



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2016

No. 23

Senate

The Senate met at 11 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.

O God, our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, thank You for our Nation and for the freedoms we enjoy. Lord, thank You also for the men and women who gave their lives that we might be free.

Forgive us when our preoccupation with selfish dreams keeps us from surrendering to Your will. Help us to strive each day to give You our best.

Guide our Senators. May nothing deter them from doing Your will. Lord, give them faith to meet each challenge with Your wisdom. Help them to give themselves completely to You, permitting Your peace to guard their hearts.

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. FLAKE). The majority leader is recognized.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the President released a budget today. Congress will review his final set of proposals and priorities—his call for new taxes, new spending, and more debt.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just this morning, local health departments confirmed two cases of the Zika virus in two States bordering Kentucky—Indiana and Ohio.

Americans want a better understanding of the administration's efforts to fight this virus and its spread. Americans want to know what the administration's funding priorities are for combatting Zika in a time of limited Federal resources. We appreciate Secretary Burwell coming today to help explain all of this. She and her team will provide a briefing to Senate leaders, committee chairs, and ranking members about a virus Americans are rightly concerned about. Keeping Americans safe and healthy is a top priority for all of us. I am looking forward to hearing what she has to say.

THANKING AMBASSADOR DEREK MITCHELL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, turning to the nomination we will consider today, our Ambassador to Burma, Derek Mitchell, has staunchly pursued America's interests in an important post. He helped guide our relationship with Burma through a historic transition to elected government. He also served as a trusted and valuable partner in understanding how best to measure the pace and viability of reform within Burma.

I have gotten to know Derek pretty well over the last few years. I offer to him sincere gratitude for all of his advice and counsel. He will be missed. He is a genuine expert on that country. And while he leaves big shoes to fill, I intend to support the man nominated to succeed him.

NOMINATION OF SCOT MARCIEL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, Scot Marciel has served as the Principal Deputy Executive Secretary since

August 2013, following time in Jakarta as our Ambassador to Indonesia for 3 years. He served as Ambassador for ASEAN Affairs and as Deputy Assistant Secretary for the East Asia and Pacific bureau, responsible for relations with Southeast Asia. Earlier in his career, he served in Vietnam, the Philippines, Hong Kong, Brazil, and Turkey, as well as in the Economic Bureau's Office of Monetary Affairs.

Ambassador Marciel will represent us as a new government is formed in Burma and as America's policies adjust to those changes on the ground. He obviously has a lot of experience. I think it will prove valuable as he works to represent our Nation at a time of truly consequential change in Burma.

Burma's transition to a democratically elected government is an important mark of reform in a country with a long and very troubled history. We know there is more to be done, but the administration can take credit for its efforts, and so can Members of Congress in both parties. Hopefully we can build on that momentum working together.

NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS AND POLICY ENHANCEMENT BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, the regime in North Korea presents serious threats to regional stability, to the security of Americans, to the safety of our allies, and to the well-being of North Koreans themselves.

Pyongyang regularly threatens neighbors, such as South Korea and Japan. It routinely engages in cyber warfare. It repeatedly commits gross human rights violations against its own people and continues to develop a nuclear program that threatens peace in the region and throughout the world. The regime's most recent display of belligerent behavior only underlines that the administration's approach has certainly not worked. Let's

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S709

work together to change that. Let's vote to move America's policy in a better and more successful direction.

Last month the House of Representatives voted to pass comprehensive sanctions legislation on a bipartisan basis. Tomorrow the Senate will turn to comprehensive sanctions legislation that builds on what the House passed, and we should pass that measure on a bipartisan basis as well.

The North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act was written by a Republican from Colorado, Senator CORY GARDNER, and a Democrat from New Jersey, Senator BOB MENENDEZ, and reported from the Foreign Relations Committee. It would strengthen congressional oversight. It would give the President more tools to take action against North Korea's growing aggression and require him to do so. It would also reassure our regional allies that we have not despaired in taking any action against North Korea—with or without help from China.

The kind of belligerence we have seen from Pyongyang must not be ignored. Let's work together to make our country and our world safer by passing this bipartisan bill.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I said yesterday and I say again today that I appreciate very much the Republican leader scheduling the meeting to talk about the Zika virus today. As I indicated yesterday, things crop up. I have been called to the White House at that same time, so I personally won't be at the meeting, but I will have people there to make sure that if there is anything I missed, I will be brought up to date on that. Again, I appreciate the Republican leader scheduling that meeting.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am pleased that we are going to be considering the Ambassador to Burma. Everyone knows the personal attention Senator MCCONNELL has shown to the country of Burma for many years. I am pleased we are going to get an Ambassador to Burma.

I hope everyone understands we are really shortchanging the State Department. We have numerous people held up. The Secretary of State has called me on several occasions lamenting the fact that he is having trouble getting the work done because we don't have the people to do the work.

Fifteen foreign policy nominations are being held up by Republicans, and we have a number of Ambassadors who are being held up: Sweden, Norway,

Luxembourg, and Trinidad—a number of countries that are extremely important to what we are doing here. It is a shame that they are being held by Republicans. It is very unfortunate.

FLINT, MICHIGAN, WATER CRISIS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the people in Flint, MI, continue to suffer through a catastrophic series of problems. Basically, it is their water. It is heavily contaminated. Their nightmare, which began almost 2 years ago, is an emergency that requires a Federal response, and that is what we have been trying to do. In the case of emergencies like this, we must act to help Americans dealing with a public health crisis.

For weeks now, we have called on Republicans to work with us to provide assistance for the people of Flint—100,000 people. Nine thousand children under the age of 6 have been poisoned in that little city in Michigan. It is very large by Nevada standards, but by Michigan standards, that city is not one of the bigger ones, but they need help. We need help from the Republicans. Nothing is happening because we haven't had enough Republican support. In the meantime, the people of Flint, MI, are using bottled water to bathe, to drink, to brush their teeth, and to cook with. That is really too bad.

This should not be a partisan issue. This is drinking water we are talking about. Everyone is entitled to pure, clean drinking water, and access to safe water is a right every American deserves. Whether you live in Michigan, Texas, Florida, Arizona, Nevada, Illinois—it doesn't matter where you live, you shouldn't be afraid to drink the water that comes out of your faucet. No one should have to suffer, but the people of Flint, MI have suffered.

Yesterday the American Academy of Pediatrics wrote a long letter to me and to Senator MCCONNELL. In this letter they said that this organization representing 65,000 pediatricians and other pediatric specialists believes something needs to be done with the water in Flint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics.

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

AMERICAN ACADEMY OF PEDIATRICS,
Elk Grove Village, IL, February 8, 2016.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADERS MCCONNELL AND REID: On behalf of the American Academy of Pediatrics (AAP), a non-profit professional organization of 64,000 primary care pediatricians, pediatric medical sub-specialists, and pediatric surgical specialists dedicated to the health, safety and well-being of infants, children, adolescents, and young adults, I write

regarding Congressional efforts to respond to the tragedy in Flint, Michigan and the exposure of its citizens to lead, a potent neurotoxin, through their drinking water.

The AAP supports federal efforts to provide immediate funding and other assistance to the people of Flint, including the amendment offered by Senators Stabenow and Peters. While their proposal is a vitally important first step, we would urge the Senate to provide additional funding for long-term educational, early literacy, nutrition, medical, behavioral, and other assistance to this community. This includes, but should not be limited to: support for Head Start and Early Head Start; quality child care; literacy programs; Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program enrollment; the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children; school meals and after-school feeding programs; and mental health screening and treatment.

There is no safe level of lead exposure for children. Lead damage can be permanent and irreversible. Lasting decreases in cognition have been documented in children with blood levels as low as 5 micrograms per deciliter of lead in blood. It is therefore clear that the children and families of Flint will need comprehensive assistance in both the short- and long-term.

The AAP is eager to assist this community, and federal policymakers, in both immediate and longer-term solutions to this public health tragedy. Thank you for your consideration. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Ami Gadhia in our Washington, D.C. office.

Sincerely,

BENARD P. DREYER, MD, FAAP.

President.

Mr. REID. I will only read a short phrase or two out of the letter, which says it all:

The AAP supports federal efforts to provide immediate funding and other assistance to the people of Flint, including the amendment offered by Senators Stabenow and Peters.

The letter goes on to say:

There is no safe level of lead exposure for children. Lead damage can be permanent and irreversible. Lasting decreases in cognition have been documented in children with blood levels as low as 5 micrograms per deciliter of lead in blood. It is therefore clear that the children and families of Flint will need comprehensive assistance in both the short- and long-term.

This is a letter from the American Academy of Pediatrics. These are people who deal with children. They are not politicians. They are willing to tell us that these children have been poisoned.

In order to do something for the children of Flint and other families, we need help from my Republican colleagues. Despite harsh words from several Members of the Republican caucus who have no interest in resolving the crisis in Flint, some Republicans are willing to help. For example, the senior Senator from Oklahoma has been working with Senator STABENOW all weekend to put together an aid package that includes immediate funding for the people of Flint. Now we are once again waiting on Republicans to step forward and to support the chair of the Environment and Public Works Committee. It is incumbent upon the Republican majority to get to "yes" to

help the people of Flint end this man-made emergency that is simply beyond their control.

All Americans deserve safe, clean drinking water, not just some of them. I hope my Republican colleagues will choose to help us to pass legislation to resolve this crisis, sending emergency funds to the people of Flint now.

Mr. President, would the Chair 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, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The assistant Democratic leader.

NATIONAL SECURITY SATELLITE LAUNCHES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to address an issue of vital importance to America's national security. It is the issue of reliable rocket launches—launches which the Department of Defense and the national intelligence agencies count on on a regular basis to launch satellites to keep America safe.

There is a separate area of launches with NASA involving the civilian side, but this morning I want to focus primarily on the Department of Defense rocket launches.

We made a decision about 10 years ago that was wrong. Two companies that were competing at that time, Boeing and Lockheed, came forward to the Federal Government and said: We have a plan. Instead of our companies competing, we will join together. We will become one company—Boeing and Lockheed—for this purpose, under the term United Launch Alliance. They argued, convincingly at the time, that this was the best way to come up with affordable, reliable launches. Well, that was true for half of the projection. They were reliable.

In the last 10 years, the United Launch Alliance has been a reliable partner with the Department of Defense in launching satellites and other things into space which are critical for our national security. But, unfortunately, because they became a monopoly, with no competition, they became increasingly more expensive and we had no place to turn.

Recently, there have been new entries in this market in terms of launching satellites. One of the most promising is SpaceX. SpaceX, from its infancy, has matured into a company that could play an important role in the future of satellite launches in the United States. I noted this fact, and as chairman of the Appropriations Sub-

committee on Defense, I did something that doesn't happen around here very often. I had a hearing scheduled and brought together the CEOs of United Launch Alliance, the traditional partner of the Department of Defense in launching satellites, and this new company, SpaceX. I invited the CEOs from both companies to sit at the same table and to answer questions from the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. Then, at the end of the hearing, I did something that I thought might be positive and constructive. I said to each CEO: I would like each of you to write 10 questions that should be in the record answered by your partner at the table there. If we haven't covered everything to give a fair exposition of where this issue stands today, now is your chance.

