we can just make a commitment to do our jobs and begin the process of considering the Supreme Court nominee once the President makes this nomination.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

MR. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the prescription drug crisis. Every day someone in our Nation dies—a son, daughter, a parent—from a drug overdose. Most overdoses are from prescription drugs, such as opioid painkillers. Too often drugs that were intended to bring comfort end up bringing tragedy. Oxycodone, hydrocodone, OxyContin—we have an epidemic of these prescription drugs and the abuse of them. These drugs wreck lives, wreck families, and wreck entire communities.

In my home State of New Mexico, we know this all too well. We have the second highest rate of drug overdose deaths. We are in a crisis, and it is getting worse. More New Mexicans are dying from drug overdoses than ever before. It touches home and it hits hard.

One of those we lost was a young man named Cameron Weiss. According to the Albuquerque Journal, Cameron was 18 years old, an athlete, a poet, and then became addicted to painkillers for the treatment of sports injuries. That led, as it often does, to heroin. Within 2 years this promising young man with his whole life ahead of him was dead from a heroin overdose.

His mom, Jennifer Weiss, took her grief and put it to work to help others. After Cameron's death, she founded a group called Healing Addiction in Our Community so she could help other young people struggling with addiction. She told the Albuquerque Journal the following:

Something tragic has to happen before change happens. Unfortunately, when it comes to heroin, that tragedy happens all the time.

Most of us know young people like Cameron. A similar story of another young life that was lost to a heroin overdose was shared with me last week. This young man's father who visited my office is a medical professional in New Mexico. With all of the resources and knowledge available to him, he was still not able to prevent his son's tragic death last year at the age of 22.

One of my own staff members who was raised in Albuquerque lost four of his friends at Cibola High School. All four turned to heroin after abusing prescription drugs. One was his best friend, Michael, whose life was cut short at 30 years old.

We see this pattern time and again. A person becomes addicted to painkillers and then turns to another prescription or to heroin, which is cheaper and easier to get. It is a lethal combination and a downward spiral.

We have all heard the numbers, and they are chilling. Opioid-related deaths quadrupled nationally from 2002 to 2013. In 2014, nearly 30,000 Americans died from prescription opioid and heroin overdose. More Americans die each year from drug overdoses than from car crashes. Addiction knows no boundaries of race, gender or background, but our Hispanic and tribal communities in places such as Rio Arriba County, NM, are ground zero. Year after year, Rio Arriba County has the highest rate of overdoses in the Nation, more than five times the national average.

Just a few weeks ago KOB-TV reported on the toll that this has taken, generation after generation casting a long shadow over the beautiful Espanola Valley.

A young man named Rufus Billy said: "Growing up here, they'd say this was the heroin capital of the world."

For many, prescription painkillers come first and heroin comes later. Ac-

cording to KOB, prevention groups report that 2 million opioid prescriptions were filled in New Mexico in 2014, double the number from 10 years ago.

The abuse is so severe, according to Rio Arriba County Sheriff James Lujan, that "6 and 7-year-olds are talking about grandma and grandpa being addicts. . . . It's like a never-ending cycle."

New Mexico is on the ropes and so many other States are as well. I listened to my colleagues from both sides of the aisle. The stories are heart-breaking, and, sadly, we are losing the fight.

This is not just about numbers. It is about families and communities torn apart. Too often it is a story of those looking for help and not finding it. We can change that, but it will take more than words, more than handwringing. It will take a real commitment, and, let's be clear, real money.

Rehab saves lives—not always, and that is a tragedy all its own for some families. But treatment certainly can't help when you can't get it. People are desperate and trying to get treatment and help. We see this every day, especially in rural States like New Mexico. That is why we need to pass the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, because this isn't just about addiction. It is about recovery and giving hope to those who feel hopeless.

I am proud to cosponsor this bill, and I thank Senators WHITEHOUSE and SHAHEEN for their leadership. CARA will help States and local communities fight this battle for prevention, education, treatment, and law enforcement efforts. CARA is a step forward, and we urgently need to move forward. We can't keep falling behind.

In Spanish, C-A-R-A, "cara," means face. We should remember the faces and remember our loved ones. These are not just statistics. That is why I have also introduced legislation to improve monitoring of prescriptions and to have a better referral for addicts to treatment services. It also directs the FDA to review naloxone, which is an important lifesaving medication for over-the-counter use.

There is no doubt we have a crisis. We can't just say what works. We need to pay for what works. Our commitment has to be equal to the challenge, so I am quite disappointed that last week we did not adopt a key amendment for additional emergency funding. Let us step up to the plate and get this done.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, a couple of weeks ago, a small agency in

New York State took a very big step that I think is very dangerous. The State Board of Regents said it will start giving some illegal immigrants a license to practice medicine in the State of New York. This is a State agency that grants certificates and licenses for more than 50 different professions. You need this board's permission if you want to be a nurse in New York, a pharmacist, a dentist or a doctor. I think it is a terrible idea to grant licenses to illegal immigrants because doctors, dentists, and others are entrusted to prescribe powerful medications. That is the point of the bill we are on right now. These include these very opioid painkillers we have been talking about for the past few weeks.

Right now the Senate is debating what we can do to help communities and families who are struggling with abuse of these drugs. I think a big part of the problem is that these powerful medications are just too widely available. I can tell you that, as somebody who practiced medicine in Wyoming for 25 years, I worry that there are physicians and dentists who may be too free in prescribing opioids, very addictive medicines.

There are pharmacists who maybe haven't been as careful as they could be about making sure the drugs are used appropriately by the people who come to pick up prescriptions, and families across the country have been hurt by this abuse of these opioids, including many in New York State itself. Senator GILLIBRAND came to the floor last week to talk about it. She talked about the problem of opioids being overprescribed in New York.

So then the question is: Why is New York State so eager to allow these drugs to be prescribed and dispensed by people who we know have already broken the law? The legislation we are debating today tries to reduce the flow of opioids, to reduce the ways that they might be prescribed improperly. It includes language that would help States monitor and track prescriptions. That is a very important part of this legislation which I support.

Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts has actually offered an amendment that would do even more. It would tighten the process for registering people to dispense powerful drugs like these opioids. Under the rules today, the Drug Enforcement Administration registers doctors before it allows them to write these prescriptions. Senator MARKEY's amendment says that before anyone could even get this registration, they would have to complete additional training.

We all want to make sure people who have been handing out these medications can be trusted to do it responsibly. We all should have to be very careful about giving a prescription pad to someone who, by history and maybe even their identity, may be unclear. So I am submitting an amendment to this Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act that will help us do this. This

amendment actually takes the same approach as Senator MARKEY's does. It adds a simple requirement, a requirement that before the Drug Enforcement Administration can register someone to prescribe or dispense these powerful addictive medications, that this applicant must be able to prove that they are either a U.S. citizen or a legal resident. That is it.

There is actually a Federal law already on the books that requires this. It was signed into law and passed by Congress and signed by Bill Clinton in 1996, but there was a loophole in the law that allowed States—like what New York is doing—States to come around later and exempt illegal immigrants from the requirement in their State.

New York is doing that right now through its board. It is not the State legislature that is doing it in New York. It is not the citizens of New York who are doing it. They are not the ones saying they are willing to take a chance and loosen the standards of those who can prescribe these powerful, addictive medications. This is being done, and this decision is being made by a very small State agency acting on its own authority. I think this decision is much too important to be left to a small group of people in Albany, NY.

I want to be clear. This is not about immigrants. This is about the threat that comes from the misuse of opioid painkillers. It is about maintaining the standards of the law. My grandfather came to this country. He did it legally like millions of others. He followed the rules. He worked hard. He continued to obey the law. We all know this is a country of immigrants, and we know America still proudly welcomes legal immigrants today.

We also know that being a doctor is not like other jobs. When a patient goes to her doctor, she may literally be placing her own life in that doctor's hands. People need to have complete confidence that their doctor is ethical, honest, and can be trusted with life-and-death decisions. How can a patient have this kind of faith in someone who broke the law and is in the country illegally at this time? This action by the New York Board of Regents could seriously undermine the doctor-patient relationship and the trust that needs to be there.

Doctors are held to the highest possible standards. They need to be outstanding members of their community. In the State of New York, a doctor can actually lose their license if convicted of a crime. What is it being in the country illegally? Why would we then give a license to someone who already knows they have committed a crime by being in the country illegally? It makes no sense.

As a doctor, I will tell you these opioid medications are very powerful. They can be abused, and they have been abused, especially if they fall into the hands of someone who is not up to the highest moral professional and

legal standards who is writing the prescription in the first place.

We in Congress have a responsibility to make sure such dangerous medications can be given out only by people who meet the standards. I think it would set a terrible precedent if we allow people who are in this country illegally to begin prescribing these highly addictive drugs, but that is what New York wants to do. I don't think we can allow someone who has broken the law to serve as the gatekeeper for those potentially dangerous medications. We owe every American the peace of mind that the doctor treating their sick child is who that doctor claims to be and that their doctor is in the country legally.

The New York Board of Regents is ignoring, absolutely ignoring, this important public health and public safety concern. If New York will not act to protect its people, then Congress must.

Thank you.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today the Senate continues to work on legislation that addresses the heroin epidemic affecting our communities all over the country. Every State represented by a Senator in this Chamber is affected by it. I am pleased to see that yesterday we had a strong vote on an important step forward to consider more amendments, with the hope we will consider them today or tomorrow and then have a vote on this legislation before the end of the week and send it over to the House of Representatives,

where there is similar legislation, a companion bill that has already been drafted and is also bipartisan.

I thank SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who is on the floor now, my coauthor, and also Senators AMY KLOBUCHAR, KELLY AYOTTE, and the 42 other bipartisan co-authors of our legislation. This is bipartisan, but it is also comprehensive and evidence based. It is not just supported by a lot of Senators, but it is also supported by a lot of groups. That is very important.

Over the past few years, Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have worked with groups around the country and in our own States to come up with the right answers; in other words, evidence-based solutions to prevention and education to help people not make the mistake and get into the funnel of addiction but also, once those people are addicted, to help them more with better treatment, better recovery, and to ensure we are treating addiction like a disease, which it is. We are also helping law enforcement and helping to keep prescription drugs off the bathroom shelves and helping to monitor people's prescription drug use because a lot of this comes from the overprescribing of prescription drugs for pain medication.

I am pleased to see we are making progress, and I want to talk about one specific issue that is included in the legislation but which we have yet to talk about, at least at length on the floor.

Over the last few years, we have had five forums in Washington, DC, to talk about issues related to addiction. Some have been with regard to the science of addiction, some about our youth, some about prevention, and some about better treatment options, but we had one that was particularly interesting, I thought. It was about a very special issue; that is, how to treat substance abuse impacting our veterans and servicemembers and how to prevent our veterans and servicemembers from becoming subject to this addiction.

In the legislation we are considering on the floor, we focus on this issue. This came out of the expert testimony we had and the work that has been done around the country on this issue. CARA allows veterans who were discharged for a substance abuse disorder to use drug courts as they recover.

Too often our men and women come home from serving our country with untreated trauma and PTSD, which often manifests itself in an addiction. We know from the research that has been done that more than 20 percent of veterans with PTSD also suffer from an addiction or dependence on drugs like heroin or a dependence on alcohol. So post-traumatic stress disorder is related very much to this addiction issue.

A few weeks ago, I was in Columbus, OH, and met with our veterans court there. We had a roundtable discussion with some of the veterans who had been through it. It was actually a very inspiring experience hearing from veterans, many of whom had been serving

our military in combat roles and had come home, gotten into some trouble. They were in and out of the court system, and then they found these veterans courts. These courts actually helped divert these veterans from prison, into treatment, and then into a support network with other veterans.

For veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder, going to jail can be a major hurdle in their recovery. Yet for many who turn to drugs and alcohol in an attempt to self-medicate, that is exactly where they end up.

Ryan is a combat veteran. He served in Iraq. He had a distinguished career. He got home and found himself in a situation where he had trouble readjusting to life back at home outside of the military. He got into some trouble and ended up in jail. That didn't work for him. His quote was this:

You send me to jail and all you're doing is sending me back to the jungle. All those coping skills I've learned, they go out the window. I'm the type of person that you put me in there and all hell breaks loose.

That is Ryan. Fortunately for Ryan, he was able to participate in a veterans treatment court and get on the path to recovery. I am very proud of him today. He is a student at a major university in Ohio and about to graduate. He has his life back together and his family back together. Again, it was an inspirational story because he has taken it upon himself to focus on his addiction and get the help he needed through this veterans court.

There are 17 veterans treatment courts in the State of Ohio. The program Ryan went through is a 2-year program that offers mental health and substance abuse treatment to veterans as an alternative to incarceration. These veterans also have to make regular court appearances, so it is not as though they are not connected to the criminal justice system. They are. They know if they test positive for drugs, they will end up back in that system. They are subject to random drug testing.