That was in January 2014. It was the first time anybody had brought together two potentially competing companies and let them plead their case before the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. But I felt this was the best way to give SpaceX a chance to tell its story as a new entrant into this competition and for ULA to defend its position.

We then decided there was another element that was important. United Launch Alliance has several engines that can take a satellite into space. The most economical one is built by the Russians, the RD-180. I happen to believe that it is not in our best security interest to be dependent on the Russians to supply us with a rocket engine for vital satellites to be launched into space. So I started pushing in the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense to put money into a competition for an American-made, American-built rocket engine to replace the Russian RD-180. For 2 successive years we have appropriated more money for this competition than the defense authorizing committee.

It turns out that we are on the right track, but the timing is challenging. What we have been told is that replacing the Russian engine with an American-made engine will take up to 5 years. Who is the source of that statement? The Secretary of the Air Force. So the obvious question is, If we can't cut off the Russian engine today without jeopardizing our national security, what should we do? We decided in the current appropriations bill to extend the authority to the Department of Defense to take bids on rockets launched by the Russian engine from ULA through this fiscal year. I thought this was a prudent thing to do—to wean ourselves from dependence on Russian-made engines—but to do it in a thoughtful, sensible way that gave the Department of Defense some options. This request, incidentally, for options and flexibility came not just from the Secretary of the Air Force, but it came from the Director of National Intelligence as well as the Secretary of Defense. They said they needed these options to keep America safe.

That was the state of play until the senior Senator from Arizona decided he was going to come to the floor repeatedly and challenge this conclusion by the Appropriations subcommittee, then leading to an op-ed which he published yesterday in the Wall Street Journal. I come to the floor this morning to address that op-ed by the senior Senator from Arizona. It is titled: "Congress's Cynical Crony-Capital Gift to Putin."

The senior Senator from Arizona referenced me by name in this article, as he has repeatedly on the floor of the Senate, though many would argue that violates the Senate rules. Notwithstanding that personal aspect of this, I want to address the issue that is before us.

Why does the senior Senator from Arizona continue to single me out personally? It is because I happen to agree with the Secretary of Defense, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Secretary of the Air Force about a vital, important national security issue. The senior Senator from Arizona disagrees with them.

The issue is deadly serious, despite the name-calling by my colleague. It is about competition for launching defense satellites into space. Here are the facts. One company, United Launch Alliance, or ULA, held a monopoly for nearly 10 years. The cost of launches rose out of control. Today, there is finally an opportunity for competition. A new company I mentioned earlier, SpaceX, has entered space launch. They are challenging ULA. As I said earlier, in January 2014, I recognized this option—this possibility, this opportunity—and held a hearing with the CEOs of both companies testifying under oath. The result of this competition is that costs are dropping, exactly what we wanted to achieve, and the taxpayer is beginning to see savings. However, as I mentioned earlier, the ULA rocket most often uses a Russian-built rocket engine, the RD-180. After the Russian invasion of Crimea and eastern Ukraine, the Department of Defense and Congress agreed it was time for us to phase out any dependence on this Russian-made engine and to make an American product as soon as possible. I couldn't agree with that more.

Developing and testing a new, American-made rocket takes time—more time than I imagined. The Secretary of the Air Force, testifying before the committee of the senior Senator from Arizona, estimated that it would take to at least 2021 or 2022 until there was an American-made rocket engine that can replace the Russian engine that is being used today. However, the senior Senator from Arizona doesn't want to wait that long to replace the Russian engine. In his Wall Street Journal diatribe, he writes that "we don't need to buy any more." And he is apparently considering a total ban on the Department of Defense using these Russian engines, despite the fact that we have received, in writing, from the Secretary of Defense and the Director of

National Intelligence a warning that doing this would in fact create a gap which could endanger our national security.

In May 2015, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence wrote to the chairman of the defense authorization committee, and they shared his goal of replacing this Russian engine. But they warned the senior Senator from Arizona that if he followed his own plan, it could harm U.S. national security. They were alarmed, in this letter, of the proposed cutoff of access to Russian engines before an American replacement was ready. Secretary Carter and Director Clapper do not want to trade one launch monopoly, ULA, for another launch monopoly, SpaceX. They are encouraging and standing for competition. They want to keep them competing so they can have lower costs and options if one of the companies, for whatever reason, is unable to meet its obligations.

Also, our defense and intelligence satellites must not be dependent on one type of rocket. A SpaceX launch failed last summer, and it took 6 months before they could return to launches. With only one supplier of rockets, a crash could stop vital satellite launches for months, endangering America's national security.

The senior Senator from Arizona ignored the arguments being made by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence. After all, it is hard for a Senator to argue with the senior national security leader, Secretary Carter, whose doctorate is in theoretical physics, and it would be unconscionable to call our Nation's highest intelligence official—a former Air Force pilot and career civil servant—a “Putin crony.”

But I take warnings from our top national security experts seriously. My Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense has been working to address these issues the right way, the safe way. Rather than attack fellow Senators in the press, the senior Senator from Arizona should face the facts.

When the Defense appropriations bill was marked up in June of 2015, the bill included a bipartisan provision to allow the Department of Defense to conduct full and open competitions for rocket launches for 1 year. An amendment was offered by the Republican senior Senator from the State of South Carolina to strike that provision. But after a full debate, he withdrew his amendment when it was clear there was bipartisan support for the bill. The provision was modified in conference, but the effect of the provision remains the same—to make sure that the Department of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence have some answer to their concerns about a launch monopoly.

The senior Senator from Arizona has proposed another solution—that ULA offer another rocket called the Delta IV, which, of course, is not a Russian

engine. According to the Pentagon's top weapons buyer and ULA, each of those rockets endorsed by the senior Senator from Arizona costs about 30 percent more than the Atlas rockets with Russian engines. So if that figure is correct, the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona requires American taxpayers to pay approximately \$1 billion more in launch costs over the next 6 years. This Senator, who comes to the floor frequently telling us that he is such a budget hawk, is proposing a plan that will cost us at least \$1 billion more over the next 6 years. That figure could be higher. His plan could triple the cost of launches for some satellites that are too heavy to be launched on a single rocket.

Under the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona, the taxpayers would foot the bill for a new government-created monopoly. It is in fact a \$1 billion windfall and gift to one defense contractor in California if we follow the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona, and it would also put our national security at risk if there is a technical failure.

If spending \$1 billion of taxpayers' money to increase the risk that the United States won't be able to launch a satellite to keep track of Russia sounds like a counterproductive and questionable idea, you would be right. Last year, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said many times that the Defense authorization bill isn't a budget bill. Now, as vice chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—the subcommittee that has to make the math work—I can say that spending an extra \$1 billion at this moment in the history of the Department of Defense doesn't make sense.

There is another aspect to this. I don't know if the senior Senator from Arizona is going to look into it or attack it as well. When it comes to supplying the space station, we are reliant on Russian-made engines. If the senior Senator from Arizona wants to cut off access of NASA to these Russian-made engines, it will be a dangerous proposal. There are a variety of NASA missions ahead that rely on this Atlas rocket. These include multiple resupply missions to the International Space Station, a mission to take samples from a nearby asteroid, a new Mars lander, a probe to study the sun, and several weather satellites.

If there is the will to ignore the national security concerns of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence about access to space for national security, we had best take care. The senior Senator from Arizona will now say that supplying the space station is somehow a sellout to Vladimir Putin.

We have appropriated \$448 million to develop all-American engines, which is more than the Armed Services Committee has authorized. In a few years, we will have real competition for space launches that will help lower costs for a long time to come—but only if we lis-

ten to our top defense and intelligence leaders, who favor a responsible transition to the next rocket in the interest of national security and oppose the plans put forward by the senior Senator from Arizona.

One aspect of this article in the Wall Street Journal that troubles me the most is the suggestion that I take lightly the adventurism of Vladimir Putin and his bloody invasion of Ukraine. I am proud to be the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus with Senator PORTMAN of Ohio. We have a large Ukrainian population in my State. I have spoken to them many times, and I have visited Ukraine many times to make it clear that I detest what Putin has done in invading their country and threatening their sovereignty. The irony is the senior Senator from Arizona personally invited me to accompany him to Ukraine, where we both protested Putin's actions. To suggest my position on these rocket engines is somehow a give-in to Putin is shameful and wrong. I think my statements—public and otherwise—have made it clear.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning at 11 a.m., the President released the budget, his final budget for his Presidency. Unfortunately, rather than something that sends a signal that he wants to work with Congress, it is basically more of the same—a \$4 trillion budget that is unserious, partisan, and contains reckless spending. In it, he does include several new proposals, proposals he knows will be dead on arrival here in the U.S. Congress.

From my perspective, coming from an energy State, one pretty astounding measure he suggested was putting a \$10 tax on each barrel of oil. What that would do is translate into 25 cents a gallon more for consumers at the pump. How in the world would that help American families who are suffering as a result of stagnant wages due to slow economic growth in this country as well as additional costs, such as ObamaCare, that have been imposed upon them by the administration? The simple fact is that it doesn't help the average American family get by. It is the opposite.

At a time when our country is producing more energy domestically than it ever has and just beginning to export that energy to our friends and allies around the world, the President's budget reveals that he has little interest in growing our energy independence and little interest in jump-starting our economy.

All he has to do is look at Texas, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and other places to see how our domestic energy production has helped create thousands of jobs and helped grow the economy. Instead, the President makes these job-

killing proposals, which will further burden hard-working American families, along with the tepid growth that we have seen here in our own economy—0.7 percent just this last quarter. The President's budget adds further insult to injury by adding to our national debt, which is already \$19 trillion.

Somebody is going to have to pay that back. In the meantime, what we will have to do is pay interest on that debt, which will continue to crowd out spending in other areas like national security where there is a national consensus. This is the number one priority for the American people.

Strangely, but unfortunately predictably, rather than deciding to work with Congress and to listen to the concerns that are raised by those hard-working American families, President Obama went ahead and submitted a budget with no apparent interest in finding any kind of common ground. It is a sad testament to his go-it-alone legacy, which has been more ideological than actually solution oriented.

We are here to try to solve problems, and the only way we do that is by working together to find consensus where we can. Understanding that there are people who serve in the Senate and the House from different points of view all across the ideological spectrum, it is only by working together—and that includes not just Congress but the President, too—that we can actually begin to help grow the economy to help create jobs, to help make America more secure.

Given the fact that the President has decided to take the tack he has, I hope that Congress will lead the charge against this request for irresponsible spending and try to help get our economy back on track, to begin the process of reducing our debt and strengthening the hand of the American family.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, I wish to spend a few minutes talking about a very important hearing that we will be having tomorrow in the Senate Judiciary Committee, something that I feel very passionately about, and that is finding a way forward on mental health reform. As shocking as it is, our jails and our streets have become places where people suffering from mental illness basically are left without treatment and without recourse.

Tomorrow I will have the honor of chairing that hearing where we will discuss the intersection of our mental health system such as it is and our criminal justice system, and hopefully we will be able to find a way forward to push toward real reform. The goal of the hearing is to better understand how to bring help and support for those who struggle with mental illness.

This is an area where we can and we must do better. Too often, after the fact, we find out that families faced with the choice of allowing their loved

ones' mental health to continue deteriorating, letting their illness spiral out of control until they become a danger to themselves or others—there are very few choices available to families whose loved ones are becoming more and more ill. True, they could go to court and seek a court order, seeking a temporary commitment to a mental institution, but that frequently exacerbates frayed relations among family members, and it stigmatizes the individual who is suffering from mental illness issues.

We need to give those families more and better choices on how to deal with their loved ones, hopefully to keep them from becoming a danger to themselves and to the community. Thanks to the marvels of modern medicine, for many people suffering from mental illness, if they will just follow doctors' orders and take the medication that has been prescribed for them—frequently under some doctor's supervision—many of them can get much better and become more productive in society.

One of our witnesses tomorrow will be Pete Earley who wrote a book called "Crazy." He is not talking about a person. He is talking about our so-called system of mental health treatment. Pete Earley wrote this book because, as an accomplished journalist and writer, he knew of no other way than to write about the issue to help his very own son who had encounter after encounter with the criminal justice system because he had untreated mental illness.

Sadly, the failure to adequately address mental health in the United States has led to a drastic increase in the number of mentally ill individuals being locked up in prisons and jails, still without adequate treatment. I don't think anyone would support the idea of turning our prisons and our jails into warehouses for the mentally ill, but that is what has happened by default.

We need to provide better choices to law enforcement officials, to families, and to the individuals who suffer from mental illness. So often many of them will self-medicate with drugs and alcohol, compounding their problems, creating more and more of this turnstile effect within the criminal justice system where no one ever gets better and the illness never gets treated.

As criminologists and mental health experts will tell you, locking up people with mental illness without treatment will make them only more dangerous and increase the risk of crisis, but unfortunately this is an all-too-common practice across our country.

This is a shocking number to me when I read it, but one estimate suggests there are as many as 400,000 current inmates in our prisons across America who suffer from some form of mental illness. That is because, at least in part, the United States has witnessed a rapid decline in psychiatric and mental health hospitals over the

past decades. The idea was that you couldn't institutionalize people so you had to let them out. Unfortunately, just letting them out without finding a way forward to help them deal with their mental illness resulted in many of them becoming homeless, living on our streets or in our jails and our prisons when they commit petty crimes such as trespassing and the like.

Since 1960, more than 90 percent of State psychiatric beds have been eliminated—90 percent. But prison is a poor and often very harmful replacement for a treatment facility. Our goal in the hearing tomorrow is to work toward another solution, one that would give families greater flexibility, including actual treatment options for the people they love.

A bill I introduced, the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act, offers one proven approach to treating mental illness. It borrows from a successful model of reform, put into place in my hometown in Bexar County, TX, more than a decade ago.

Let me say a word about borrowing from these successful local and State models as opposed to imposing a one-size-fits-all approach at the national level, not knowing whether it would actually work in this big and diverse country we live in. I believe that taking successful examples of best practices at the local and State level—those are the best subject matter for us to look at in terms of scaling these up on a national level where appropriate.

The Bexar County sheriff, Susan Pamerleau, a champion of mental health reform in San Antonio, will testify tomorrow about the San Antonio story. Bexar County's mental health program focuses on treatment of the mentally ill instead of just putting them behind bars and leaving them untreated. The results have been very impressive.

These reforms have reduced the size of our overcrowded jails, which has been a perennial problem. It has saved tax dollars, and it has improved the lives of people who otherwise would be put behind bars and left to their own devices.

I look forward to hearing from Sheriff Pamerleau tomorrow. I bet other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and anyone else who cares to listen will learn a lot about how we can bring these reforms to the rest of the country.

Another part of this is to help equip law enforcement, teachers, judges, and people who work in the courts with the knowledge and skill set they need to spot mental illness early on. Wouldn't it be more helpful if teachers, parents, and counselors were empowered to help identify people who need help early on in school? Doesn't it make sense to train our law enforcement officials how to deal with a person suffering from a mental health crisis? Do you slap the cuffs on them? Do you get engaged in a violent confrontation? Or do you try to deescalate the incident in a way that is

safer for the law enforcement official as well as the person being confronted?

There are better ways for us to respond effectively at the early signs and help to train the people who are in the best position to identify people who need help early on. This legislation includes specialized training for those on the frontlines, such as law enforcement and judicial officials, so they are ready to respond and can react swiftly and safely should a mental health crisis erupt.

The truth is that this is a difficult issue and one that raises hard questions. But I am grateful to Chairman GRASSLEY of the Senate Judiciary Committee for not shying away from this topic but embracing it and having witnesses such as those we will have tomorrow who I think will open the eyes of many people to something they perhaps don't encounter in their daily lives because they don't go to our jails or our prisons or they don't have a loved one who suffers from mental illness. I think this will open a lot of eyes, and it will help us continue the conversation so we can find some common ground and work toward real solutions.

Reform is long overdue. All you need to do is visit our jails, as I have done in Harris County, Bexar County, and Dallas County, to see that too often our jails are occupied by people who—yes, they may have committed petty crimes, nonviolent crimes, but they really need some help. If we give them the help, they can turn their lives around and become more productive.

It will save taxpayers money, and I think it will be a much more humane and efficient system of dealing with people suffering with a mental health crisis. I am hopeful we can advance substantive legislation to help those struggling with mental illness and their families and, as a result, make our communities safer.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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

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

NORTH KOREA SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT BILL

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the bill that will be coming before the Senate this week, the North Korea Sanctions Enforcement Act, which seeks to curb North Korea's unacceptable behavior through the implementation of targeted sanctions.

On January 6 of this year, North Korea tested a nuclear weapon in open violation of numerous U.N. resolutions. This is the fourth time North Korea has conducted a nuclear weapons test, and it is estimated the country may

have as many as 20 nuclear warheads in its arsenal.

Just this past weekend, while many Americans were getting ready to watch the Super Bowl, North Korea conducted a missile test, putting a satellite into orbit. This missile test, which has already been condemned by the U.N. Security Council, served as a demonstration of the threat posed by North Korea's long-range missile program. In fact, just a few hours later, the satellite launched by the North Korean missile passed over the site of the Super Bowl in Santa Clara, CA.

If equipped with a nuclear warhead, a missile similar to the one launched this weekend could potentially threaten the United States and our allies, and North Korea is actively seeking to market this same missile technology, as well as its nuclear weapons technology, to other rogue regimes.

North Korea's history of aggressive behavior is already well known and well documented. In March of 2010, a North Korean torpedo sank the South Korean naval vessel *Cheonan*, killing 46 sailors. In November of 2010, North Korea fired artillery on the island of Yeonpyeong, killing two soldiers and injuring an additional 15 soldiers and 2 civilians.

North Korea's dictator Kim Jong Un continues to spout threats against the United States and our allies. This past year, when South Korean citizens sent leaflets with unfiltered information into North Korea, the regime responded with threats to turn the whole of South Korea into a "sea of fire." After the January nuclear test, a North Korean spokesman said: "North Korean scientists are in high spirits." The statement went on to claim that North Korea detonated an H-bomb, which we now know to be untrue, and added that the bomb was "capable of wiping out the whole territory of the U.S. all at once." These threats are so common now that they barely make the news.

North Korea is not only a threat to the United States, it is also a threat to its own people. It is estimated that 150,000 to 200,000 North Koreans are imprisoned in concentration camps. We can confirm the existence of these camps from satellite photographs and firsthand accounts. These are not camps for what we would consider criminals but for individuals deemed disloyal to the regime. The "crime" of a single family member—which can be something as simple as accidentally tarnishing the photo of a member of North Korea's hereditary dictatorship—can lead to an entire North Korean family being sent away to a labor camp.

The brutality of these camps has been confirmed by those who have made it out. To date, more than 28,000 North Korean defectors have escaped and made it to South Korea. Tens of thousands more are still in China, often working as cheap laborers who become victims of human trafficking.

The stories of those who have escaped Kim Jong Un's regime carry a

common theme: starvation, imprisonment, torture, and the execution of family members. And this is everyday life for the people of North Korea.

The bill we are considering this week seeks to curb North Korea's aggressive behavior through the use of targeted sanctions. The bill restricts access to financial resources and raw materials that North Korea uses to support its nuclear weapons program and operate its political prison and forced labor camps. It levels mandatory sanctions against individuals who contribute to North Korea's ballistic missile development and targets luxury goods the regime uses to maintain the loyalty of party elites. It also puts in place sanctions against any entity determined to be enabling North Korea's ability to censor information, as well as those engaged in money laundering, narcotics trafficking, and counterfeiting. The bill also includes discretionary sanctions that the U.S. President could use to target entities assisting North Korea in misappropriating funds for the benefit of North Korean officials. The President would have to justify any waivers of these sanctions on a case-by-case basis. The bill also codifies into law the Presidential Executive orders issued in 2015 following the cyber attack on Sony Pictures.

This is a multifaceted bill designed to target North Korea's weapons programs, human rights abuses, and the finances of government elites. And it will do so with minimal impact on the lives of everyday North Koreans who continue to suffer at the hands of their own government.

Last week I introduced legislation addressing another threat posed by North Korea. As I stated before, North Korea is actively seeking to market its nuclear weapons technology to other rogue regimes. In fact, the Syrian nuclear reactor destroyed in 2007 is based on a North Korean design. My bill would ensure that North Korea can't sell its technology to another rogue regime—Iran.

Although President Obama's nuclear deal seeks to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, many of us remain skeptical. And with the North Korean regime strapped for cash, its nuclear weapons and missile technology are some of the few commodities it can offer, and it actively tries to market them to other rogue regimes.

My bill seeks to prevent Iran from becoming a potential customer for North Korea's nuclear weapons technology. Under my legislation, if Iran attempts to acquire nuclear weapons technology from North Korea, all sanctions waived or suspended as a result of the President's nuclear deal would be reinstated immediately. A nuclear armed Iran is unacceptable.

Regardless of what the President claims his Iran nuclear deal has achieved, we must remain vigilant and ensure that Iran keeps its end of the agreement and does not go after a nuclear weapon.

I am glad the Senate is addressing the threat posed by North Korea. A similar version of the North Korea sanctions bill that we are addressing this week recently passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 418 to 2. I hope we will see similar bipartisan support for the bill here in the Senate. We should not compromise the national security of the United States with disputes between our political parties. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle feel the same and will join me in moving this bill forward.

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

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

BUDGET REFORM

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, today the President of the United States unveiled the last budget of his Presidency: \$4.1 trillion. Of that, \$1.1 trillion is discretionary spending, which is the amount Congress will discuss over the next few months.