As Ryan and the other veterans I talked to told me that day in Columbus, OH, this combination of accountability and support—accountability and support—was the right combination for them to get back on the right track. It made a difference for them in getting their lives back together, their families back together, and to once again be contributing to their country.

CARA will expand veterans treatment courts and will also ensure veterans who are discharged for substance abuse issues are also eligible to go through these programs. This is a critical change that will help allow more veterans to get the help they need and again get at the root cause of their addiction.

CARA—the legislation we are considering right now—has the support, as I said, of a lot of groups—130 national stakeholders in public health, law enforcement, criminal justice and drug policy fields, doctors, nurses, and oth-

ers working in the trenches on prevention and treatment. It is designed to fight prescription drug opioid abuse and heroin use holistically, from expanding prevention to supporting recovery.

In addition to the specific provisions I discussed that help our veterans, CARA also expands prevention and educational efforts to prevent prescription opioid abuse and the use of heroin. It increases drug disposal sites to keep medications out of the hands of young people. It helps with regard to drug monitoring to know when people are being prescribed drugs, even if they cross State lines, by having an interstate drug monitoring system.

The legislation also authorizes law enforcement task forces in some of our toughest areas around the country to combat heroin and methamphetamine and expands the availability of the overdose reversal drug naloxone—really a miracle drug—so that our law enforcement agencies and other first responders—our firefighters—have the training for using this drug but also have access to it.

In the criminal justice system, CARA will help to promptly identify and treat individuals suffering from substance abuse disorders and expand these diversion efforts and these education efforts to give these people a second chance.

CARA also authorizes resources to expand treatment, including medication-assisted treatment, based on the evidence that it supports what has worked around the country. So we are trying to hold up some of the best treatment programs in the country where there has been success on a very tough issue, which is taking people through this process of getting back on their feet and recovered.

CARA supports those recovery programs that are strictly focused on youth and building communities of recovery, including at our colleges and universities. It also creates a national task force on recovery to improve ways to address the collateral consequences imposed by addiction.

So this is a comprehensive bill that will help to reverse this tide. Again, this is something that is affecting us all. The numbers are overwhelming. In the United States of America today, there will be about 20 people who will die from overdoses. In Ohio, this happens every week. About 25 people are now dying from overdoses, but that is just part of the problem. Many are not dying from the overdose. Naloxone is working in many cases, for instance. Others aren't overdosing. Yet their lives are ruined, their families are torn apart, and the communities are bearing the brunt of it. Many more crimes are being committed. I was with a prosecutor in Ohio last weekend, and he told me 80 percent of the crime in his county is related now to this issue of heroin and prescription drug abuse.

We need to pass this bill and get it signed into law so it can help reverse

this tide, help our State and local governments and our nonprofits that are doing a great job trying to address this issue, and help individuals who are suffering from this addiction, which is a disease, to get the treatment they need and the recovery efforts that are needed to truly make a difference. This is an epidemic. It has now reached that kind of level—this kind of crisis level.

I am hopeful we will again have a series of amendments that can be included and voted on in the next 24 hours; that we can move forward with this legislation and get a strong vote. We can then send it over to the House with a strong message that it is time for us to do what we can to address this issue and make a difference in the lives of our constituents.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to complete these remarks.

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

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Constitution is the primary way the American people set rules for government. America's Founders made sure those were also written down so that as the Supreme Court said more than two centuries ago, they may be neither mistaken nor forgotten.

The U.S. Constitution is one of the shortest and currently the oldest national charter in the world, but while public officials, including every Member of this body, swear an oath to support and defend the Constitution, it appears some are paying very little attention to it.

One of the most popular slogans in the debate over filling the vacancy left by the death of Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia is "Do your job."

Never have so few words been so misleading for so many. Those who use this slogan insist that the Senate's job is to conduct the confirmation process, including hearings and confirmation votes, in a certain way whenever the President makes a nomination. In other words, the Senate should be at the President's beck and call, configuring the confirmation process around a particular timeline that he prefers.

There is some irony here, Mr. President. A few years ago, President Obama wanted to stall certain members of the National Labor Relations Board. The Senate was unlikely to confirm his nominee so the President bypassed the Senate altogether and made so-called recess appointments. The Supreme Court eventually, and unanimously, ruled those appointments were unconstitutional.

Now that the President intends to send a nominee to the Senate, he feels he can dictate how the Senate evaluates that nominee. The President would, no doubt, be the first to say the Senate cannot tell him whom to nominate but apparently feels he can insist

on whatever Senate confirmation process that will suit his purpose.

Colleagues on the other side of the aisle insist the Constitution requires timely hearings and prompt floor votes for every nominee. I don't know what Constitution they are using because the real one says nothing of the kind. The real Constitution gives to the President the power to nominate and to the Senate the separate power of advice and consent, leaving to each the judgment of how to exercise their respective power.

Actually, I should say that my Democratic colleagues are currently insisting that the Constitution requires timely hearings and votes, because they were singing a very different tune only a few years ago.

The minority leader, the minority whip, and the Judiciary Committee ranking member each voted dozens of times to deny any confirmation vote whatsoever for President George W. Bush's judicial nominees—dozens of times. Were they voting to defy the Constitution then, or are they referring to a made-up, fictional Constitution now?

When they served in this body, Vice President BIDEN and former Secretary Hillary Clinton voted, respectively, 29 and 24 times to deny the very confirmation votes they now say the Constitution itself requires. The shape-shifting Constitution they use apparently means whatever then suits their political objectives. A coincidence, I am sure, but a very convenient coincidence.

The President himself, when he was a Senator, tried to deny confirmation votes to multiple nominees, including Supreme Court Justice Samuel Alito. While President Obama recently said he now regrets voting to filibuster Justice Alito, he did not explain why it took him 3,670 days to reach that conclusion. Cynics might even suggest that his desire now to appoint another Supreme Court Justice may have contributed in some small way to this epiphany.

So when Democrats in this body and their equally confused liberal allies call on the Senate to do its job, they really mean that the Senate should do what they want. I, too, want the Senate to do its job, but I don't find our job description in anyone's political agenda. The Senate's job is to determine the best way to exercise its advice and consent power in each particular situation, and the Senate has done so in different ways, at different times, under different circumstances.

When he was Judiciary Committee chairman in the 107th and 110th Congress, for example, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY, denied a hearing to nearly 60 judicial nominees. Yet those are the hearings he now says the Constitution requires. I don't think he can have it both ways.

On May 19, 2005, the minority leader said that nowhere in the Constitution does it say the Senate must vote on

Presidential nominees. He called that notion rewriting the Constitution and reinventing history. Today, he says the opposite: that the Constitution actually does require a vote. Was he wrong in 2005, or is he, in his own words, rewriting the Constitution and reinventing history today?

No, Mr. President, the Constitution does not dictate how the Senate must exercise its power of advice and consent; the Constitution leaves that up to us in each situation.

The Senate has never allowed a term-limited President to fill a Supreme Court vacancy that opened up this late in his term. In fact, this vacancy is only the third in the last century to occur after Presidential election voting has started. In 1956 and 1968, the Senate did not confirm the nominee until after the next inauguration.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee for 39 years and a chairman for 8 of those years—I am now in my 40th year—I have watched the judicial confirmation process disintegrate. Conservatives and liberals have very different views about the kinds of judges America needs. Several Supreme Court nominees in the last few decades have been subject to intense, confrontational campaigns. In addition, the current Presidential election cycle is already more hostile and divisive than in the past. These are among the circumstances we face today and must consider when deciding how to exercise our power of advice and consent. It would be irresponsible to follow a process suitable for a different situation or, worse, a process designed only to produce a desirable political outcome.

Combining a high-stakes confirmation fight with a no-holds-barred Presidential campaign will produce a storm that will do more harm than good. The better course would be to defer the appointment process until the next President takes office and let the people make this determination. We are not without guidance in making this decision. In June 1992, then-Judiciary Committee Chairman JOSEPH BIDEN argued that if a Supreme Court vacancy occurred in that Presidential election year, the appointment process should be deferred until the election season was over. By combining an increasingly divisive appointment process and a Presidential election that is already underway, he said, "partisan bickering and political posturing" would overwhelm the serious debate necessary to make such an important decision. He could have been talking about 2016 instead of 1992.

This vacancy also presents the American people with a rare opportunity to address the direction of the judiciary. The percentage of Americans concerned about that direction has risen steadily for years, and while voters do not appoint judges, they do elect the President who nominates and the Senate that gives advice and consent.

Elections, after all, have consequences. The 2012 election had con-

sequences for the President's power to nominate, and the 2014 election had consequences for the Senate's power of advice and consent. With this Supreme Court vacancy on the table, the 2016 election can similarly have consequences for the American people's voice on this important issue. Deferring the appointment process also minimizes partisanship and maximizes fairness.

No one knows the party of the next President, the makeup of the next Senate, or the identity of the nominee the Senate will eventually consider. Choosing the appropriate process for the current circumstances, rather than for partisan advantage, can prevent a nominee from being perceived as a political pawn.

The Constitution leaves nominations to the President and leaves advice and consent to the Senate. That division of responsibility is written down for all to see and, hopefully, for none to forget.

Deferring the process for filling the Scalia vacancy until the next President takes office and leaving it up to the American people is the best approach for the Senate, the judiciary, and the country.

Before I close, I have to say a word about the disgraceful attacks on my friend and colleague, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I have served with him on the Finance Committee for nearly 25 years and on the Judiciary Committee for 35 years. I have served 40 years on the Judiciary Committee but 35 of them have been served with Senator GRASSLEY. If anyone knows his own mind, it is Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY. He has served on the Judiciary Committee longer than all but four Senators in the committee's history. No one is more dedicated to the Judiciary Committee and to the Senate than CHUCK GRASSLEY is.

Each of us is entitled to our own opinions or positions on issues that come before this body, even controversial ones. Each of us can feel as strongly as we want about those issues. But I want to categorically reject the notion that a difference of opinion means that someone such as Senator GRASSLEY is compromising the integrity or independence of the Judiciary Committee. That comes very close to impugning his character, and that sort of attack is beneath the dignity of this body because everybody in this body knows that CHUCK GRASSLEY is a man of great character, great honesty, great service, hard work, and cares for this wonderful country.

It is irritating to me to see the personal attacks that have been made. I don't think we should be personally attacking each other. We can find fault with each other. We can criticize each other on the issues. We can differ with each other. We can be politically different from each other, as we are. But to personally attack somebody with the prestige of the chairman of the Judiciary Committee is beneath the dignity of this body, and it is beneath the

dignity of the attackers. It really bothers me.

We have had wide differences of opinion on the Judiciary Committee. Let's face it: It is a tough committee. It is a very partisan committee. The Democrats on that side in the committee are extremely partisan, and the Republicans on our side of the committee are extremely partisan too. That is not necessarily bad as long as people are honest and people respect the opinions of others.

We can have downright bitter battles and bitter exchanges, but we don't have to malign each other in doing that. It is a tough committee. These are tough issues the Judiciary Committee handles. I know, I was chairman of this committee. I have to say it is a wonderful committee, and it is probably good that it is a diverse committee where you have a lot of liberal Democrats on one side and you have a lot of conservative Republicans on the other. We can bat up against each other, and sometimes we even come up with very good legislation.

Most of the time, everybody on that committee is concerned about having the best judges we can possibly get. Even though there have been some pains between various members of the committee from time to time—this naturally occurs when you have people who feel very deeply about these subjects—there is still no excuse for maligning the current chairman of this committee, CHARLES GRASSLEY.

I don't think you are winning a debate when you challenge somebody as a person of the highest integrity that this body has to offer. Senator GRASSLEY is one of those persons. There are others here too. I hope I am one. The fact is, CHUCK GRASSLEY is one of the best people we have in the Senate, he is one of the most noble people in the Senate, and he is one of the most honest people in the Senate. He is one of the people who are more at ease around the common people in this country and in the State of Iowa than many of us in the Senate, and he is a person of dignity and capacity. He is also a person who doesn't forget, and I would prefer to have people treat him with dignity so that he can forget.

All I can say is that there is not a better person on the committee than CHUCK GRASSLEY, and I call on my colleagues on the other side to be gentlemen and to treat him with the respect he certainly deserves. The fact that they disagree with his position on the Supreme Court right now is irrelevant in some ways when it comes to characterizing him as somebody less than who he is.

That committee is a committee of deep feelings on both sides, and thank God it is because that is what makes it a great committee. That is what makes it so people really want to be on it. We have really good debates in that committee, and we have really good people on both sides, not the least of whom is CHUCK GRASSLEY, and I want him treat-

ed with dignity and respect. I want people to know that he doesn't take positions he doesn't believe in. There are some who do in this body, but he doesn't.