It is no big secret that Presidential budgets typically are dead on arrival—this one especially so, obviously, as it is the last one of the President's term. It is a requirement of the 1974 Budget Act. The President turns in his budget by the first Monday of February. It is actually now into the second week. It is a week late, but it is closer to on time than the budgets of other Presidents have been in the last few years.

There are a lot of wish list items in the President's budget. It also includes about \$3.4 trillion in new taxes over the next 10 years. It increases spending by \$2.5 trillion over the next 10 years, including next year. The challenge in the President's spending plan is that he increases spending so much that we also continue to increase the deficit, the debt, and our interest payments.

This body should realize that on the current track, the Congressional Budget Office and the President's budget that he released today forecast that within the next 10 years, the United States of America will spend more on interest on our debt than we spend on national defense. I want everyone to soak that in. Within 10 years, the Federal taxpayer will spend more on interest on our debt—our debt payments—than we spend on national defense.

When the President came into office, there was \$10.6 trillion in total debt. The President's budget lays out a plan that by the end of his budget, there will be \$27.4 trillion in total debt. This is an issue for us, and it continues to accelerate. And until this body and until the House and until the White House agree this is a problem, it will not be solved.

I don't want to say this flippantly; the President and I have had this conversation. He does not believe that increasing deficits—that is, overspending what we bring in—is a problem. He believes, as he has shared with me and with the American people publicly, that if the government overspends a little bit, that stimulates the economy. Well, that might be true in some economic formula, but when our interest payments are larger than total what we spend for defense, we are in a spiral that we cannot sustain.

We cannot keep saying we will add more debt every year and there is no reckoning for that. Our total debt right now exceeds our gross domestic product. Literally, if we took from every single American in the entire country all of their income for the entire year we could not pay off our debt.

We are very much at a tipping point. The problem Congress faces is Congress never seems to act until we have to, and, in this time, in an economic crisis, when we have to, it is too late. How do we get on top of that? How do we stop bragging about how much the deficit has been cut and actually start reducing our debt? Many Americans don't hear the difference between the debt and the deficit because they don't live in this world of all of these different terms. Deficit is how much we overspend in any one year; debt is the accumulation of all of those deficits.

Washington continues to talk about how in the last 6 years we have cut the deficit by \$1 trillion. And that is a good thing, but the problem is that in the last 10 years, the debt has also doubled as deficits are still so large every single year, and that is a problem.

So what do we do with this? I would say there are multiple things. No. 1, we are not going to get out of this in any one time period. This body needs to understand that this is not a car payment we are paying off. This is a really big jumbo mortgage. We are not going to pay this off in 1 year, and we are not going to fix it in one stroke. This is going to take multiple years of picking away at this.

I have reminded several of my colleagues of one sobering fact: If we were to balance our budget and set this 10-year time period to actually balance the budget, if the next year after the balanced budget we had a \$50 billion surplus as a nation, it would take 460 years in a row of \$50 billion surpluses to pay off our debt. For twice as long as we have been a country, if we had a \$50 billion surplus every year, we could pay off our debt. At some point we have to admit this is a really big issue.

CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, as all of us know in this room, continues to rattle us and remind us that this debt is continuing to grow and we do not have the resources to do it. For the first time since 2009, our deficit will rise again next year to \$544 billion. That is up 24 percent from just this last fiscal year. As we continue to have more individuals who retire and

use Medicare and Social Security, which they have set aside their entire life to go into, and as that number continues to rise and as discretionary spending continues to stay fairly capped, we are not getting on top of the big issues that we face.

Where do we go from here? In 1974 this Congress created the Congressional Budget Act, which set up the process of how we would actually do our budget every year. It is a very interesting process with the House and Senate passing budgets, putting them together, going through the process and getting everything to the President. All the timing and everything was set up with appropriations bills and how they would be done with all the deadlines. Interestingly, since 1979, the Congressional Budget Act, in the way that it was set up, has only worked two times—twice since 1979. Would anyone else admit that there is a problem with that setup? Coming out of Watergate in 1974, they wanted more transparency and an open process doing the budget. So they created this process that is so cumbersome that since 1979 it has only worked twice.

To give more up-to-date details, in the last 10 years we should have passed 118 appropriations bills. Of the 118 appropriations bills, only 7 of those individual bills were passed on time. We have a problem just in basic process.

So allow this Senator to just throw out a few ideas to recommend to this body that we consider. If we are going to fix our debt and deficit, we have to look at the process of executing our budget to fix it.

Here are a few thoughts. A biennial budget—if we don't do a budget every year, we should do a budget every 2 years. We are dealing with trillions of dollars. We should do a little bit of advanced planning. We should be able to do that at least 2 years in advance to be able to lay out how we are actually going to do the spending. We could do appropriations every single year to be able to provide the accountability, but at least the major budget process we should do every 2 years.

We should get rid of the budget gimmicks that dominate this body in how we "balance our budget." Budget gimmicks such as pension smoothing, corporate timing shifts, and all of our favorites—CHIMPS, or changes in mandatory programs, which everyone outside of this city thinks is a monkey, and everyone inside this city knows it is a great budgeting technique.

Here is how some of these work. Here is an example from October's budget agreement. A pension payment acceleration in section 502 changed the due date for pension premiums from October 15, 2025, to September 15, 2025, in order to get \$2.3 billion into the ten-year window. Now what just changed there? They moved the payment time 30 days forward and so that is when it is due. Since they moved it 30 days forward 10 years from now, suddenly that is another \$2 billion into the Federal

budget. If our Federal budget was not 10 years, but 10 years and 2 weeks, it would have been \$2 billion short. Because they moved the payment over a month and made it earlier, suddenly the budget picked up \$2 billion. It is not real. It is a gimmick.

There are the changes in mandatory programs that go out, such as the Crime Victims Fund. That is a fund of money that is expected to be spent, but should we actually not spend part of it, they will say: Great, we can take that part we were “expected to spend” and actually spend it this year. Then guess what; next year you spend it again, and next year you spend it again. It is a gimmick. That should be struck. We shouldn’t have gimmicks like that. Those things make Congress look good but don’t actually deal with our deficit and debt. There are rules that are internal that need to be fixed. We need to get real numbers and be able to have agreeable real numbers.

Right now there is a big argument all the time saying: How does the budget balance against the President’s budget—this particular baseline and that particular baseline? How about this: We have a lot of programs that have not been authorized—some of them for more than a decade—though we continue to allocate money for them every single year. Authorizing programs as we do for national defense every single year is important, and we should actually do the work with that to be able to bring bills to the floor and to be able to get it done.

We have reports from the GAO and from the IG that come out every year showing waste, yet many of those no one ever acts on. Three folks I see on the floor right now—Senator FLAKE and Senator MCCAIN from Arizona and my office—have all put out waste reports in the past 5 months detailing billions of dollars in waste. We can identify these areas, and the inspector general’s office and the GAO can identify these areas. We need to set a process in place to actually solve those issues. Then we can do more than talk about it. We can move it from just a messaging moment to solutions on our debt and our deficit.

I recommend a measure such as the Government Shutdown Prevention Act that says we don’t have a government shutdown. I understand some are very romantic about government shutdowns and what they would accomplish. Government shutdowns always cost more money for the taxpayer than they save. They cost a tremendous amount of turmoil in the Federal workforce and multiple places.

There is an easier way for us to handle this. Congress only acts when we have to. When we have a government shutdown, we suddenly have to act. How about if we do something simple and straightforward, and we put in place something that at the end of the budget year, if we do not have a budget in place and do not have proper appropriations done, we have a short-term

continuing resolution for 30 days that automatically puts into place in all legislative offices and the Executive Office of the White House a funding haircut to create the incentive that we need to act? If 30 days later we still don’t have the appropriations done, the Executive Office of the White House, the House, and the Senate get another haircut, and we continue to press. There are ways that we can add pressure to ourselves that won’t actually damage what is happening in the rest of the Nation.

Why don’t we pass a balanced budget amendment, which we have talked about forever and which we voted on in 2011 and has not come up again? We will never get to some of these measures until Congress is compelled to do the right thing. Let’s put some processes in place beginning with our budget process, with real reform in how we do the budget and real structural changes to actually push this body to do what everyone outside of this body says needs to be done.

In the days ahead when we are spending more on interest than we are on national defense, this body should hang its head in shame. But before that occurs, we should fix it so that never happens and we get on top of our debt and deficit with a straightforward process that actually gets us back to work.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate in morning business and be allowed to complete my remarks, which won’t be too long.

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

WATERBOARDING

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today is the 100th New Hampshire Presidential primary. Regardless of who wins, this is a celebration of our vibrant democracy of engaged citizens putting candidates to the test and demanding answers on the tough issues the next President will confront.

It is also another important step in choosing our next Commander in Chief, and the stakes couldn’t be higher. As we heard from the Director of National Intelligence this morning, the threats to our Nation are growing more diverse, more complex, and more dangerous. More than ever we need a Commander in Chief with a clear vision, a steady hand, sound judgment and confidence—not only in our Nation’s power but in the values and ideals that generations of American heroes have fought for and died defending.

That is why it has been so disappointing to see some Presidential candidates engaged in loose talk on the campaign trail about reviving waterboarding and other inhumane interrogation techniques. It might be easy to dismiss this bluster as cheap campaign rhetoric, but these state-

ments must not go unanswered because they mislead the American people about the realities of interrogation, how to gather intelligence, what it takes to defend our security, and at the most fundamental level, what we are fighting for as a nation and what kind of a nation we are.

It is important to remember the fact that these forms of torture not only failed their purpose to secure actionable intelligence to prevent further attacks on the United States and our allies, but they compromised our values, stained our national honor, and did little practical good. While some have shamefully sought to minimize the practice of waterboarding, it is clear to me that this practice, which is a simulated execution by drowning, amounts to torture as any reasonable person would define it and how the Geneva Conventions on the treatment of prisoners of war, of which we are signatories, define it.

The use of these methods by the United States was shameful and unnecessary because the United States has tried, convicted, and executed foreign combatants who employed methods of torture, including waterboarding, against American prisoners of war. Following World War II, Japanese generals were tried, convicted, and hung. One of the charges against them was that they practiced waterboarding. Contrary to assertions made by some of the defenders, it provided little useful intelligence to help us track down the perpetrators of the September 11 attacks or to prevent new attacks and atrocities.

This Senator knows from personal experience that the abuse of prisoners will produce more bad than good intelligence. I know that victims of torture will offer intentionally misleading information if they think their captors will believe it. I know they will say whatever they think their torturers will want them to say if they believe it will stop their suffering. Most of all, I know that the use of torture compromises that which most distinguishes us from our enemies—our belief that all people, even captured enemies, possess basic human rights that are protected by international conventions the United States not only joined but for the most part authored.

I understand that in the aftermath of the worst terrorist attacks on our homeland, those who approved harsh interrogation methods and those who used them were sincerely dedicated to securing justice for the victims of terrorist attacks and protecting Americans from further harm. I know that in the aftermath of the terrorist attacks in Paris and San Bernardino, many Americans feel again the grave urgency that we felt 15 years ago. But I dispute wholeheartedly that it was right for our Nation to use these interrogation methods then or that it is right for our Nation to use them now.