I expect people in this body to show the proper decorum, to show friendship even when we have deep differences. Show respect for somebody who certainly deserves it. I hope we don't have any more of this idle chatter that can destroy any kind of rapport we have in the Senate, and that goes for both sides. Senator GRASSLEY is being maligned unfairly, and I don't like it and neither would anybody else who has any brains or any thought about what is decent and honorable.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to share my support for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2015.

This legislation, of course, that we have been debating for well over a week now aims to address the growing drug addiction crisis facing our country by not only promoting prevention and education, but by increasing efforts to improve treatment and recovery for those who have fallen to this growing epidemic.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that from 2002 to 2013, the number of heroin-related overdose deaths nearly quadrupled, with approximately 8,200 deaths in 2013. The CDC furthermore found that 44 people die every day due to prescription drug overdoses.

The National Institute on Drug Abuse estimates that the abuse of alcohol, illegal drugs, and tobacco costs the United States roughly \$700 billion every year because of increased criminal activity, loss of employment, and health care costs associated with drug use.

Colorado, unfortunately, is no exception to the increase in drug overdose deaths. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reports that drug overdose deaths in Colorado have risen in every single county except for one over the last 12 years. The Colorado Health Institute found that Colorado's 2014 rate of 16.3 drug-related deaths per 100,000 people exceeded the U.S. average of 14.7 deaths per 100,000 people. This same study by the Colorado Health Institute found that drug overdose deaths climbed 68 percent in Colorado between 2002 and 2014—a 68-percent increase in drug overdose deaths in 12 years.

The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism found that nearly 23 million adults in the United States have struggled with drug use.

However, the National Institutes of Health found that only 10 percent of U.S. adults who need treatment are receiving it. So only 2.3 million people out of the 23 million they have identified with some kind of a drug use problem—only 10 percent, 2.3 million out of the 23 million—are receiving some kind of treatment.

So what are we going to do to move forward from here? We are on an unsustainable path when it comes to addiction and when it comes to its treatment.

It is imperative that States are empowered with the resources needed to address the unique needs of each individual State, and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act does just that. The bill leaves behind the idea that the one-size-fits-all program out of Washington, DC, can fix everything. It encourages States to develop their own strategies because what works in Colorado may not work in New Jersey and what works in New York may not work in Texas or California.

It encourages these strategies to prevent, treat, and reduce the growing addiction epidemic by, No. 1, creating an interagency task force to develop best practices for prescribing pain medication and pain management. The CDC found in a National Survey on Drug Use and Health conducted from 2011 to 2013 that individuals addicted to opiate painkillers are 40 times more likely to be addicted to heroin. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that in 2012, health care providers wrote 259 million prescriptions for opioid pain relievers. That is nearly one bottle of pills for every single American—certainly every single American adult.

It is absolutely imperative that best practices are established to ensure health professionals are being trained properly to identify patients who require prescription pain relievers for chronic pain management and those who do not, in an effort to treat this system and to better identify.

The consequences of this addiction, we have seen in our communities, are devastating to individuals and their families. It is vital that States establish best practices to minimize the devastating effects that our communities have seen and our families have seen.

No. 2, this bill expands disposal sites for unwanted prescription medications. Community pharmaceutical drug take-back programs, as they are called, allow individuals to dispose of unwanted or expired medications in a safe and responsible way. Many households in our country don't safely and securely store unused pharmaceutical medications, leaving open the door for abuse by teenagers and young adults who might find the prescription drugs, the unused or expired pharmaceuticals—they might find them in the household.

According to the CDC, the abuse of prescription drugs has become the second leading cause of death among individuals between the ages of 25 to 64.

Furthermore, the abuse is strongly linked to heroin addiction.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, four out of five new heroin users started with prescription medications. Unfortunately, the vast majority of medication take-back programs in Colorado are in the Denver metro area, but we are not simply dealing with a metro problem. Getting unused drugs out of the communities eliminates the potential for misuse and decreases drastically the potential for addiction. The expansion of these programs is a step in the right direction to reduce the accessibility of dangerous prescription medication, especially in rural Colorado.

Third, this legislation also aims to identify and to treat incarcerated individuals who suffer from addiction by implementing medication-assisted treatment programs for use by criminal justice agencies. Statistics show that imprisonment has a small impact on future drug use when addiction goes untreated. The National Association of Drug Court Professionals found that 95 percent of those who committed drug-related crimes returned to drug abuse after release from prison. We know that addiction is treatable, and it is important that these individuals have access to addiction and recovery services so that they don't continue to cycle in and out of our Nation's prisons.

I would like to share a success story from an adult recovery program in the Denver area about a young woman who went to a treatment facility to turn her life around. I am not using her real name.

Sarah was admitted to our program in Denver in September of 2015. Outside of the first week, she has been clean and sober. Sarah found a job and has received positive performance reports, and she also received a raise at the place of employment she sought out after treatment. She has begun to do additional volunteer work in her spare time as a way to give back to her community that took care of her through these programs. She has reconnected with her family. Remembering every holiday since she started this program, Sarah reports that it is the first time she can remember being sober for that holiday. She reports that she is loving her life and that there is no turning back for her.

This bill will create more of these success stories to help people get back on their feet, to reconnect with their families, to engage in community service, and to receive raises at work because they do a good job when they make sure their addiction is broken.

Fourth, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act takes a step in the right direction by strengthening prescription drug monitoring programs aimed to identify and treat drug-seeking individuals. State electronic databases that collect data on substances dispensed throughout the State have been incredibly effective in tracking

the movement of prescription opiates throughout the country. Utilizing these programs allows States to identify drug diversion, prescription drug fraud, doctor shopping, and forgery. Prescription drug monitoring programs also identify drug-seeking individuals more easily to get them into treatment facilities so they can receive the care they need, just as Sarah did in Denver. Tracking and minimizing drug diversion is absolutely vital, and this legislation takes a step in the right direction to strengthen this policy.

As we talk about this legislation, I think it is important that we have these stories that have been told on the Senate floor about what has happened to friends and family members, about drug overdose and opioid abuse, about heroin addiction, the fact that we had doctor shopping, and the fact that we had forgery of prescriptions or perhaps unused drugs sitting around somebody's house without a take-back program. Improper ways to dispose of it mean that teenagers and young adults are getting their hands on it. We recognize in these stories that it is not just the metro area, not just our urban centers that are facing these challenges. In fact, it was recently reported in the Denver Post under this headline: "Drug overdose deaths hit record levels in rural southern Colorado." There is a comment from the San Luis Valley Behavioral Health Group. The San Luis Valley is in southwestern Colorado, in the Western Slope of Colorado.

"We are getting more referrals for heroin, along with prescription drug abuse," said Kristina Daniel, chief operating officer of the San Luis Valley Behavioral Health Group. "We have a need for services in our area for sure."

Among Colorado counties, the most striking increase in drug deaths occurred in Baca County in the southeast part of the State, an agriculture community bordering the Presiding Officer's home State of Oklahoma. They are talking about the death rate having quintupled in 12 years. This is a small rural community bordering both Kansas and Oklahoma in the corner of our State—a rural community that has seen its death rates quintuple in 12 years. The amount of hardship that has been placed on families and friends is unimaginable and unacceptable. With this legislation we can help work through these challenges to overcome them and to start putting an end to the tragedies that we have talked about now for this past week, because this is an epidemic in our country. Drug overdose and heroin opioid abuse don't discriminate against race, gender, or economic status. It has hit some of the most unsuspecting in our country.

I am proud to join my colleagues to support this broadly bipartisan legislation. I heard overwhelming support from my constituency in Colorado. Everyone from local law enforcement, families, victims of addiction, recovery specialists, and mental health providers have joined together to voice their support.

I would like to commend my colleagues Senators PORTMAN and AYOTTE for their extensive efforts to advocate on behalf of those who do not have a voice. I am proud to join my colleagues, and I urge the Senate to support this legislation.

HONORING CORPORAL NATE CARRIGAN

Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of Corporal Nate Carrigan and the work of Master Patrol Deputy Kolby Martin and Captain Mark Hancock of the Park County Sheriff's Office.

On the morning of February 24, while serving an eviction notice, the resident of the home they were serving the eviction notice to opened fire on the officers. Master Patrol Deputy Martin and Captain Hancock suffered injuries from the exchange and Corporal Carrigan tragically lost his life. Combined, these three men had served the citizens of Park County for over 35 years.

Corporal Carrigan was a pillar of the Park County community. His work led to the successful conclusion of many cases during his time with the sheriff's office. Park County was always home for him, growing up among the green hills and blue skies of Colorado, where he took on the role of serving his community.

As a teenager, he was a wrestler and the catcher for the Platte Canyon High School baseball team. Twenty years later he was coaching the same baseball team he had played on, and he was the assistant coach for the high school football team. It was the future of his community that he cared so deeply for and that he stood ready on that thin blue line to protect.

Residents of this small town recognize the value and importance of a close-knit community. It provides a source of comfort and strength during a difficult time such as this. In this quiet mountain town, colleagues, store owners, and schoolmates are often friends and neighbors as well. They come together to lift one another up as they honor a member who has fallen in service. It is a place where those surrounding you naturally feel like family.

The officers who were dispatched with Corporal Carrigan were not only coworkers but friends and even coaches of the very same sporting teams. This loss reminds us of the difficult and dangerous situations that our first responders are placed into each and every day.

My deepest sympathy is with those at the Park County Sheriff's Office who not only lost a team member but a comrade as well and to Corporal Carrigan's loved ones who are mourning the loss of a friend and family member so near and dear to their hearts. We honor law enforcement, who, in the spirit of selfless sacrifice, honor their communities through their service. Their work to protect our State never finishes, their bravery never waivers, and our gratitude will never cease.

This is the second time in a week that I have come down to the floor and mourned the loss of a brave law enforcement officer in Colorado, and I pray that we never have to do this again.

Our prayers go to Corporal Carrigan's family.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I wish to speak for 5 to 10 minutes about an important matter, and so I appreciate being recognized.

Madam President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is postcloture on the substitute amendment to the CARA bill.

Mr. WICKER. We will let the time run on that issue.

ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Madam President, at this point I wish to talk about Alzheimer's and an opportunity that we have to cure this most serious disease. We could find a cure for Alzheimer's, Madam President and my colleagues, and we could do it through American ingenuity.

No obstacle has ever been too great for American ingenuity. We have defied seemingly impossible odds in the past. We have eradicated polio from the entire North American Continent and from most of the globe. We have mapped the human genome. We have been to the Moon. We are going to send somebody to Mars. We can conquer Alzheimer's.

Alzheimer's was first discovered more than a century ago. When you think about it, we only began human flight about 100 years ago. Think of what we have done in human flight. It just boggles the imagination.

We need to cure Alzheimer's here at the beginning of the second century of this disease. We have made progress in understanding the disease. Yet we still do not know how to stop it. We don't know how to slow it, and we certainly don't know how to prevent it from happening.

Alzheimer's continues to cause profound human suffering. It affects 5 million Americans who have the disease, but not only them. It takes a toll on family and friends forced to watch their loved ones slip away. I could tell you from personal experience I know what I am talking about.

Last month Time magazine featured Alzheimer's on the cover: "A radical new drug could change old age." "The Longevity Issue." There is an article in here entitled "Alzheimer's from a New Angle." I think we need a new angle to address Alzheimer's in using innovative drug trials, as the magazine indicates, but also in a new angle concerning the use of prize competitions. I propose that Congress should look at Alzheimer's from the angle of using the XPRIZE Foundation and using a suggestion that has been endorsed by a number of organizations that have thought long and hard about this.

I introduced the EUREKA Act last fall as a way to reinvigorate the fight against Alzheimer's and related dementias. EUREKA stands for Ensuring Useful Research Expenditures is Key for Alzheimer's—EUREKA. We have found it, and we can find a cure for Alzheimer's. This bill could be the beginning of finding a cure.

Finding a cure is our ultimate goal, but it will take steps to get there. My bill would create prize competitions to reward breakthroughs in Alzheimer's research. I want to assure my colleagues who are very interested in NIH funding that EUREKA would not be a substitute for any dollars that are going to current research funding for Alzheimer's. That would continue, it ought to continue, and we ought to do whatever we can to expand that.

EUREKA would be in addition to what we are doing at the National Institutes of Health. Prizes would be awarded for a number of advancements, perhaps drug treatments to early detection methods. The best part is there would be nothing for us to lose because with a prize competition you pay only for success. Without success, the American taxpayer pays nothing when it comes to the EUREKA bill.

I am grateful for the bipartisan support that my bill has already received in the Senate. Thirty-five of our colleagues have sponsored the bill. I believe by the end of the day I will be able to announce 36. I hope even more will lend their support. Alzheimer's is certainly not a partisan issue. It is a national issue and one of the great challenges of our time, not only from a human standpoint but from a budget standpoint.

Alzheimer's is a major spending issue. It is responsible for \$226 billion a year. The estimates are that by the year 2050, those costs will be \$1 trillion per year. We have a \$19 trillion debt right now. Think of the additional debt that will be piled up unless we tackle this issue and get to a cure. Think of the savings. Think of the other areas we would be able to address if we didn't spend so much of our Medicaid budget on Alzheimer's patients, so much of our Medicare budget on Alzheimer's patients.

Experts say \$2 billion in research funding is needed to prevent and treat Alzheimer's by the year 2025. This remains the goal of the Alzheimer's plan, and it remains my goal, but that is a much higher number than we can afford at the NIH level right now.

However, by fostering public-private partnerships, as the EUREKA bill would do, we could build on current resources in new and exciting ways. These partnerships would help unleash the power of American innovation and the power of American competition to encourage people from different backgrounds and sectors to work together in pursuit of a life-changing discovery. This could work. Prize competitions have worked in the past. When Charles Lindbergh achieved a nonstop flight be-

tween New York and Paris, he won a \$25,000 prize and helped inspire the aviation industry that we know today.

Another example of success in this concept is the XPRIZE. The competition is currently sponsored by the XPRIZE Foundation. The XPRIZE Foundation has been promoting technological breakthroughs for more than two decades. In 2004 it offered \$10 million for the first reusable manned spacecraft. This XPRIZE competition generated \$100 million in investments by competitors. A \$10 million prize generated \$100 million in investments by competitors. In 2011, a skimmer that accelerates the cleanup of oil spills was awarded a \$1 million XPRIZE.

So this can work and it will work if we give it a chance. The bottom line is that we need America's best and brightest minds working on Alzheimer's right away. We need a way to reward success. Deaths from Alzheimer's are on the rise. Its costs already exceed those for cancer and heart disease. Think about that. The costs for Alzheimer's per year exceeds the cost for heart disease and cancer put together. So we need to put our emphasis where the need is.

I thank all of the organizations that have come together and endorsed this concept. I thank my friends at the XPRIZE Foundation. They stood with me last fall and endorsed this concept. This legislation was designed with the help of the XPRIZE Foundation, in consultation with the XPRIZE Foundation, and they know what they are talking about. I thank the foundation for doing that.

I also thank the following organizations that have endorsed this concept and specifically endorsed the EUREKA bill: a group called UsAgainstAlzheimer's, the Alzheimer's Association, the Alzheimer's Foundation of America, the BrightFocus Foundation, the MIND Center at the University of Mississippi Medical Center in my capital city of Jackson, and also a group called Leaders Engaged on Alzheimer's Disease. They all agree that by unleashing this—the concept of a prize competition—we can cure Alzheimer's disease and I hope we will try. This bill is generating support and dialogue for finally putting an end to this devastating disease.

Let's pass this bipartisan legislation. Thank you.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, as we consider the CARA bill on the floor at this time—the bill that deals with the opioid epidemic in our country—I

thought it might be useful to bring a few statistics forward so we can consider the nature of the epidemic we are dealing with.

In 2014, 29,267 people died from prescription opioid and heroin overdoses in our country, with 10,574 of those people dying from heroin. That is a 28-percent increase from 2013. Can I say that again? There was a 28-percent increase in heroin deaths in our country in 1 year. That is the trendline we are talking about with this epidemic.

Deaths from synthetic opioids like fentanyl increased 79 percent from 2013 to 2014. Can I say that again? A synthetic opioid, fentanyl, had an increase of 79 percent in deaths from 2013 to 2014.

Here is another statistic: Today's young White adults age 25 to 34 are experiencing the highest death rates since the Vietnam war. Can I say that again? White adults between the ages of 25 and 34 are experiencing the highest death rates since the Vietnam war.

In 2014, an estimated 1.9 million people had an opioid use disorder related to prescription pain relievers and an estimated 586,000 had an opioid use disorder related to heroin use.

This is the profile of the epidemic we have in our country right now.

In the 5-year period between 2008 and 2013, overdose deaths from prescription painkillers and heroin combined increased 37 percent.

In 2010, enough opioid painkillers were sold to medicate every American adult with a typical dose of hydrocodone every 4 hours for 1 month.

In 2012, health care providers wrote 259 million prescriptions for opioid painkillers—enough for every American adult in our country to have a bottle of opioid painkillers in 2012. Can I say that again? Enough of these opioid painkillers were prescribed so that every adult could have a bottle on their shelf in 2012.

Pick a number of how many 10-milligram opioid painkillers were approved by the Drug Enforcement Agency in the year 2014. Just pick a number in your brain of how many pills were authorized to be manufactured in our country in 2014. Just pick a number in your brain of 10-milligram pills, of opioids. Here is the answer. You were wrong. The number is 14 billion 10 milligram-equivalent pills that were authorized to be manufactured in our country by the Federal Government—by the Drug Enforcement Agency—in the year 2014.

Again, all this is part of the recipe. Stir well, ignore it for about 15 years, and let our country finally recognize that there is an epidemic in their house, on their street, with their relative, with their friend that should never have happened because we know what the cause of this issue is.

This unparalleled rise in overdose deaths in the United States parallels a fourfold increase from 1999 to 2010 in the sale of opioid painkillers. We know there has been a tripling in the number

of overdose deaths from 1999 to 2012 in our country, but we also know this: America is only 5 percent of the world's population, and yet we now consume 80 percent of all of the opioid painkillers on the planet.

Again, this is not some big puzzle in terms of what has caused this problem. This is all very simple, easy-to-understand stuff that ordinary families have been grappling with, especially over the last 10 years, beginning with their understanding that OxyContin and Percocet and all these other drugs that are allegedly “abuse-deterrent” in fact, when they are swallowed pursuant to a prescription, if done on an extended basis, can cause an addiction that is worse than the underlying problem of the individual taking these painkillers.

Roughly 480,000 emergency room visits in 2011 were attributable to the misuse and abuse of opioid painkillers in our country—488,000 emergency room visits on that one issue.

The prescription painkiller epidemic is killing more women than ever before, and it is estimated that about 18 women die every day from a prescription painkiller overdose.

The numbers are staggering.

We should create a requirement that if the DEA is going to license physicians to prescribe opioids—and every physician in America must go to the DEA to get a license—if they are going to be allowed to prescribe, the physician must prove he or she has been educated to do so.

Two years ago, the FDA authorized their voluntary education program for physicians. Pick a number in your mind of what percentage of all physicians in America have taken advantage of a voluntary education program for opioids. You are wrong, whatever number you just picked. Only 12 percent of all physicians have actually taken the voluntary education program.

The FDA continues to authorize new opioids on the market without even having an expert advisory panel to deal with the issue, even as the DEA continues to authorize 14 billion 10-milligram pills per year.

This issue is one that we have to deal with. We should have physician education. We should have tighter standards for what the FDA does in allowing for new drugs to go out on the market. We have to ensure that they are safe, and we have to ensure there is a proper understanding of their abuse potential. We have to have a day of reckoning with the costs of all of this.

We have to make sure that the funding level is there for families who are already suffering. We have to provide the help for them. We just have to. This is an epidemic that was largely created at the Federal level, largely created by physicians and pharmaceutical companies. It is time for us to finally begin to provide the help these families so desperately need.

Here is what I know most: It will not even be those who have the problem right now, although those families will

get the help they need; it is all the families who will never need the help because we did put the right recipe on the books. We did put the right prevention measures on the books. We did put the preventative measures on the books so that their families never even knew this day arrived in their history.

I hope as we go through this whole process that we can keep those thoughts in mind. That is what we can do from the Federal Government. We should strive to do this. We should try our best to stand up and provide the help that these families need at the local level.

Madam President, I yield the remainder of my time.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am in strong support of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and its supplemental funding amendment. I have to say I wish we weren't in this position today. I wish we didn't have a persistent and growing drug epidemic in this country that is ravaging our communities and tearing apart our families.

The issue of opioid abuse and heroin addiction is not a Republican or Democratic issue. It is an American issue. It touches every corner of our society: wealthy, middle class, and poor; rural, urban, and suburban; moms, dads, children, and grandchildren; our friends and our neighbors.

It is devastating that today more Americans are dying from drug overdoses than from car accidents. In looking at the facts, there are two things we can point our finger to: prescription opioid painkillers and heroin. Prescription opioids are increasingly to blame for overdose deaths. These drugs include hydrocodone, oxycodone, and morphine, to name a few. Their numbers are hard to believe—in 2014, 6.5 million Americans over the age of 12 abused controlled substance medications. The second factor, heroin, is even worse in what it has done to our Nation. Heroin use has increased 79 percent nationwide in just 5 years.

These two factors are connected. When people are injured and prescribed painkillers, what is given as help for pain can easily become an addiction. These painkillers are frequently and liberally distributed by medical practitioners for all kinds of issues—acute pain, PTSD, recovery from surgery, recovery from accidents, the list goes on.

However, when those prescriptions run out but the addiction has already set in, people turn to heroin for their fix. Why heroin? Heroin provides similar effects to the drugs they are already taking, is highly addictive, and readily available on the street. It is also incredibly inexpensive—\$10 or less for a hit. When you have something like that at your disposal, it is not hard to see how people can continue their addictions to the point of dying.

Every day, 120 Americans are dying as a result of drug overdoses. It is time to take a hard look at what we can do to fight back and stop these drugs from

taking over our communities. I look to my home State as a prime example.

In my home State, we recognize that heroin and opioid abuse are serious problems that must be addressed. In recent years, deaths from heroin have risen 88 percent. In 2014 alone in Maryland, we had 578 heroin-related deaths and 1,070 drug-overdose deaths. This problem reaches to the far ends of my State.

I met a woman on the Eastern Shore of Maryland who lost everything when one of her family members became addicted to opioids. He resorted to stealing from his family and their family store, and they ended up declaring for bankruptcy because of his addiction and the consequences of it. They lost everything due to one member's addiction, and I can't imagine the strength it took to try to put their family back together after all that.

We have all heard stories of friends, neighbors, and family that have faced addiction. Some have lost that battle; some have made it to recovery and continue to fight every day. There are examples everywhere in our community of both those who have lost their fight and those who, with the help of family and community, have put their lives back together.

When thinking of this problem in Maryland, many people's minds go directly to Baltimore. I can understand why—Baltimore was once characterized as the "heroin capital" of the U.S. It, too, has battled this problem for too many years, with insufficient results to show. In 2014 alone in Baltimore, 303 people died from drug and alcohol overdose. That is more than the number of people who died from homicide.

Today in Baltimore, we have 60,000 people addicted to opioids. That is 1 in every 10 residents of the city. Baltimore has the highest rate of heroin addiction in the country and many more who are abusing prescription opioid medication. While people like Dr. Leana Wen, the director of the Baltimore City Department of Health, have been actively taking steps to turn the tide, there are many more out there who would see this problem continue so they can profit off of it.

But this problem is not just about Baltimore, nor is it just about drug addiction. Widespread addiction leads to other problems in society. Addicts commit crime to get money in order to get drugs, like theft and fraud. Gangs are trafficking and selling these drugs to those who haven't been able to quit. The worst of our society is brought out because of these drugs and their effects, and those effects are being seen in every corner of my State and every level of society.

As I have traveled around Maryland meeting with county executives, every single one talked about the problem of heroin and opioid abuse. Both Republicans and Democrats have told me time and time again, they can't solve this problem themselves. They have asked me to help. They need multiple

resources to fight. They need everyone standing up saying, "enough is enough." It is time to take back our communities, and we can start with this bill and its supplemental funding.

This bill does five things that I think will really help us start going in a more positive direction. First, it expands prevention and educational efforts to prevent opioid abuse and promote treatment and recovery. Second, it expands the availability of lifesaving options to provide for first responders and law enforcement to save lives and reverse overdoses. Third, the bill expands the resources to treat those already in prison who are suffering from addiction and look at alternatives to incarceration for those arrested with substance abuse issues. Fourth, it strengthens programs to monitor prescription drugs to cut down their widespread misuse and expands disposal sites for unwanted medication to keep it out of the hands of our children. Last, it creates an interagency task force with experts in all fields to look at the best practices for prescribing painkillers.

I would like to add that I also support the Shaheen supplemental funding amendment. The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act is the authorizing bill here. It makes the promises for services to help Americans in need through education, prevention, and treatment across geographical and economic lines. The Shaheen supplemental amendment is the appropriations that cuts the check for the services. It is tailored to the bill, providing \$240 million to the Department of Justice and \$360 million to the Department of Health and Human Services. Both the bill and its amendment are needed to get help to Americans and to Marylanders who don't have the resources to solve these problems on their own.