Waterboarding, as well as any other form of torture, is not in the best interest of justice, security or the ideals

we have sacrificed so much blood and treasure to defend.

It is the knowledge of torture's dubious efficacy and the strong moral objections to the abuse of prisoners that have forged broad bipartisan agreement on this issue. Last year, the Senate passed in an overwhelming vote of 91 to 3 the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016, legislation that took a historic step forward to ban torture once and for all by limiting U.S. Government interrogation techniques to those in the Army Field Manual. That vote was 91 to 3. There was debate and discussion about it in the Armed Services Committee and on the floor of this Senate. The vote was 91 to 3.

Now candidates are saying they will disregard the law. I thought that was our complaint—Republicans' complaint—with the present President of the United States.

The U.S. military has successfully interrogated more foreign terrorist detainees than any other agency of our government. The Army Field Manual, in its current form, has worked for the U.S. military—including on high-value terrorist detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere—and it reflects current best thinking and practices on interrogation.

Moreover, the Army Field Manual embodies the values Americans have embraced for generations, preserving the ability of our interrogators to extract critical intelligence from our adversaries while recognizing that torture and cruel treatment are ineffective interrogation methods.

Some of the Nation's most respected leaders from the U.S. military, CIA, and FBI supported this legislation, as well as numerous human rights organizations and faith groups, including the National Association of Evangelicals and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops.

GEN David Petraeus, a military leader whom I admire more than literally any living military leader, said he supported the use of the Army Field Manual because "our Nation has paid a high price in recent decades for the information gained by the use of techniques beyond those in the field manual—and, in my view, that price far outweighed the value of the information gained through the use of techniques beyond those in the manual." Obviously, that includes waterboarding.

Why don't we listen to people like GEN David Petraeus, who has had vast experience in Iraq and Afghanistan with detainees, the information we have gotten from them, and our practices. If General Petraeus were here, he would tell you the most effective method of gaining information is establishing a friendly relationship with the detainee.

Obviously, we need intelligence to defeat our enemies, but we need reliable intelligence. Torture produces more misleading information than ac-

tionable intelligence. What the advocates of harsh and cruel interrogation methods have never established is that we couldn't have gathered as good or more reliable intelligence from using humane methods. The most important lead we got in the search for bin Laden came from using conventional interrogation methods. I think it is an insult to many of the intelligence officers who have acquired good intelligence without hurting or degrading prisoners to assert that we cannot win this war on terrorism without such methods. Yes, we can and we will.

In the end, torture's failure to serve its intended purpose isn't the main reason to oppose its use. I have often said and will always maintain that this question isn't about our enemies, it is about us. It is about who we were, who we are, and whom we aspire to be. It is about how we represent ourselves to the world.

We have made our way in this often dangerous and cruel world, not by just strictly pursuing our geopolitical interests but by exemplifying our political values and influencing other nations to embrace them. When we fight to defend our security, we fight also for an idea that all men are endowed by their Creator with inalienable rights; that is, all men and women. How much safer the world would be if all nations believed the same. How much more dangerous it can become when we forget it ourselves, even momentarily, as we learned from Abu Ghraib. Our enemies act without conscience. We must not. It isn't necessary, and it isn't even helpful in winning this strange and long war we are fighting.

Our Nation needs a Commander in Chief who understands and affirms this basic truth. Our Nation needs a Commander in Chief who will make clear to those who fight on our behalf that they are defending this sacred ideal and that sacrificing our national honor and our respect for human dignity will make it harder, not easier, to prevail in this war. Our Nation needs a Commander in Chief who reminds us that in the worst of times, through the chaos and terror of war, when facing cruelty, suffering, and loss, that we are always Americans—different, stronger, and better than those who would destroy us.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:36 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Scot Alan Marciel, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Maryland

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator so modify his request?

Mr. COTTON. I do modify my request.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise today in support not only of the nomination of Scot Marciel to be our Ambassador to Burma but to celebrate the remarkable change Burma is undergoing.

I recently traveled to Burma, leading a congressional delegation hosted by our Embassy there, Ambassador Derek Mitchell, and Deputy Chief of Mission Kristen Bauer.

Burma has undergone a remarkable transition. After 50 years of a brutal military dictatorship, Nobel Laureate Aung San Suu Kyi and her party won a landslide election in November. The military is still entrenched in power, but gradual change is occurring, in part thanks to U.S. policies. It is change we should continue to support.

Sitting at the intersection of China and India, Burma is a geostrategically critical country. Sitting, as it does, between the crossroads of Southeast Asia and the Middle East, it is critical to the War on Terror. Burma can be a potent trading partner because of its largely untapped natural resources and is a shining example of the strategic impact of U.S. moral leadership in the world.

Those elections were not the end of the work, though; they are only the beginning of the work. The military still has a deep role in the Constitution. The National League for Democracy needs to transition from an opposition party to a governing party. Burma must address its internal ethnic conflicts, and, like most countries, it needs to address corruption and economic reforms as well. Our mission team in Rangoon is working on all these matters and more. I know that

Ambassador Marciel looks forward to leading that team and continuing to strengthen the U.S.-Burma relationship.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to join Senator COTTON in urging our colleagues to vote for the confirmation of Scot Marciel to be Ambassador to Burma for the reasons Senator COTTON pointed out.

There are exciting things happening in Burma. It is a country in transition. We have seen some promise. There are still major challenges in that country. We clearly need a confirmed ambassador. It is important that the Senate act, and I am glad to see we will be acting in a few moments.

We couldn't have a more qualified person to take on the ambassadorship of Burma than Scot Marciel. He currently serves as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia and Pacific Affairs. I got to know him very well in that capacity in the last Congress when I chaired the subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations on East Asia and the Pacific. He is a career diplomat who has taken on some of the most challenging positions in Foreign Service, including being the Chief of Mission in Indonesia. He has devoted his life to these challenges. I know he will do an excellent job representing U.S. interests in Burma.

I urge our colleagues to support the nomination.

Mr. President, I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Marciel nomination?

Mr. MENENDEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 19 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Ernst	Merkley
Ayotte	Feinstein	Moran
Baldwin	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Murphy
Bennet	Franken	Murray
Blumenthal	Gardner	Nelson
Blunt	Gillibrand	Paul
Booker	Grassley	Perdue
Boozman	Hatch	Peters
Boxer	Heinrich	Portman
Brown	Heitkamp	Reed
Burr	Heller	Reid
Cantwell	Hirono	Roberts
Capito	Hoeven	Rounds
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Kaine	Sessions
Coats	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Coons	Lankford	Tester
Corker	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Udall
Crapo	Markey	Warner
Daines	McCain	Warren
Donnelly	McCaskey	Whitehouse
Durbin	McConnell	Wicker
Enzi	Menendez	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Cruz	Rubio	Toomey
Graham	Sanders	Vitter
Mikulski	Sasse	
Risch	Shaheen	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Under the previous order, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from South Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. 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.

Mr. THUNE. 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. MCCAIN. 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. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. MCCAIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2519

are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, 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. 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.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to simply say to Chairman GRASSLEY and the Judiciary Committee: Thank you for being willing this week to have a markup and to legislate and report out a bill with regard to the prescription drug and heroin epidemic we now face around our country. The legislation is called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA. It focuses on several areas. One is prevention and education to try to keep people from making the wrong decision and going down the road to addiction, but another is to encourage States and provide incentives to local governments and nonprofits to use evidence-based treatment and recovery that has been proven to work to try to deal with this epidemic.

Today we have unfortunately higher levels of death from drug overdoses than we do any other accidental cause of death—more than car accidents, for instance. In my own home State of Ohio, this has been true for the last couple of years. We lost over 2,400 Ohioans last year to drug overdoses. Part of the legislation also addresses this issue directly by providing our law enforcement and other first responders—firefighters, EMS—with Narcan, also known as naloxone, which is a miracle drug to bring people back if they overdose.

Finally, the legislation helps to get prescription drugs out of the hands of the wrong people. There has been overprescribing over the years, and so our legislation encourages getting these drugs off the bathroom shelves so they can't be used and having a drug-monitoring program to tell if someone has been prescribing these drugs. It would be national in scope, so if someone can't get prescription drugs in one location, they don't go across the State line to get them somewhere else. Sadly, these narcotic painkillers have caused a lot of the concern out there because sometimes they are given appropriately—maybe for pain—but they are overprescribed, and then someone uses them to the point that they become addicted and later turn to heroin because heroin is so much less expensive.

This is an issue that affects the whole country. In my own State, it

looks as if the per capita use in the rural areas is higher than it is anywhere else, including the inner city or our suburban areas. But no ZIP Code is immune from this; we are all affected by it. In Ohio, over the last week, there have been two incidents where people have overdosed while behind the wheel. In one just a couple of days ago, someone overdosed on heroin while his kids were in the backseat, and he had a bad crash. Luckily, the children were not injured badly. This continues to happen again and again. And of course much crime is being committed to pay for the habit.

This is an effort at the Federal Government level to work with State and local governments and with nonprofits to address this growing problem, the epidemic of prescription drugs and heroin abuse.

I encourage the Judiciary Committee to move swiftly with this legislation. There is a markup scheduled on Thursday so we can move this legislation to the floor of the Senate, get it to the House, and get it to the President for his signature.

There seems to be not only bipartisan but nonpartisan support for this legislation. In other words, this is not a political issue but something that affects us as fathers, mothers, brothers, and sons. I hope the Senate will take on this issue.

I was in Ohio yesterday meeting with some women who are recovering addicts, and they told me their stories. Many of them started on prescription drugs sometimes because of an accident. They talked to me about how the grip of addiction is so great that it requires real courage and real resilience to be able to come through it. We want those women and others to be able to live out their God-given abilities and not to be afflicted by this addiction, which is really a disease. This legislation we have before us is a step in the right direction.

I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it and to move it to the President so we can begin to help local communities, neighborhoods, and our States be able to address this growing problem.

I yield back my time, Mr. President. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG ADDICTION

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first, I say to my colleague from Ohio—Senator PORTMAN, who is a dear friend—that we all have it; you are right, it is nonpartisan. This has no home. This has affected every American family one way or another. There is not a person I know in my State or in the good State of Ohio that doesn't have a family member—immediate family, extended family—or close friend who hasn't been affected by legal prescription drug abuse. We are looking at a whole cultural change that needs to go on, and I am on the floor to share letters with you.

Senator PORTMAN, I am sure you are getting the same letters. I would encourage all our colleagues to read just one letter a week from a family whose lives have been changed. They have lost a husband, they have lost their childhood, or they have lost a dear family member. It has destroyed their family life as they knew it. They can't get a job—a first-time felony offense, and they are out of the workforce now.

If you talk to law enforcement, there is not a law enforcement agency in America today that will not tell you that 80 percent of their crimes are drug related. Theft, arson, robbery—whatever it may be, it is around drug abuse.

So I come to the floor to continue to share the story of millions of Americans—most importantly, of some of my very dear West Virginia family members—who have had this.