We can't enforce our way out of this, and this bill recognizes that. We must look at it from the standpoint of addiction and mental health services as well. The impact that addiction has had on our society has created an urgent and desperate situation. Both this bill and its funding need to be passed immediately.

As chair and vice-chair of the Appropriations Committee, I have fought very hard to get funding in the Federal checkbook to help combat this epidemic. Through a bipartisan effort in the fiscal year 2016 omnibus, we were able to secure record funds to combat drug abuse and provide services to Americans.

As vice chair of the Commerce, Justice, and Science Subcommittee, cracking down was a priority in the omnibus bill. We provided \$2.45 billion for the Drug Enforcement Agency, who targets and dismantles criminal narcotics activities and regulates and combats prescription drug abuse. This was a \$52 million increase over fiscal year 2015.

The Department of Justice received \$7 million for anti-heroin task forces,

\$12 million for residential drug treatment grants, \$13 million for prescription drug monitoring grants, and \$42 million for drug courts.

Additionally, we were able to allocate significant funds for treatment and recovery of substance abuse disorders, including instituting some new programs. Funds include: \$70 million for the CDC Prescription Drug Overdose Prevention program, more than triple the Fiscal Year 15 level; \$12 million for new Substance Abuse & Mental Health Services Administration, SAMHSA, grants to equip first responders with overdose-prevention drugs; \$5.6 million for new CDC funding for heroin surveillance; \$10 million for new SAMHSA funding to promote prevention strategies; and \$25 million for SAMHSA medication-assisted treatment programs.

We recognize that our veterans can suffer more than most in opioid abuse, whether from injuries sustained in combat or mental health issues when they return. In further protecting our veterans, we added reforms at the Veterans Administration. These include adopting the CDC guidelines for safe opioid prescriptions for chronic pain, protections against double-prescribing, establishing a working group focused on opioid therapy, ensuring all facilities are prepared with opioid blocking drugs, and providing training to all employees that prescribe controlled substances.

Lastly, we required a multiagency report on heroin from the Department of Justice and 25 other Federal agencies. This report included recommendations and best practices for combating this crisis in our country. These experts said that there is hope to mitigate the issue, but that law enforcement and public health must work together to educate and intervene with effective treatments. They gave us a road map to take action, and several of their recommendations can be found in this bill.

The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act is a first step toward stemming the tide of the harm that opioids and heroin have wreaked on our country. Along with the appropriations supplemental from Senator SHAHEEN, it will provide immediate action and a comprehensive response. Unfortunately, my colleagues voted against this amendment, meaning we have to wait another day to put money for these expanded services in the Federal checkbook.

This bill recognizes that the problem won't be solved just by the Federal Government or local governments acting alone. We must come together with a multipronged solution working on all levels of government and including our allies in the public and private sector.

We all share the same goal in this instance. We must do more and do better to reduce prescription drug abuse, to help those struggling with addiction, to keep heroin and opioids out of the hands of children, to stop those who are trafficking and selling these dangerous drugs, and to better train and

equip those on the front lines of this battle to save lives. I urge the adoption of this bill and I pledge to do my best to provide the Federal funding needed in the appropriations bills for fiscal year 2017.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I was necessarily absent for yesterday's vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Grassley-Leahy amendment No. 3378 to S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Bill. I would have voted yea.

(At the request of Mr. REID, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Madam President, I was necessarily absent for yesterday's cloture vote on the Grassley-Leahy amendment No. 3378 in the nature of a substitute to S. 524, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2015. I would have voted yea. •

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO ZAK BAIG

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise today with enormous pride, but also real sadness, to honor one of my most talented and longest serving staff members, Zak Baig, as he departs the Senate and starts an exciting new career.

Zak has worked his way up the ranks in my office. He started working for me on the House side and in the process has filled almost every role in sight, starting with chief bottle washer and going up from there. He actually started in 2001, shortly after I was elected to the U.S. House, as an intern back in Hammond, LA. He did a great job there.

In 2002, he was an intern in DC and showed even greater progress and promise, and then he came on full time as a legislative correspondent at the end of 2002.

In 2004, I ran for the U.S. Senate. It was a big undertaking and an enormous challenge to take on a statewide campaign. Zak moved onto the campaign side and was in charge of the grassroots effort, which was enormously important and helped lead to our success. He truly helped guide us to victory that year.

After that, as we started working in the Senate, he became an integral member of the Senate staff. In those first 3 years, he served as our projects director and then in 2008 became legislative director.

In 2013, Zak served as a Republican staff director for the EPW Committee, while I was the ranking Republican.

In 2015, after we took the majority and I became chair of the Small Busi-

ness Committee, Zak became the full staff director there, as well as acting chief of staff for a period of time.

As I said, he has absolutely worked his way up the ranks and merited each and every step of the way, doing a better and better job as he progressed. You can tell that in his body of work, which is very impressive and which, of course, I benefited from.

At the EPW Committee, as a Republican staff director, Zak helped navigate the legislative waters and shepherd through some major infrastructure legislation in the Senate.

At the staff level, he was able to lead the negotiations of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014, starting from drafting bipartisan legislation with Senator BARBARA BOXER and her staff—the chair of the committee—to negotiating with the House of Representatives in conference, to ultimately getting the bill signed into law. It was a major legislative accomplishment. Shortly after that, he turned around and helped do the same thing with the highway bill reauthorization.

Under his leadership, we also conducted some really important oversight of the administration, particularly the EPA, the Department of Transportation, and other agencies under the jurisdiction of the EPW Committee. When we moved to the majority and chairmanship of the Small Business Committee, Zak served as staff director, just as, if not more, effectively. He helped lead the way as we passed 22 bipartisan bills out of the committee in just 1 year, 8 of which have become law. To put that in some perspective, our predecessor on the committee only passed 10 bills out of the committee over 5 years. So it really was making the committee work in an effective, bipartisan way—as it should. And just in general, in the office Zak was behind a lot of our major efforts and achievements and was always effective at whatever he put his mind to.

A lot of that success is directly attributed to his never-ending energy, his drive to see things through from start to finish, and, maybe even more importantly, his personality, his attitude, his sense of humor, his being able to do tough things and always getting along with those he was occasionally battling with because he always did it with a smile and a friendly attitude, and he probably had a friendly joke or two mixed in.

It is at that personal level that I am most saddened to say goodbye to Zak—at least working with him day to day professionally—although we will obviously keep in close touch.

I have been honored to have been a mentor to so many younger folks who have worked in the Senate office. I have been honored to mentor Zak through the years, and it really has been a personal privilege and honor. Through those years, I have literally seen him grow up from a young stu-

dent—a boy, really—to a consummate professional, a wonderful husband, and a great father. I like to think I had a little bit to do with that as well, because Zak met his wonderful wife Wendy when they both worked for me in the Senate office. In fact, their marriage is one of four that came out of our Senate office, which, as I look back at my service in the Senate, is probably the statistic and fact I will be most proud of—the young people I helped mentor and served with and those marriages that directly came out of the office.

In that sense—through that mentoring and through those years—I gained not just a great staff leader but a true and dedicated friend, and for that I will always be grateful. It is at that personal level that I will think back about fights, struggles, work, challenges, and a lot of jokes and fun we had along the way.

In that spirit, I want to leave Zak with three parting gifts. One has to do with a day when I carried something with me from committee hearing to floor activity and then to actually giving a speech on the floor with it next to me. It is a funny photograph which will not be described in more detail. It is perfectly PG-rated, but it is an inside joke. After that day, Zak got a hold of that framed photograph, and I think it has been completely destroyed. But there was a file of the originals involved, and so I will hand that to him as a parting gift as part of the inside joke.

On another occasion, commemorating his enormous devotion to Syracuse sports—he went to Syracuse as an undergraduate—a prized basketball of his was hijacked. This was a basketball signed by Coach Jim Boeheim after their national championship season in 2003. It was hijacked and moved locations. It sent ransom notes from all around the country for quite a protracted period before Zak got it back.

I was going to have the basketball with me to help tell the story today only to find out that it has been hijacked again. So my second parting gift to Zak is to get in contact with the abductors and return the prized basketball for yet a second time.

The third, and probably the most important parting gift, is to give Zak the true credit he deserves. One fight I took on in the last several years is to have Members and staff health care handled appropriately as was intended under ObamaCare—the so-called Washington exemption of ObamaCare—ending that. I just want to give Zak full and public credit that that crusade and idea was really his and his alone—not. I just wanted to give him one last heart attack, thinking for a split second that his promising lobbying career had just ended before it even began.

I know that Zak's Senate peers and our constituents in Louisiana will miss his tireless service, but no one will miss that and his camaraderie, good humor, and friendship more than my

wife Wendy and our four children. We have all become very close with him and his wife Wendy and their two sons. We also know his parents very well and are friends with them back home in Louisiana. We wish them all the best.

I know Zak's greatest achievements are ahead of him, not behind, and I can tell him to count me in as a cheerleader and fan as he takes on those new challenges.

With that, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

REMEMBERING JUSTICE ANTONIN SCALIA

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, Antonin Scalia entered the world as the son and grandson of Italian immigrants in 1936. When he unexpectedly departed this life last month, he was the patriarch of a large American family and the intellectual father of the most important legal movement in generations. Between those points, he lived an extraordinarily full life that helped shaped the course of our country.

By 1980, Scalia had already accomplished more at the age of 44 than most can ever hope to in a lifetime. He had been a distinguished lawyer, served at the highest levels of the government, and taught at the country's best law schools. He might have continued to develop a reputation as the Nation's brightest law professor and scholar, but providence had still more to ask of him.

Upon his election, President Ronald Reagan came to Washington with a mission to restore a country that seemed divided and in decline. He promised to rebuild our military, revive our economy, and restore our sense of purpose. Just as critical as these efforts, Reagan was determined to bring new life to our Founders' vision of our Constitution, which provided for carefully limited government, separation of powers, and the rule of law. In accordance with that determination, Reagan appointed Scalia first to the critical D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and then to the Supreme Court of the United States. The three-decade judicial career that followed would establish Justice Scalia as one of

the most influential American jurists—and one of the most consequential Americans—in our Nation's history.

The Federal judiciary that Scalia joined in 1982 had, for too long, both abused and shirked its proper role. It had stripped the American people and their elected representatives of their legitimate powers by inventing brand-new “constitutional rights” practically out of thin air. Just as troubling, it had failed to uphold the very real constitutional limits on government. The courts too often treated the text of statutes as mere suggestions and often appointed themselves as a kind of super-legislature.

Scalia would not stand for this. He saw this prevailing approach of judges as an abuse of power and a threat to a free and self-governing people. For Scalia, the rule of law was the touchstone of liberty, and judges had an important role in upholding it. He understood that America has a written Constitution for clear reasons: to restrict government and preserve liberty. As a judge, Scalia insisted that the Constitution be applied as written and originally understood, not freely interpreted by unelected judges. If the Constitution must change, as it has needed to throughout our history, the document itself offers an amendment process.

Justice Scalia had a sharp and well-articulated legal philosophy that put the text and meaning of the Constitution and law front and center. A judge, Scalia believed, must put aside his policy preferences in order to say what the law is. “The judge who always likes the results he reaches is a bad judge,” he said.

Justice Scalia lived out this approach on the bench. His majority opinions established clear and well-articulated precedents. His sharp and colorful dissents brilliantly exposed moments when too many of his colleagues preferred to put policy preferences and outcomes above the Constitution and the rule of law. For conservatives, the words “Scalia dissents” always offered a silver lining—they meant that a likely damaging legal precedent would at least come pre-packaged with a wonderfully readable corrective.

Whether he was on the majority or minority side of a decision, the forceful logic and clear phrasing of Scalia's opinions commanded attention and engagement. Over time, his most reliable intellectual adversaries found themselves increasingly forced to fight on the ground he established. While Justice Scalia did not win every argument, he changed the conversation forever. Judicial activism no longer has a free hand because Scalia challenged it and inspired an entire generation of legal minds to follow his example.

His judicial writing alone would have changed American law and advanced the cause of liberty, but Justice Scalia went further than that. He wrote books, lectured, and mentored stu-

dents. He traveled around the country, engaged the media, and debated colleagues and critics. His many law clerks now distinguish themselves throughout the legal profession. The Federalist Society, which he helped nurture in its fledgling years, now provides a lively forum for a variety of conservative and libertarian perspectives on law. Antonin Scalia has left us a legal culture absolutely transformed from the one he found.

Justice Scalia's judicial opinions, legal philosophy, and forceful advocacy for the rule of law inspired me as a law student and continue to inspire me to this day. While a wide array of life experiences and values have shaped the way I see America and the world, Antonin Scalia has been the single most important influence on my view of the Constitution and the proper role of judges in our Republic as men and women who should put the original meaning of our Constitution ahead of their policy preferences.

Justice Scalia's life is a testimony to the fact that ideas matter. It is proof that a person of principle, with the willingness to invest in debate and persuasion, can change history. His life also reminds us of another important truth. Particularly in these sharply divided partisan times, we can lose sight of the fact that the things that unite us are more important than the things that divide us. Justice Scalia never did. He knew the Constitution was his sole guide in his professional life, but he was also a devout Catholic who accepted that God has a plan for all of us. He took evident joy in living out his faith, in loving his family, and in nurturing countless friendships, even with his ideological foes. We should all be grateful that God's plan for our Nation, especially the people whose paths he crossed, included having Justice Scalia on the Court for the past 30 years. He was a role model for all of us and particularly for Christians in public life.

As a U.S. Senator, I led a bipartisan group of colleagues in filing an amicus brief in the Supreme Court. The brief, submitted in the case of *Town of Greece v. Galloway*, defended the practice of legislative prayer. It argued that the original meaning of the First Amendment clearly did not require the purging of religious expression from the public square. I attended the oral argument in the case and will forever be grateful for having had the opportunity to watch Justice Scalia's sharp and incisive questioning from the bench.

Although I did not have the good fortune to get to know Justice Scalia personally, he had a profound impact on me. All those who cherish the Constitution and limited government mourn this great loss. Justice Scalia was a brilliant legal mind who served with honor, distinction, and only one legal objective: to interpret and defend the Constitution as written. He is a model for exactly what his successor and all future Justices should strive to be on the highest Court in the land.

Antonin Scalia left us far too soon, but his legacy will remain with us as long as we remain a republic under law.●

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, it is an honor to pay tribute to the late Justice Antonin Scalia. Justice Scalia was a staunch defender of the Constitution who, above all, sought to uphold the original meaning of its text. He steadfastly adhered to his oath of office, which directed him to “administer justice without respect to persons, [to] do equal right to the poor and to the rich, and [to] faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all [his] duties . . . under the Constitution and laws of the United States.” In doing so, he recognized this approach to judicial interpretation might conflict with popular opinion. As Justice Scalia once stated: “If you’re going to be a good and faithful judge, you have to resign yourself to the fact that you’re not always going to like the conclusions you reach. If you like them all the time, you’re probably doing something wrong.”

A few years ago, I had the privilege of visiting the Supreme Court to listen to oral arguments in the case of *National Labor Relations Board v. Noel Canning*, which concerned the scope of the President’s authority to make recess appointments. I recall being struck by Justice Scalia’s probing questions and his ability to immediately get to the crux of an issue; yet Justice Scalia never lacked civility when making an argument. As he once said, “I attack ideas. I don’t attack people. And some very good people have some very bad ideas.”

Justice Scalia was known for more than his jurisprudence. The son of immigrants and the first Italian American to serve on the Supreme Court, he is remembered by many for his strong belief in the American dream. A former law clerk recalled how he introduced Justice Scalia to his grandfather, a Holocaust survivor. The clerk’s grandfather was nervous to meet a member of the Court, but Scalia embraced the man. He said he was honored to meet a man who represented everything that made him proud to be an American.

Justice Scalia was also a loving husband to Maureen, his wife of 56 years, and the father of nine children and many grandchildren. Scalia often noted that his wife deserved all the credit for their children’s accomplishments. Each year, the ranks of Scalia alumni would grow, and he would visit with each of them and their families, even nicknaming their children as his “grandclerks.” Justice Scalia was also a man of faith and looked to the Roman Catholic Church as a guiding force in his life. One of the Justice’s former law clerks recalled that Scalia’s faith inspired the clerk to deepen his own embrace of religion.

Scalia loved hunting, the opera, anchovy pizza, and red wine. He was known for taking law clerks to lunch at A.V. Ristorante, an Italian res-

taurant in Washington that has since closed down. He insisted they order anchovy pizza and red wine, and he was said to be dismayed when a clerk declined one or the other. After A.V. Ristorante closed, he would lead clerks in a hunt for a worthy replacement.

Of course, as Justice Breyer once noted, Justice Scalia “loved nothing better than a great argument.” Although he frequently disagreed with his colleagues on the Court, Justice Scalia formed deep bonds and friendships with his fellow Justices and respected their views. As Justice Breyer recalled:

We both would hope that the audience of students or senators would leave not with a better sense of who was right, but with a greater respect for the institution we represented. They would see that sometimes we disagreed, that we nonetheless understood and paid attention to each other’s points of view, that those views were serious views, and that we were friends. And we were good friends.

When Justice Elena Kagan joined the Supreme Court the two became hunting buddies. A few times a year, they would go hunting together to enjoy a shared appreciation for this sport. But it was his deep friendship with Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg that was well known to many. She stated recently: “How blessed I was to have a friend of such brilliance, high spirits, and quick wit . . . we were different, yes, yet one in our reverence for the court and its place in the U.S. system of governance.”

Justice Scalia will be remembered for his brilliant legal mind and faithful dedication to the Constitution. We will also remember his humor, his spirituality, his love for his family, and his ability to find common ground even in the face of disagreement. Let us pray for his family and friends as we proudly celebrate his service to our country.

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, on February 13, 2016, the Supreme Court not only lost one of its Justices, our Nation lost a true legal giant.

Justice Antonin Scalia was described by his colleagues as “extraordinary,” “treasured,” and “a stylistic genius.” Beyond his unwavering dedication to upholding the originalist viewpoint of the Constitution, Justice Scalia was also whole-heartedly committed to his family. He was a husband, father of nine, and grandfather to 36 grandchildren. His son Paul said of him during his homily that “God blessed Dad with a love for his family . . . He was the father that God gave us for the great adventure of family life . . . He loved us, and sought to show that love. And sought to share the blessing of the faith he treasured. And he gave us one another, to have each other for support. That’s the greatest wealth parents can bestow, and right now we are particularly grateful for it.”

Justice Scalia was nominated to the United States Supreme Court in 1986 by President Reagan and was confirmed by the Senate in a unanimous vote. While his time on the Court often led

to criticism of his legal opinions and colorful dissents, he remained respected by his colleagues, even those at the opposite end of the judicial spectrum. This is a sign of true character—to have the ability to have an open, honest debate about a particular issue, while respecting the individual person holding an opinion different from your own.

Justice Scalia said, “I attack ideas. I don’t attack people. And some very good people have some very bad ideas. And if you can’t separate the two, you gotta get another day job.”

This sentiment was best portrayed through his friendship with Justice Ginsburg. Of her friend, she said, “We are different, we are one. Different in our interpretation of written texts, one in our reverence for the Constitution and the institution we serve. From our years together at the D.C. Circuit, we were best buddies. We disagreed now and then, but when I wrote for the Court and received a Scalia dissent, the opinion ultimately released was notably better than my initial circulation.”

Justice Scalia was known for his wit and sarcasm in his writings, famously referring to the legal interpretations of his colleagues as “jiggery-pokery,” “pure applesauce,” and “a ghoul in a late horror movie.” Yet it was these same criticisms that Justice Ginsburg said nailed the weak spots in her opinions and gave her what she needed to strengthen her writings.

Justice Scalia represented a consistent, constitutional voice on the Court. Just as the Constitution is a pillar of our legal system, so too was his affirmation to this foundational document of our Nation.

He said, “It is an enduring Constitution that I want to defend. It’s what did the words mean to the people who ratified the Bill of Rights or who ratified the Constitution, as opposed to what people today would like.”

As Justice Kennedy said, “In years to come any history of the Supreme Court will, and must, recount the wisdom, scholarship, and technical brilliance that Justice Scalia brought to the Court. His insistence on demanding standards shaped the work of the Court in its private discussions, its oral arguments, and its written opinions. Yet these historic achievements are all the more impressive and compelling because the foundations of Justice Scalia’s jurisprudence, the driving force in all his work, and his powerful personality were shaped by an unyielding commitment to the Constitution of the United States and to the highest ethical and moral standards.”

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF CASEY FAMILY PROGRAMS

● Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, today I wish to acknowledge the 50th anniversary of Casey Family Programs, the Nation’s largest operating

foundation focused on safely reducing the need for foster care and building communities of hope for children and families across America. Casey Family Programs works to influence long-lasting improvements in the safety and success of children, families, and the communities where they live. I am proud that Casey is based in Seattle, WA.

March 15 is Casey's Founders Day, a time for its leaders to reflect on the history of Jim Casey and his vision for the foundation and its mission.

Jim Casey, the founder of United Parcel Service, saw a critical need 50 years ago to ensure that our Nation's most vulnerable children had safe and stable families who would provide the opportunities and support they needed to succeed in life. After Jim's father died when he was just 14, he felt responsible for taking care of his mother and three younger siblings. As he was building the bicycle messenger service he started in 1907 into the world's largest delivery and logistics company, Jim also noticed that his most effective workers came from strong families, while those who did not thrive came from unstable backgrounds.

Those experiences and his vision led him to generously invest his resources to create Casey Family Programs in 1966 to provide direct services to vulnerable children and families. The foundation now works with all 50 States, as well as tribal, county, and other child welfare jurisdictions, to safely reduce the need for foster care and help create and sustain safe and stable families. It also educates policymakers at all levels of government about effective policies and evidence-based interventions that improve the lives of families and children.

From 2009 to 2015, Casey Family Programs invested \$45 million in Washington State. It has helped support the child welfare system, courts, tribes, policymakers, and other organizations to improve stability for children and build communities of hope.

Casey Family Programs provides education, research, and information that is valuable in policy discussions as well as for Washington State and other States participating in the Federal IV-Waiver Program. For instance, Casey Family Programs has provided specific research to track which evidence-based programs States are using under their Federal waivers so that States can learn from and replicate these practices.

As the ranking member of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, I am committed to supporting policies to improve the lives of children and families. In particular, I was proud to include provisions in the Every Student Succeeds Act to increase educational stability for foster children and homeless youth. I appreciate Casey's commitment to these important issues as well.

I truly value the contributions of Casey Family Programs to Washington

State and our country. Jim Casey once said that "inspiration and enthusiasm are of little value unless they move us to action and accomplishments." I believe that the current leadership of Casey Family Programs has embraced the vision of their founder. I look forward to working with Casey Family Programs in the years ahead.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4630. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC): Implementation of Electronic Benefit Transfer-Related Provisions" (RIN0584-AE21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4631. A communication from the Assistant Director, Executive and Political Personnel, Department of Defense, transmitting, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of the Air Force, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4632. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4633. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Export Control Reform: Conforming Change to Defense Sales Offset Reporting Requirements" (RIN0694-AG38) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4634. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks" (RIN7100-AE45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4635. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Reserve Bank Capital Stock" (RIN7100-AE47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4636. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the continuation of the national emergency originally declared in Executive Order 13692 on March 8, 2015, with respect to Venezuela; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4637. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursu-

ant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4638. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4639. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanded Examination Cycle for Certain Small Insured Depository Institutions and U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks" (RIN3064-AE42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4640. A communication from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2016 Trade Policy Agenda and 2015 Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4641. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period October 1, 2015, through November 30, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4642. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-124); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4643. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4644. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Unique Device Identification System; Editorial Provisions; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0090) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4645. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Update on the Adoption of Health Information Technology and Related Efforts to Facilitate the Electronic Use and Exchange of Health Information"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4646. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Use of Mandatory Recall Authority Submitted Pursuant to Section 206 of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act, Public Law 111-353"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4647. A communication from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal

year 2015 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4648. A communication from the Director of the Peace Corps, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Peace Corps' fiscal year 2015 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4649. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "U.S. Department of Education Fiscal Year 2015 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2017 Annual Performance Plan"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4650. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Information on Corporate Contractor Performance and Integrity" (RIN9000-AM74) (FAC 2005-87)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4651. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments" (FAC 2005-87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4652. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2005-87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4653. A communication from the Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Introduction" (FAC 2005-87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4654. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) for Fiscal Years 2013 and 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4655. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans: Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4656. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Report to the Congress on the Native Hawaiian Revolving Loan Fund"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4657. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting,

pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Exemption from Registration for Persons Authorized Under U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission or Agreement State Medical Use Licenses or Permits and Administering the Drug Product DaTscan" ((RIN1117-AB38) (Docket No. DEA-394F)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4658. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Extension of Temporary Placement of 10 Synthetic Cathinones in Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act" (Docket No. DEA-386) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2016; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4659. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on crime victims' rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4660. A communication from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2015 Data Mining Report to Congress"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4661. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of the Lamorinda Viticultural Area" (RIN1513-AC17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 2, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4662. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promoting Diversification of Ownership in the Broadcasting Services, Review of Media Bureau Data Practices, and Amendment of Part 1 of the Commission's Rules, Concerning Practice and Procedure, Amendment of CORES Registration System" ((MB Docket No. 07-294, MB Docket No. 10-103, and MB Docket No. 10-234)(FCC 16-1)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 7, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4663. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" (RIN0648-XE419) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 3, 2016; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 779. A bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency (Rept. No. 114-224).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 2648. A bill to assist entrepreneurs, support development of the creative economy, and encourage international cultural exchange, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 2649. A bill to modify the treatment of the costs of health care furnished under section 101 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to veterans covered by health-plan contracts; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2651. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2652. A bill to extend the authorization of the Highlands Conservation Act; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 2653. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 2654. A bill to make funds available for Dungeness crab and rock crab emergency disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MORAN):

S. Res. 391. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to oppose the transfer of foreign enemy combatants from the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States homeland; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 392. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the prosecution and conviction of former President Mohamed Nasheed without due process and urging the Government of the Maldives to

take all necessary steps to redress this injustice, to release all political prisoners, and to ensure due process and freedom from political prosecution for all the people of the Maldives; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MORAN):

S. Res. 393. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 590

At the request of Mr. BENNET, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 629

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to enable hospital-based nursing programs that are affiliated with a hospital to maintain payments under the Medicare program to hospitals for the costs of such programs.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1074

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1455, a bill to provide access to medication-assisted therapy, and for other purposes.