I applaud the good Senator from Ohio. All of us are working. This will go through a normal process, I hope. It will be an open amendment process, and we are all going to make a piece of legislation and maybe for the first time start changing the culture in America, starting right here in Washington, DC, with the Food and Drug Administration. I will talk about that too.

West Virginia has been hit the hardest per capita. Just this past year, 600 West Virginians have died—in a State with less than 2 million people. The American people are drowning under the weight of prescription opioid abuse. Nationally, more than 51 people die every day—in my State, Oklahoma, Ohio, all across this great Nation.

The FDA must get serious about the dangers—we have been speaking about this—of prescription drugs, and this will not be accomplished without a significant change in the culture. It starts with them.

Although the FDA announced that the agency will be taking steps in the right direction to address these problems, it is not enough and more needs to be done. Let me explain why. The FDA's No. 1 priority must be public health and well-being—nothing else. Yet time and again the FDA has stood in the way of efforts to address the opioid abuse epidemic and improve public health.

The FDA plays a critical role in the epidemic as the agency overseeing the approval. Let me make sure we understand. This starts with a prescription. A legally licensed company makes medicine for pain reduction, if you will, pain suppressant, an opiate, and then they bring that to the FDA, and the FDA goes through a process of evaluating it to see if it should go on the market. They go through an evaluation—or their committee, basically an oversight committee—and then they say this is a product that should be on the market or should not. Many times the FDA has gone against the advice of their own advisory committee.

These are things we have to protect the American public from. Why?

So last week they decided to slightly improve the agency's response to the

opioid epidemic. I am pleased at this small step, but let me tell you about this small step. They said that now they are going to be serious about the dangers of prescription drugs, and they said they are going to finally start listening—mind you, listening—to the advice of their advisory committee. Oh, that is wonderful; they are going to listen to them now. That means they haven't really been listening to them up until now, but they are going to start now.

What they don't tell you is they are not going to be required to take the recommendation of their experts. A perfect example is Zohydro. It took us 3 years to get all opiates—Vicodin and Lortab, which are the most prescribed pain relievers and pain pills in the country—3 years to get the FDA to change that from a schedule III to a schedule II, even after I went personally, when I was first in the Senate 5 years ago, to the advisory committee and they voted overwhelmingly that, yes, this should be a schedule II. Within the bureaucracy, the FDA took 3 years. The day they did that and made that piece of legislation or that rule saying that now it will be schedule II, we saw the immediate effect. It took 1.1 billion—billion with a “b”—pills off the market. Twenty-two percent of the amount of opioids on the market were reduced immediately within the first year. Within a week of their finally agreeing to go from a schedule III to a schedule II, which controlled the prescriptions, they came out and approved Zohydro against the wishes of their advisory committee, 11 to 2. Now you tell me why that product came to market.

So I have legislation that says: Listen, when you are not going to take their advice and you don't recommend or you don't basically agree with your advisory committee, you have to come to the people's representatives—that is us—and tell us why you think this addictive drug needs to be on the market.

I believe we have to do things and take important steps. What we have basically turned a blind eye to is unbelievable.

Let me explain what I think goes on and what goes on. This is of such an epidemic proportion that we are afraid to talk about it. If you have a child in your family who is addicted, if your mother or father or maybe you or your wife is addicted, you are afraid to talk about it. It is kind of a shame, so we kind of try to take care of it. Guess what. We can't even find treatment centers to help people. And then you can't afford it if you can find it—most people in America—and most of the times you can't.

So there are two things that have to be done. First, and I am as guilty as anybody here—the last 20 years I thought: Boy, if you are going to use these drugs and abuse them, that is a crime. I am going to put you in jail. You are going to pay the fine for that, a penalty.

Well, guess what. It hasn't worked. They go in addicted and come out addicted. All we did by convicting them and putting them in jail is give them a felony. Now they can't get a job. Now they are out of the workforce. Next, they come out more addicted than when they went in.

As Americans, we must say: Listen, this is an illness, and an illness must be treated. You can't just throw them in the jail and say out of sight, out of mind; it will take care of itself. So once we change that—and we have enough courage here politically to do that—then we will start moving in a cultural change that will basically be able to take on this epidemic.

We are fighting on that. I continue to go into all of this, but I have always come here and I have said: Listen, all of you in the State of West Virginia, please get on my Web site, manchin.senate.gov. It is very simple. And all of us have our Senate Web sites. Share with me your life-altering letter. Tell me what happened.

We have been getting them by the hundreds. They are coming from all over my State, and they are in every State. I am sure Oklahomans will send the Presiding Officer theirs too.

I am going to read two stories. This brings to light everything we are talking about and why we must be successful in fighting this horrific epidemic.

This is Kylie's story:

In 1994 my dad broke his shoulder.

We all have accidents in our families.

He had to have surgery. He was on prescription narcotics from 1994–1996—

Now you tell me why he was allowed to be on them and why the doctor kept prescribing them for 2 years. That is the biggest problem—

he became addicted in those 2 years. After the doctor would no longer prescribe—

Finally, maybe the doctor came to his senses—

him pain medication, he'd illegally purchase them off of the street. His life literally revolved around his pain medication. His pain medication money came before our bills.

There were a few times we could not have Christmas or Easter because he used all of our money to purchase these drugs. I have 2 sisters. Eventually, he started buying more potent drugs when he couldn't find anyone to buy prescription pain pills off of. Heroin, Cocaine, you name it, he'd buy it. My mother eventually filed for a divorce and that made him so much worse. He started using more and more.

He used more because of depression on top of that addiction.

On February 23, 2007, I stayed home from school. I was a junior in High school in Clarksburg. I woke up at 10am, went to check on my dad who had been having drug withdrawals, I found him dead. He'd found drugs and overdosed while I was asleep, leaving me there to find him. It's something I carry with me everyday. I don't have many memories of my father interacting with us kids as a father should. I only have the bad memories of him going above and beyond for drugs. Even back then, if the prescription drug problem wouldn't have been so bad, I feel like he'd still be here today.

I remember exactly how he was laying when I found him. I remember everything.

It's my first thought in the mornings and my last thought at night. It changed my life, taught me a lot of life lessons but it also left me with a lot of heartache.

And unanswered questions—as I told you, the rescheduling took 2 years. Basically, you could get Vicodin and Lortab that were schedule III at this time, and all you had to do was keep calling in. You never had to see the doctor after the first visit. They can give them to you 90 days at a time or even longer. They were like M&M's. So when we went from schedule III to schedule II, that knocked it down. It took at least a billion that we know of off the market, and we are hoping maybe even more. So that is what happened.

This is Helen's story:

My husband and I were married for over 21 years. We had two daughters together and I expected to grow old with him and enjoy our grandchildren. He worked in a factory for over 18 years. Part of his job was moving 55 gallon drums of different types of fluids. He worked full time. Sometimes 6 days a week.

He sprained his back and was prescribed pain medicine. The doctor he was going to gave him the maximum amount—

At that time it would have been more than 90 days probably, and he didn't have to go back because it felt so good—

allowed by law for about six years.

As time went on, he needed a higher dose for it to be effective. Taking more caused him to run out before the next refill. He started going through withdrawals. Instead of going to the emergency room to get help, he took his life. Now I have no husband, my children have no father and my grandchildren do not have a grandpap.

The stigma surrounding all of this is what kept him from getting the help he needed to get off those pills.

We have said it is a silent killer. They were afraid to talk about it. They couldn't go to anybody, didn't know where to turn, and didn't have any types of treatment centers that would bring him off of that.

The Friday before he ended his life, I spoke with a doctor and told him he needed to get off those pills and get dried out. He didn't want to be admitted and they let him go.

They knew he was desperately hooked.

Why do pharmaceutical companies market drugs that cause normal people to give up on their families and life? Why do doctors allow their patients to take something so long and build up such a tolerance for it? I will never find the answers to these questions and it is too late for him now.

It sickens me to read of others going through this and there just doesn't seem to be an end to it.

This is why I am standing here. I face it every day. I go home. There is not a person who doesn't come up to me knowing that basically their lives have been changed and knowing now that they can speak to somebody. I am making it a point to give them the comfort of speaking to me. I protect their identity. I try to get them help.

There has to be a way. As my good friend from Ohio and the Presiding Officer, my good friend from Oklahoma—

this is not partisan. This should not be bogged down because of who gets credit, who doesn't get credit, or whose fault it is. We are all to blame, and we all can share in changing the culture of drugs in America—legal drugs.

Most drug addicts today—people who are addicted—will tell you if they are on heroin or illicit, harder drugs, they started with legal drugs that were in their prescription cabinet, in the medicine cabinet that their mom had or that they had. This is what has to change. This is why—Dr. Robert Califf is being recommended by the President; he is a good man with a stellar resume, a stellar performance, very honorable. But the culture that he comes from is basically from a research institution and a research university that has been funded by the pharmaceutical industry. That is just the way they say it is done. So they are funding the clinical research, and then we are expecting Mr. Califf to come into this industry, into the FDA, and make the wholesale changes.

I need—and I think we all need—for America to find somebody who has gone through a life-changing event and who has all of the experience and all of the education to be able to go into that agency and say: Listen, we are not going to give you a prescription just as a frontline in the first line of defense because I know the chances of it changing your life are greater than my helping you and giving you relief.

Until we have that and until that permeates clear down through, it will not change. Tell me how the CDC—the Centers for Disease Control within the agency of DHHS—is able to start responsibly recommending guideline changes for how we are going to prescribe and how doctors should be trained before they prescribe these life-altering drugs. Then, within the FDA they are fighting against it, and they are within the same agency of the HHS. So it is deep-rooted, and it has to be culturally changed from the top. It doesn't change from the bottom within.

So if this good man would withdraw his name and let us move on, I would be tickled to death, because he is a good person and he can be very helpful in his knowledge. But I don't think he can drive the change that needs to be done for us to save the families and children and moms and dads across America.

I yield the floor.

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. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, and will the Presiding Officer advise me when 20 minutes has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

INNOVATION PROJECT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, today I would like to report some good news about the work of the Senate that should be of interest to every single American family; that is, that we are moving ahead in the Senate on a package of 50 bipartisan proposals that will help move medical devices, medical cures, and medical drugs through the long, expensive, regulatory process and into medicine cabinets and doctors' offices, where they can help patients. We call this our Innovation Project. It is a companion to work that has been done in the House of Representatives already that they call their 21st Century Cures Act. It is also work that President Obama has talked about in important ways. The reason that the House has already done its work, that the President has talked about this in his State of the Union Address, and that we in our HELP Committee in the Senate have been working for a year to develop 50 bipartisan proposals that we hope to bring to the floor of the Senate is because we have never had a more exciting time in biomedical research in America than today. We are talking about actually curing some cancers, not just treating cancers. We are talking about using 3-D printing to actually help replace knees.

I was in a medical device office in Memphis a few weeks ago, and that company told me that in one-third of the cases where it sells knee replacement equipment, it also sells a tool to the doctor made with 3-D printing so that if he or she—the doctor—is replacing the knee of the Senator from Oklahoma, the doctor uses this tool that is just made especially for the knee of the Senator from Oklahoma and virtually eliminates the possibility of a mistake by the doctor in that surgery. The company told me it not only uses 3-D printing in one-third of the cases but that it could easily do it in all of the cases and expects it will soon.

At our hearing about 3 weeks ago, I asked Janet Woodcock, the head of the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research at the Food and Drug Administration, if there had ever been a case of a 3-D of printing of a drug, and she said, yes, there had been one. They have used 3-D printing to manufacture a medicine for epilepsy.

That is not all. Last year when the President announced his Precision Medicine Initiative, he introduced a young man whose cystic fibrosis had been cured by a new medicine, which he takes every day. While that only benefits some cystic fibrosis patients, the drugs that are used to cure that number of patients are the same kind of drugs they believe eventually will cure every patient with cystic fibrosis.

On that day, the President announced what he calls his Precision Medicine Initiative and that he wanted

to assemble 1 million human genomes so that if my doctor is prescribing for me a medicine by knowing what my genome is and what that medicine has done in other genomes, he can make a very specific sort of prescription, one that is more likely to help me and less likely ever to hurt me.

I attended the President's ceremony. I told him afterward that we would do our best to incorporate his Precision Medicine Initiative into our work in the Senate on our Biomedical Innovation Project.

The House was making good progress on its 21st Century Cures project. So I told the President: Mr. President, I can't imagine why we can't get a result in this Congress.

Since that time, the President has announced a cancer task force that Vice President BIDEN is leading to work to speed up treatments and cures for cancer. The House has passed its 21st Century Cures Act. In our committee in the Senate during the past year we have held 10 bipartisan hearings, including 6 on how to improve the electronic medical records systems that hospitals and doctors are using. We have had five bipartisan staff working groups that have met or held briefings more than 100 times in the last year, and the result of their work has been 50 bipartisan legislative proposals. As I said, every single one of those has support from Democrats as well as Republicans on the committee.

Today in our committee we debated and approved the first 7 of these bills, which included 12 of the 50 bipartisan proposals I just mentioned. We had an open process. Any Senator who wished to could have offered an amendment. The bills have had so much work on them that there weren't any amendments, but they were important pieces of work.

Our committee probably is the most diverse in the Senate. I know that is saying a lot, but if you look up and down the Democratic and Republican aisle, we span the whole spectrum. Last year we worked together, despite our differences of opinion, and produced a bill to fix No Child Left Behind. A lot of people thought we couldn't do that. I expect the same sort of bipartisan effort led by Senator MURRAY, the senior Democrat on her side, and me as chairman, to work well for us again.

We have a second markup of legislation scheduled for March 9 and a third for April 6. My expectation is that after we meet these 3 times and consider 50 legislative proposals, when we are finished it will all add up to bipartisan companion legislation to the House's 21st Century Cures legislation, and our legislation will include important elements of the President's Precision Medicine Initiative in his Cancer Moonshot.

The 21st Century Cures Act, the House bill, includes \$9.3 billion in so-called mandatory funding over 5 years, mostly for the National Institutes of

Health. Several of President Obama's other proposals in his new budget involve mandatory funding, and several Members of our committee have talked to me about mandatory funding for some of the work we need to do.

Here is my view about mandatory funding: I don't want to get the cart before the horse. When I was Governor of Tennessee and we needed a new road system, people would say to me: Are you going to raise the gas tax? I said we are not going to talk about the gas tax. There are lots of different ways to pay for the road. You can borrow the money. You can use discretionary money. You can raise the fuel tax. You can build a toll road. We are not going to talk about any of that. First, we are going to decide on what we want to do. What we decided to do was to have three big road programs to attract the auto industry suppliers to Tennessee, and it worked.

The decision we made after we decided what we wanted to do was in that case to raise the fuel tax three times because we didn't want any road debt. We have among the best roads in the country and zero road debt, and we have the auto industry. That worked out pretty well for us 30 years ago. I would like to apply the same sort of thinking here.

I don't want to talk about how we pay for something before I decide what the something is. Here is the something I am thinking about. I am thinking about something called the NIH—National Institutes of Health—Innovation Projects Fund; five areas, in addition to the things we normally fund and do that require extraordinary support, one-time support for ideas that have a start and a finish. In other words, they are not built into the budget for a long period of time.

The National Institutes of Health Director would have the authority to direct allocations of this fund to specific areas of importance. The five areas of importance I have in mind are helping the President launch his Precision Medicine Initiative and an American Young Investigators Corps.

We have heard from Dr. Collins, the head of NIH, and many others how important it is to have young investigators have enough money to give them the money to do their research. The BRAIN Initiative, all of us are staggered by the prospect of the personal anguish that Alzheimer's and other brain diseases will cause individuals and their families, and we are excited about the prospect of relieving that anguish. We know how much this is going to cost us—in the tens and tens of billions of dollars. If we can find a way to develop new understandings of neurological disorders, which help discourage Alzheimer's disease or prevent it or deal with it, it saves money as well as saving anguish. A Big Biothink Award—Dr. Collins had suggested this in some of his testimony. During this exciting time, let's let each of the 24 Institutes that fund grant awards at

the National Institutes of Health issue a challenge and let them identify the most promising big ideas in the country in their areas and fund it; for example, cancer, mental health. Let's see what comes out of this remarkable country of ours when we challenge them in that way. Then the Cancer Moonshot—now that the President and the Vice President are involved in this way, we want to make sure we do all we can to take advantage of curing some cancers as well as treating some cancers. There may be some aspects of that effort that have a start and a finish that could be part of what I call NIH Innovation Projects Fund.

I go into some detail about my Innovation Projects Fund proposal because we may be able to fund these needs in the regular appropriations process, but I am willing to consider using mandatory funding for these five areas because, No. 1, they have a start and a finish. They help jump-start. They are limited. In that sense, they are not subject to being appropriated forever, as appropriations often are. No. 2, I believe we should reduce other mandatory funding in order to use this mandatory funding. We should be about setting priorities in the Senate. I cannot think of a more important priority than biomedical research.

I mentioned we have 50 legislative proposals for which we have bipartisan support, but we do not have bipartisan agreement in the Senate committee on how to deal with any of these items that are paid for by mandatory funding, and neither do we have enough money within the jurisdiction of our committee to deal with it. So we will deal with both the Innovation Projects Fund and the mandatory funding—if that is what it turns out to be to pay for it—once the bill comes to the floor.

We have to decide first what programs we want and then how to pay for them. We should do that on the floor. We know we will have to have 60 votes to do it in that way that includes mandatory funding. We had some experience with that.

Last year we had some very difficult issues with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I had one of them that had to do with vouchers. That drives some people on the other side of the aisle up the wall. If I insisted on putting the scholarships for kids proposal that I had on the bill in the committee, the bill may never have gotten to the floor. Senator FRANKEN, on the other hand, had an important piece of legislation to him on discrimination, but if he had gotten that on the bill in the committee, it would never have gotten to the floor. We agreed, since we needed 60 votes to get a result—and a result is what we want and the American people expect us to get—that we would withhold our controversial amendments until the floor and see if we could develop bipartisan support on the floor to have at least 60 votes and get a result.

We followed, in our Education bill, the rule that the late Senator Kennedy

and Senator ENZI followed when they were the ranking members of this committee, and that was let's find the 80 percent we agree on and work on that first, and let's take the things we disagree on and do those later, but most important, just as Senator Kennedy did with Senator ENZI, just as the full Senate did last year on fixing No Child Left Behind, we kept in our mind getting a result.

I said on the floor many times last year that if all you want to do is make a speech or assert your point of view, you can stay home. You can get your own radio program. You don't have to travel as much. There is no need for you to come to the U.S. Senate. You can have your say here, but if you really want to do your job here, you can work with other people and see if we can get a result, especially when we are talking about issues that affect every American family in such an important way.

I am determined to get a result. I am delighted I have the opportunity on this committee to work with the Senator from Washington, Mrs. PATTY MURRAY. She is a strong Democrat. She is the leader of the Democratic caucus, but because of her leadership and her interest in getting a result, we were able to succeed last year. I believe, working with her and the other Members of our committee, we will be able to succeed this year.

The House of Representatives has done its work. It has passed the 21st Century Cures legislation. The President has made his proposals for precision medicine and for a cancer moonshot. He talked to all of us during his State of the Union Address in the last two sessions. We have worked for a year in our committee to produce 50 bipartisan legislative proposals that should go through the committee and be ready in early April to come to the floor.

The majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has said to me, and he has said to all of us, that even though this is a Presidential year and we have less time here, he is still looking for important ideas that benefit a large number of Americans that have bipartisan support and that the President will sign into law. I can't think of a single piece of legislation that the Senate could consider this year that fits that definition better than our companion legislation to the House of Representatives' 21st-Century Cures legislation.

I wish to say a word about the legislation we passed today. As I mentioned, these were all bipartisan pieces of legislation. The first one was introduced by Senator BENNET, Senator WARREN, Senator BURR, and Senator HATCH. It had to do with rare diseases such as cystic fibrosis.

This is what Senator SUSAN COLLINS of Maine said about that piece of legislation during the debate in our committee:

If you ask the parents of sons or daughters—primarily sons—with muscular dys-

trophy who suffer from Duchenne's, a very rare kind of muscular dystrophy, whether the bill we just approved is important, believe me they will tell you that it is.

We approved it unanimously, and it is ready for the Senate to consider.

Senator BURR, a Republican, and Senator FRANKEN, a Democrat, offered the FDA Device Accountability Act of 2015. This legislation would help move innovative medical devices ahead—such as artificial knees, insulin pumps for people with diabetes, stents for people who have suffered a heart attack—and new surgical tools that can get bogged down in the FDA. In other words, we want to keep the safe and effective gold standard, but we want to get these devices through the system as rapidly as we can, at the lowest cost we can, so people can afford and use them.

Senator BALDWIN and Senator COLLINS—Democrat and Republican—offered a bill called the Next Generation Researchers Act. We know that biomedical research is our best weapon against diseases, illness, and death, and we can't afford to lose young scientists to other countries, so this bill helped to attract young scientists by promoting opportunities at the National Institutes of Health.

This is what Senator COLLINS had to say about that:

If you asked Dr. Francis Collins—the head of NIH—whether the bill that Senator BALDWIN and I have sponsored is important to attracting and keeping young researchers, believe me he would say yes.

Senator KIRK, a Republican, Senator BENNET, a Democrat, along with Senator HATCH, Senator MURKOWSKI, Senator ISAKSON, and Senator COLLINS, introduced another piece of legislation, S. 800. This bill will help millions of Americans with disabilities, illnesses, and chronic conditions that require them to go to medical rehabilitation. Senator KIRK, a stroke victim, spoke movingly about the importance of that bill.

This morning, Senator COLLINS said:

If you ask stroke victims whether the rehabilitation bill that we passed is important, they would say yes.

There were four other bills we enacted. The one by Senator ISAKSON—we didn't enact it—we approved it by committee. Senator ISAKSON and Senator MURPHY had legislation on advancing research for neurological diseases.