S. 1679

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1679, a bill to amend the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 to require that certain buildings and personal property be covered by flood insurance, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1890, a bill to amend chapter

90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

S. 2070

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2070, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 2217

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2217, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to improve and clarify certain disclosure requirements for restaurants and similar retail food establishments, and to amend the authority to bring proceedings under section 403A.

S. 2426

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2426, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes.

S. 2437

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2437, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the burial of the cremated remains of persons who served as Women's Air Forces Service Pilots in Arlington National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

S. 2487

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2487, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to identify mental health care and suicide prevention programs and metrics that are effective in treating women veterans as part of the evaluation of such programs by the Secretary, and for other purposes.

S. 2502

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2502, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to ensure that retirement investors receive advice in their best interests, and for other purposes.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to ensure that retirement investors receive advice in their best interests, and for other purposes.

S. 2551

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2551, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and mass atrocities, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States civilian capacities to prevent and mitigate such crises.

S. 2571

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HETTKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2571, a bill to provide for the eligibility for airport development grants of airports that enter into certain leases with components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2584

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2584, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 2621

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2621, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to genetically engineered food transparency and uniformity.

S. 2646

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2646, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Veterans Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to improve health care provided to veterans by the Department, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 388

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 388, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 3359

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3359 intended to be proposed to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

AMENDMENT NO. 3376

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3376 intended to be proposed to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

AMENDMENT NO. 3438

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3438 intended to be proposed to S. 524, a bill to

authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 2650. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any prizes or awards won in competition in the Olympic Games or the Paralympic Games; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, with 150 days until the start of the 2016 Olympics in Rio de Janeiro, I am proud today to introduce S. 2650, the United States Appreciation for Olympians and Paralympians Act. This bill would ensure that America rewards the sacrifice and hard work of Team USA by exempting from Federal tax the medals and cash prizes they win at the Olympics and Paralympics.

Our Olympians and Paralympians represent America with distinction because they epitomize our greatest values—determination, hard work and a competitive spirit. These athletes and their families sacrifice years of their lives for the opportunity to represent the United States on the world's greatest stage—the Olympics and Paralympics games. Most countries not only compensate their Olympic and Paralympic athletes, but also subsidize their training expenses with taxpayer dollars. Our athletes make considerable financial sacrifices to train for the Olympics and Paralympics, and as amateurs, receive no compensation for their training. Unfortunately, America's athletes are penalized with a tax burden for the medals and awards they receive at these games. That shouldn't be the case. We should be celebrating their achievements rather than taxing their success.

I want to thank Senator SCHUMER, Senator GARDNER, Senator GILLIBRAND, and Senator ISAKSON for working with me on this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting the USA Olympians and Paralympians Act to protect and encourage the success of our athletes competing in the upcoming Rio Games as well as future Olympic and Paralympic Games. I look forward to watching Team USA compete and win later this year, and I wish all of our Olympians and Paralympians the best of luck.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 391—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE TO OPPOSE THE TRANSFER OF FOREIGN ENEMY COMBATANTS FROM THE DETENTION FACILITIES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES HOMELAND

Mr. ROBERTS (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 391

Whereas, on January 22, 2009, President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13492, requiring that the detention facilities housing foreign enemy combatants at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, “shall be closed as soon as practicable, and no later than 1 year from the date of this order”;

Whereas Executive Order 13492 states that “[t]his order shall be implemented consistent with applicable law and subject to the availability of appropriations”;

Whereas the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55), the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113-164), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235), the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 114-4), and the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-53) explicitly prohibit the transfer, release, or assisting in the transfer or release, of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland;

Whereas the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239), the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66), the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291), and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92) explicitly prohibit the transfer, release, or assisting in the transfer or release, of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland;

Whereas the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, are legal, safe, and humane, and have been found consistent with international conventions regarding the laws of war;

Whereas, on February 23, 2009, a Department of Defense review found that the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, complied with the requirements of Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 regarding the treatment of prisoners of war;

Whereas in 2015, teams from the Department of Defense visited Federal, military, and State-owned prisons in Kansas, Colorado, and South Carolina for the express purpose of relocating detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland;

Whereas Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, serves as the intellectual center of the United

States Army as home to the Army University, the Command and General Staff College, and the Combined Arms Center;

Whereas Fort Leavenworth operates the United States Disciplinary Barracks and Midwest Joint Regional Corrections Facility, which holds convicted members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas section 812 of title 10, United States Code (article 12 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), states that “[n]o member of the armed forces may be placed in confinement in immediate association with enemy prisoners or other foreign nationals not members of the armed forces”;

Whereas the facilities at Fort Leavenworth do not provide a legal alternative for detainment of enemy combatants currently held at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay;

Whereas the sites visited by the Department of Defense teams in Colorado are in close proximity to the densely-populated civilian areas of Pueblo and Colorado Springs, Colorado;

Whereas Colorado Springs is home to the United States Air Force Academy, Peterson Air Force Base, Schriever Air Force Base, and Fort Carson Army Post;

Whereas Peterson Air Force Base hosts the United States Northern Command (NORTHCOM) and the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), which are strategic military installations, vital to our national defense and military readiness;

Whereas Pueblo is home to the United States Army Pueblo Chemical Weapons Depot;

Whereas the Consolidated Naval Brig, Hanahan, South Carolina, has been visited by Department of Defense teams for consideration as a potential site to relocate dangerous international terrorists currently held in the detention facilities at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay;

Whereas the Consolidated Naval Brig is located less than a mile from an elementary school, and is near other schools and residential neighborhoods;

Whereas the Consolidated Naval Brig is also in close proximity to one of the busiest ports in the United States, the Port of Charleston, as well as the City of Charleston, one of the most popular tourist destinations in the country;

Whereas the Consolidated Naval Brig is also located near the Space and Naval Warfare Systems Command (SPAWAR) Systems Center Atlantic and the Navy Nuclear Power Training Command, which are strategic military installations, vital to our national defense and military readiness;

Whereas Department of Defense efforts to scout locations for the express purpose of transferring detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the States of Kansas, Colorado, or South Carolina are in violation of current law, which explicitly prohibit the transfer, release, or assisting in the transfer or release, of such detainees to the United States homeland;

Whereas, on November 17, 2015, Attorney General Loretta Lynch stated to Congress that “[w]ith respect to individuals being transferred to the United States, the law currently does not allow that”;

Whereas, on January 26, 2016, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter stated in an interview that “it’s against the law now to establish another detention facility [in the U.S.], so therefore we have to get the support of Congress”;

Whereas, on February 23, 2016, the Department of Defense issued a report pursuant to section 1035 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016, entitled “Plan for Closing of the Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility”;

Whereas the report states that “the Administration will work with Congress to relocate [detainees] from the Guantanamo Bay detention facility to a secure detention facility in the United States”; and

Whereas the report does not address or attempt to mitigate the risks posed to local communities by the potential transfer of foreign enemy combatants from United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to United States soil, including to communities in Kansas, Colorado, and South Carolina: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) rejects the “Plan to Close Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility”, presented by the President on February 23, 2016, to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, to the United States homeland;

(2) determines that any attempt by the President to transfer, release, or assist in the transfer or release of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland is in direct violation of the Department of Defense and Full-Year Continuing Appropriations Act, 2011 (Public Law 112-10), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55), the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-74), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6), the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76), the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (Public Law 113-164), the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235), the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 114-4), and the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2016 (Public Law 114-53);

(3) finds that the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, is the optimal location to house dangerous foreign enemy combatants and should not be closed;

(4) asserts that any potential transfer or release of detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland represents a threat to United States national security due to the risk of providing law of war detainees with rights and protections under the United States Constitution, including the potential for release into the United States, and, particularly, a threat to the safety and security of local communities in the States of Kansas, Colorado, and South Carolina; and

(5) demands that the President immediately abandon any ill-conceived and illegal plans to transfer detainees at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, to the United States homeland without explicit authorization from Congress.

SENATE RESOLUTION 392—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PROSECUTION AND CONVICTION OF FORMER PRESIDENT MOHAMED NASHEED WITHOUT DUE PROCESS AND URGING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE MALDIVES TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY STEPS TO REDRESS THIS INJUSTICE, TO RELEASE ALL POLITICAL PRISONERS, AND TO ENSURE DUE PROCESS AND FREEDOM FROM POLITICAL PROSECUTION FOR ALL THE PEOPLE OF THE MALDIVES

Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. REED,

Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 392

Whereas the Maldives is strategically important due to its location, which straddles major trade routes in the Indian Ocean;

Whereas increasing civil rights violations in the Maldives fuel instability and pose a threat to regional security;

Whereas since January 2015, President Abdulla Yameen of the Maldives has increasingly cracked down on dissent within his own party and the political opposition, presided over the erosion of judicial impartiality, and put increasing pressure on civil society;

Whereas the arrest of former President Mohamed Nasheed in March 2015, was widely condemned as politically motivated, and his conviction and sentence of 13 years in prison has been condemned by Amnesty International as a “travesty of justice”;

Whereas in his speech in Sri Lanka on May 2, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry stated, “[W]e’ve seen even now how regrettably there are troubling signs that democracy is under threat in the Maldives where the former President Nasheed has been imprisoned without due process. And that is an injustice that must be addressed soon.”; and

Whereas on September 14, 2015, in his opening statement at the 30th session of the United Nations Human Rights Council, United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights Zeid Ra’ad said—

(1) “In the Maldives, the rule of law continues to be manipulated for political ends.”; and

(2) in reference to former President Mohamed Nasheed’s detention, “Given the deeply tainted nature of this case, I urge the Government to release him, and to review several hundred pending criminal cases against opposition supporters in relation to protests in recent months.”;

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses profound concern over the prosecution and conviction of former President Mohamed Nasheed without due process; and

(2) urges the Government of the Maldives to take all necessary steps—

(A) to redress this injustice;

(B) to release all political prisoners; and

(C) to ensure due process and freedom from political prosecution for all the people of the Maldives.

SENATE RESOLUTION 393—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MORAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 393

Whereas multiple sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as “MS”) can impact individuals of all ages, races, and ethnicities but is at least 2 to 3 times more common in women than in men;

Whereas there are approximately 2,300,000 individuals worldwide who have been diagnosed with MS;

Whereas MS is typically diagnosed in individuals between the ages of 20 and 50, but it

is estimated that between 8,000 and 10,000 children and adolescents are living with MS in the United States;

Whereas MS is an unpredictable neurological disease that interrupts the flow of information both within the brain and between the brain and the rest of the body;

Whereas symptoms of MS range from numbness and tingling in the extremities to blindness and paralysis, and the progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS in any 1 person cannot yet be predicted;

Whereas there is no laboratory test available that can definitively diagnose MS;

Whereas, while MS is not directly inherited, studies show that there are genetic and, most likely, environmental factors that make certain individuals, such as Caucasians of Northern European ancestry, more susceptible to the disease than others;

Whereas the exact cause of MS is still unknown and there is no cure;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition, a national network of independent MS organizations dedicated to the enhancement of the quality of life for all those affected by MS, recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

Whereas the mission of the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition is to increase opportunities for cooperation among MS organizations and to provide greater opportunity for the effective use and development of resources for the benefit of individuals and families affected by MS;

Whereas the United States plays a critical role in coordinating MS research globally and amplifies the impact of research in the United States through which results are delivered to MS patients;

Whereas, in 2012, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society was a founding member of the Progressive MS Alliance, which coordinates research to accelerate the development of treatments for progressive MS by removing international scientific and technological barriers and which now includes MS societies from 15 countries;

Whereas the Multiple Sclerosis Coalition recognizes and supports Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week during March of every calendar year;

Whereas the goals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week are to invite people to join the movement to end MS, encourage everyone to do something to demonstrate a commitment to moving toward a world free of MS, and acknowledge those who have dedicated time and talent to help promote MS research and programs; and

Whereas, in 2016, Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week is recognized during the week of March 7 through March 11: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(2) encourages States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week by issuing proclamations designating Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(3) encourages media organizations to—

(A) participate in Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week; and

(B) help provide education to the public about multiple sclerosis;

(4) commends the efforts of States, localities, and the territories and possessions of the United States to support the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week;

(5) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ending multiple sclerosis by—

(A) promoting awareness about individuals that are affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) supporting multiple sclerosis research and education programs;

(6) recognizes all individuals in the United States living with multiple sclerosis;

(7) expresses gratitude to the family members and friends of individuals living with multiple sclerosis, who are a source of love and encouragement to those individuals; and

(8) salutes the health care professionals and medical researchers who—

(A) provide assistance to individuals affected by multiple sclerosis; and

(B) continue to work to find ways to stop the progression of the disease, restore nerve function, and end multiple sclerosis forever.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3448. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3448. Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 39, line 5, strike “opioids.” and insert “opioids. Such activities may include supporting the availability of medication assisted treatment and other clinically appropriate services provided by treatment centers that operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, to provide immediate access to behavioral health treatment.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled “The State of the U.S. Maritime Industry: The Federal Role.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “State Department Reauthorization: An Opportunity to Strengthen and Streamline U.S. Diplomacy.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Homeland Security Department’s Budget Submission for Fiscal Year 2017.”

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on March 8, 2016, at 2:30 p.m.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to a member of my staff, Lauren Arias.

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

DEVELOPING A STRATEGY TO OBTAIN OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN IN THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 358, S. 2426.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2426) to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I 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.

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

The bill (S. 2426) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2426

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL POLICE ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Safety, security and peace is important to every citizen of the world, and shared information ensuring wide assistance among police authorities of nations for expeditious dissemination of information regarding criminal activities greatly assists in these efforts.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) is beneficial for all nations and their police authorities. Internationally shared information with authorized police authorities is vital to peace-keeping efforts.

(3) With a history dating back to 1914, the role of INTERPOL is defined in its constitution: “To ensure and promote the widest possible mutual assistance between all criminal police authorities within the limits of the laws existing in the different countries and in the spirit of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”.

(4) Ongoing international threats, including international networks of terrorism, show the ongoing necessity to be ever inclusive of nations willing to work together to combat criminal activity. The ability of police authorities to coordinate, preempt, and act swiftly and in unison is an essential element of crisis prevention and response.

(5) Taiwan maintained full membership in INTERPOL starting in 1964 through its National Police Administration but was ejected in 1984 when the People’s Republic of China (PRC) applied for membership.

(6) Nonmembership prevents Taiwan from gaining access to INTERPOL’s I-24/7 global police communications system, which provides real-time information on criminals and global criminal activities. Taiwan is relegated to second-hand information from friendly nations, including the United States.

(7) Taiwan is unable to swiftly share information on criminals and suspicious activity with the international community, leaving a huge void in the global crime-fighting efforts and leaving the entire world at risk.

(8) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan’s participation in appropriate international organizations and has consistently reiterated that support.

(9) Following the enactment of Public Law 108-235, a law authorizing the Secretary of State to initiate and implement a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health

Assembly and subsequent advocacy by the United States, Taiwan was granted observer status to the World Health Assembly for six consecutive years since 2009. Both prior to and in its capacity as an observer, Taiwan has contributed significantly to the international community's collective efforts in pandemic control, monitoring, early warning, and other related matters.

(10) INTERPOL's constitution allows for observers at its meetings by "police bodies which are not members of the Organization".

(b) TAIWAN'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERPOL.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in INTERPOL and at other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter; and

(2) instruct INTERPOL Washington to officially request observer status for Taiwan in INTERPOL and to actively urge INTERPOL member states to support such observer status and participation for Taiwan.

(c) REPORT CONCERNING OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN IN INTERPOL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a report, in unclassified form, describing the United States strategy to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in appropriate international organizations, including INTERPOL, and at other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter. The report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the efforts the Secretary has made to encourage member states to promote Taiwan's bid to obtain observer status in appropriate international organizations, including INTERPOL.

(2) A description of the actions the Secretary will take to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in appropriate international organizations, including INTERPOL, and at other related meetings, activities, and mechanisms thereafter.

COMPETITIVE SERVICE ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message to accompany S. 1580.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1580) entitled "An Act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates," do pass with amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1580 and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

EDWARD "TED" KAUFMAN AND MICHAEL LEAVITT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message to accompany S. 1172.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 1172) entitled "An Act to improve the process of presidential transition," do pass with an amendment.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 1172 and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

MAKING CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CONGRESSIONAL CHARTER OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1755 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 legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1755) to amend title 36, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the congressional charter of the Disabled American Veterans.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I 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.

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

The bill (H.R. 1755) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT OF ASTRONAUT SCOTT JOSEPH KELLY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 385 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 385) recognizing the historic achievement of astronaut Scott Joseph Kelly of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as the first person of the United States to complete a continuous 1-year mission in space.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 385) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to. (The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 3, 2016, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AUTHORIZING USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. Con. Res. 113, which is at the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the "Borinqueneers."

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

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

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) was agreed to.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 393, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 393) supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 393) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour,

equally divided, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of S. 524; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on amendment No.

3378 expire at 12 noon; finally, that the time following morning business until 12 noon be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:32 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 9, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1323–S1350

Measures Introduced: Seven bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 2648–2654, and S. Res. 391–393. **Pages S1344–45**

Measures Reported:

S. 779, to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 114–224)

Page S1344

Measures Passed:

Observer Status for Taiwan in INTERPOL: Senate passed S. 2426, to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the International Criminal Police Organization. **Pages S1348–49**

Disabled American Veterans Congressional Charter: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1755, to amend title 36, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the congressional charter of the Disabled American Veterans, and the bill was then passed. **Page S1349**

Astronaut Scott Joseph Kelly: Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 385, recognizing the historic achievement of astronaut Scott Joseph Kelly of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration as the first person of the United States to complete a continuous 1-year mission in space, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S1349**

Authorizing the Use of Emancipation Hall: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 113, authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the “Borinqueneers”. **Page S1349**

Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 393, supporting the goals and ideals of Multiple Sclerosis Awareness Week. **Page S1349**

Measures Considered:

Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—Agreement: Senate continued consideration of S. 524, to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S1327–41**

Pending:

Grassley Amendment No. 3378, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S1328**

Grassley (for Donnelly/Capito) Modified Amendment No. 3374 (to Amendment No. 3378), to provide follow-up services to individuals who have received opioid overdose reversal drugs. **Page S1328**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill at approximately 10:30 a.m., on Wednesday, March 9, 2016; that notwithstanding the provisions of Rule XXII, all post-cloture time on Grassley Amendment No. 3378 (listed above) expire at 12 noon; and that the time following morning business until 12 noon be equally divided between the two managers, or their designees. **Pages S1349–50**

House Messages:

Competitive Service Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to S. 1580, to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates. **Page S1349**

Edward “Ted” Kaufman and Michael Leavitt Presidential Transitions Improvements Act: Senate concurred in the amendment of the House to S. 1172, to improve the process of presidential transition. **Page S1349**

Executive Communications: **Pages S1343–44**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1345–46**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S1346–48**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1342–43**

Amendments Submitted: **Page S1348**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: Page S1348

Privileges of the Floor: Page S1348

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 5:32 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 9, 2016. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S1349–50.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of the Treasury, after receiving testimony from Jack Lew, Secretary, John A. Koskinen, Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, and J. Russell George, Inspector General for Tax Administration, all of the Department of the Treasury.

APPROPRIATIONS: CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION AND IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of Homeland Security concluded a hearing to examine measuring results and proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement, after receiving testimony from Kevin K. McAleenan, Deputy Commissioner, Customs and Border Protection, and Daniel H. Ragsdale, Deputy Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

APPROPRIATIONS: GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE AND CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office, after receiving testimony from Gene L. Dodaro, Comptroller General of the United States, Government Accountability Office; and Keith Hall, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

U.S. CENTRAL, AFRICA, AND SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMANDS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee concluded a hearing to examine United States Central Command,

United States Africa Command, and United States Special Operations Command, after receiving testimony from General Lloyd J. Austin III, USA, Commander, United States Central Command, General David M. Rodriguez, USA, Commander, United States Africa Command, and General Joseph L. Votel, USA, Commander, United States Special Operations Command, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Airland concluded a hearing to examine Air Force modernization in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2017 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Darlene J. Costello, Acting Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Lieutenant General Arnold W. Bunch, Jr., USAF, Military Deputy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, Lieutenant General James M. Holmes, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Plans and Requirements, and Lieutenant General John W. Raymond, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, all of the Department of Defense.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel concluded a hearing to examine military personnel posture in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2017 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from Lieutenant General James C. McConville, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, United States Army, Vice Admiral William F. Moran, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower, Personnel, Training, and Education, United States Navy, Lieutenant General Mark A. Brilakis, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, United States Marine Corps, and Lieutenant General Gina M. Grosso, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower, Personnel, and Services, United States Air Force, all of the Department of Defense; Kathy Roth-Doquet, Blue Star Families; Joyce W. Raezer, National Military Family Association; Scott Bousum, The Enlisted Association of the National Guard of the United States; and Joseph E. Davis, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

U.S. MARITIME INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety and Security concluded a hearing to examine the state of the United States maritime industry, focusing on the Federal role, after

receiving testimony from Paul N. Jaenichen, Administrator, Maritime Administration, Rear Admiral James Helis, USMS, Superintendent, United States Merchant Marine Academy, and Mitchell Behm, Assistant Inspector General for Surface Transportation Audits, all of the Department of Transportation; and Mario Cordero, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission.

FOREST SERVICE BUDGET

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2017 for the Forest Service, after receiving testimony from Tom Tidwell, Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

STATE DEPARTMENT REAUTHORIZATION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine State Department reauthoriza-

tion, focusing on an opportunity to strengthen and streamline United States diplomacy, after receiving testimony from Heather Higginbottom, Deputy Secretary of State for Management and Resources.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY BUDGET

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Homeland Security, after receiving testimony from Jeh Charles Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee held closed hearings on intelligence matters, receiving testimony from officials of the intelligence community.

Committee recessed subject to the call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House is scheduled to meet in a Pro Forma session at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 10, 2016.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 9, 2016

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Indian Health Service, 10 a.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Department of Defense, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Defense Health Program, 10:30 a.m., SD-192.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and

justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Agriculture, 2 p.m., SD-124.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2017 for the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., SD-138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of General Joseph L. Votel, USA, for reappointment to the grade of general and to be Commander, United States Central Command, and Lieutenant General Raymond A. Thomas III, USA, to be general and Commander, United States Special Operations Command, 10 a.m., SD-G50.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense security cooperation and assistance programs and authorities, 2:30 p.m., SR-232A.

Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, to hold closed hearings to examine military space threats and programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2017 and the Future Years Defense Program, 2:30 p.m., SVC-217.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine cooperative federalism, focusing on state perspectives on Environmental Protection Agency regulatory actions and the role of states as co-regulators, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to consider S. 1878, to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program, S. 1077, to provide for expedited development of and priority review for breakthrough devices, S. 1101, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of

patient records and certain decision support software, S. 2055, to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to national health security, S. 1767, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to combination products, S. 1597, to enhance patient engagement in the medical product development process, S. 2512, to expand the tropical disease product priority review voucher program to encourage treatments for Zika virus, and the nomination of John B. King, of New York, to be Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., SD-106.

Committee on Indian Affairs: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request

for fiscal year 2017 for Indian Country, 2:15 p.m., SD-628.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, to hold an oversight hearing to examine the enforcement of the antitrust laws, 2 p.m., SD-226.

House

No hearings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 9

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond one hour), Senate will continue consideration of S. 524, Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, with all post-cloture time on Grassley Amendment No. 3378 to expire at 12 noon. Following the disposition of Grassley (for Donnelly/Capito) Modified Amendment No. 3374 (to Amendment No. 3378), and Grassley Amendment No. 3378, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the bill.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11:30 a.m., Thursday, March 10

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: House will meet in pro forma session at 11:30 a.m.



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.fdsys.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.