This is what Senator COLLINS said about that one:

If you asked families that are struggling with neurological diseases such as Parkinson's, MS, or Alzheimer's, whether the bill that is on the agenda today is important, they would say yes.

Senator MURRAY offered the Preventing Superbugs and Protecting Patients Act, which is based on incidents that happened in her home State of Washington.

Finally, Senator MURRAY and I offered legislation to improve electronic medical records. Our committee did not set out to deal with electronic

medical records, but the more we got into our discussion—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 20 minutes of his time.

Mr. ALEXANDER. We have used 20 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir. The Senator asked to be notified when he reached 20 minutes, and he has reached 20 minutes. The Senator still has the floor.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I thank the Presiding Officer very much. I will complete my remarks. I see the Senator from Florida is here.

Before I yield the floor, I wish to make a brief statement about the legislation Senator MURRAY and I introduced. The electronic medical record system in this country is in a ditch. Doctors and hospitals that use it have come to dread it.

The administration recognizes that there are problems. They haven't taken all of my advice about what to do about it, but I do give them credit. I thank Secretary Burwell, Dr. Karen DeSalvo, the National Coordinator for Health Information and Technology, and the head of CMS, Andy Slavitt, for working with our committee, Senator MURRAY and me, to try to find ways to make the electronic medical record system something that genuinely helps patients and that doctors look forward to instead of dreading. We have to do this because almost every advance we need to make in biomedical innovation depends upon this. Certainly the President's Precision Medicine Initiative absolutely depends upon our getting electronic medical records right. Perhaps the most important piece of legislation we approved today, among those seven pieces of legislation, was doing what we could do in legislation to get the electronic medical record system out of the ditch and onto a better track so that doctors use it rather than dread it. We are counting on the administration to continue to work with us to finish that job.

I believe this is good news for the American people. It means we are on a path, step by step, to do our part of the job.

There was some debate in our committee about whether the bills we were passing were important.

I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senator COLLINS' comments, which remind us why each of the seven pieces of legislation is important, be printed in the RECORD.

There was some talk about the fact that we disagreed about the level of mandatory funding or whether to do it at all. We disagreed about that. We don't have bipartisan consensus on it, but we do have bipartisan consensus on 50 legislative proposals that we need to move ahead, and we will move ahead with them. Twelve of the 50 were done today, and the rest will be done in early March and early April.

My hope is that by early April, the Senate will be able to join the House of Representatives and President Obama

and say: Here is our contribution to the most important step we can take to make the quality of health better for virtually every American family by passing our companion legislation to 21st-century cures.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, the summary of each of the seven bills our committee approved today.

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

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

SENATOR COLLINS REMARKS AT INNOVATION MARK-UP

Before I turn to the bill that I am honored to cosponsor with Senator Baldwin, which addresses a real problem of keeping our young researchers at NIH, I do want to respond to some of the earlier comments that have been made about the approach we are taking today.

First—I want to commend the Chairman and the Ranking Member for scheduling these important bills for markup by this committee.

If you ask the parents of sons and daughters—primarily sons—with muscular dystrophy who suffer from Duchenne's, a very rare kind of muscular dystrophy, whether the bill that we just approved is important, believe me they will tell you that it is.

If you ask stroke victims whether the rehabilitation bill that we passed is important, they would say yes. If you asked families that are struggling with neurological diseases such as Parkinson's, MS, or Alzheimer's, whether the bill that is on the agenda today is important, they would say yes.

If you asked Dr. Francis Collins—the head of NIH—whether the bill that Senator Baldwin and I have sponsored is important to attracting and keeping young researchers, believe me he would say yes.

And the fact is that this congress has come together and approved a much needed \$2 billion dollar funding increase for NIH—that is the largest increase for NIH's budget since 2003 we also approved, and I know this well because I was Chairman of it as part of the bipartisan Alzheimer's task force—nearly a 60% increase in Alzheimer's funding bringing us to \$936 million. Is it enough? Given that we spend billions caring for people with Alzheimer's—no.

The National Advisory Council on Alzheimer's says we need to spend \$2 billion per year. But to imply that a 60% increase in funding for Alzheimer's research is nothing; is just not accurate. There is widespread bipartisan support for biomedical research because there simply is no investment that promises greater returns for Americans than that investment.

It not only leads to discoveries and the developments of effective new treatments for families who are coping with these diseases but it also can have a dramatic impact on the budgets of families, states and the federal government. I am pleased with the progress we are making, I support the approach that the chairman has taken and I believe that the bills that we are considering at this markup and at the upcoming March 9 markup are important bills that will make a real difference to American families.

INNOVATION BILLS APPROVED TODAY BY THE SENATE HEALTH COMMITTEE

SENS. BENNET (D-COLO.), WARREN (D-MASS.), BURR (R-N.C.), AND HATCH (R-UTAH)—THE ADVANCING TARGETED THERAPIES FOR RARE DISEASES ACT OF 2015 (S. 2030)

Many rare diseases, like Cystic Fibrosis, have multiple genetic mutations, making it difficult for researchers to find enough patients with the same mutation for a clinical trial. This bill will help expand the successful treatment of people suffering from rare diseases like this.

SENS. BURR (R-N.C.) AND FRANKEN (D-MINN.)—THE FDA DEVICE ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015 (S. 1622)

These innovative medical devices, items like artificial knees, insulin pumps for people with diabetes, or stents for people who have suffered a heart attack, or new surgical tools to minimize scarring and reduce post-surgery complications, can get bogged down at the FDA. This bill reduces unnecessary regulations while maintaining the gold standard of safety and efficacy to keep us safe.

SENS. BALDWIN (D-WISC.) AND COLLINS (R-MAINE)—THE NEXT GENERATION RESEARCHERS ACT (S. 2014)

Biomedical research is our best weapon against disease, illness and death and we can't afford to lose young scientists to other countries or professions because they're frustrated by the lack of opportunity or funding—so this bill helps attract talented young scientists by promoting opportunities at the National Institutes of Health (NIH).

SENS. KIRK (R-ILL.), BENNET (D-COLO.), HATCH (R-UTAH), MURKOWSKI (R-ALASKA), ISAKSON (R-GA.), AND COLLINS (R-MAINE)—THE ENHANCING THE STATURE AND VISIBILITY OF MEDICAL REHABILITATION RESEARCH AT NIH ACT (S. 800)

This bill will help millions of Americans with disabilities, illnesses and chronic conditions that require them to go to medical rehabilitation and prevention. For example, this is important to people who have suffered from strokes, 800,000 happen every year in the U.S. according to the Centers for Disease Control. This bill ensures that the NIH is focusing on research into helping these people, and others who suffer from debilitating illnesses each year.

SENS. ISAKSON (R-GA.) AND MURPHY (D-CONN.)—THE ADVANCING RESEARCH FOR NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES ACT OF 2015 (S. 849)

This bill will help people with neurological diseases like Parkinson's, Multiple Sclerosis, and Alzheimer's by helping to advance our understanding of these diseases and helping researchers access data on these diseases in order to discover new therapies and cures.

SEN. MURRAY (D-WASH.)—THE PREVENTING SUPERBUGS AND PROTECTING PATIENTS ACT (S. 2503)

If you would ask patients and families or anyone who has undergone a procedure in a hospital or outpatient facility that involve reusable medical devices—and if you asked the people of the states of Washington and Illinois—whether they thought this legislation was important, they would say yes.

There was a tragic outbreak of antibiotic-resistant infections linked to contaminated scope devices in Sen. Murray's home state of Washington, where the devices were not being properly disinfected between operations, and this bill helps FDA in its work to ensure that reusable devices like these are safe for patients.

SENS. ALEXANDER (R-TENN.) AND MURRAY (D-WASH.)—THE IMPROVING HEALTH INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ACT (S. 2511)

If you asked doctors, hospitals, or patients who want access to complete and useful patient records to both deliver care and understand more about their own health—and I think that's most Americans—whether they think this bill is important, they would say yes.

This bill takes several steps to get health records flowing between doctors, hospitals, and patients to help realize the promise of health information technology by turning these systems from something that doctors and hospitals dread into something that actually helps patients.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes.

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

THE PRESIDENT'S SPACE PROGRAM BUDGET

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the President's proposal with regard to our space budget, the civilian space program, and NASA. Of course we have many other space programs, primarily national security, but now there is a commercial space program. We are seeing the burgeoning commercial space industry in the NASA budget. We are amazed by the rockets which can take the first stage—instead of throwing it away when it lands in the Atlantic Ocean after a launch from Cape Canaveral—under powered flight, even without parachutes, can come back and land on a specific spot, just as SpaceX did in its first stage in a launch about 2 months ago. We are seeing commercial space.

The fact that these things we carry around in our pockets that we loosely refer to as phones that know exactly where we are at any time is as a result of a constellation of satellites up there called GPS that triangulate and calculate exactly where we are. It is absolutely amazing to me that my latest gadgetry acquisition—a Fitbit—can so sensitively understand what my heart rate is at any moment, can measure distance, and gives me all kinds of information about the functioning of the human body.

Well, this didn't just accidentally appear. Where in the world did a lot of this come from? It came from the space program. I wish to talk about that, but first I want to underscore something. Other than its pioneering, for example, of increased investments in aeronautics, which is the first “A” in “NASA”—the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—there are other parts of the President's proposal that have been left behind in the visionary appropriations bill we passed back in the middle of December which has sent us on a course that we are going to Mars. We are preparing to go to Mars, and that is a long way. In

order to sustain human life and go all the way there—land, survive, reignite off the surface of Mars—and, by the way, I commend the Matt Damon movie “The Martian.” The author of the book which the movie came from actually consulted with a number of folks, including one of my crewmates, on the propulsion, how to get to Mars a lot quicker. That propulsion uses magnets and plasma as its fuel and thrust to get us to Mars, and instead of the conventional 8 to 10 months, we could get there in as little as 39 days. But those are to-be-developed technologies.

Let me mention a couple of things we are developing. Folks often argue about the NASA budget, which back in the lunar days the Apollo Program was as much as 4 percent of the entire Federal budget. Now it is about one-half of 1 percent. In the process of divvying up the dollars out here, we pull and tug because people will ask: Why do we need to go to Mars? Why do we need to go to an asteroid in preparation to go to Mars? Why do we need a space program when we have so many needs here on Earth? That is a legitimate question. What is the legitimate answer? Do you appreciate the fact that we have MRIs and CT scans? MRIs—magnetic resonance imaging—and CT scans—computer-aided tomography—technologies that are used routinely today to help us so much in a diagnosis of what is wrong or what is right in our own human bodies and is part of this medical miracle that we know as modern medicine—they came straight out of the space program.

In the 1960s, NASA had to find a safe landing spot for the Apollo lunar lander amid all of that Moon surface and all of that dust. So what happened was the engineers at JPL out in California developed a digital scanning process using high-frequency sound waves, magnets, and computers. In addition to making six successful Moon landings, this technology was tweaked, adapted, improved, and it led to CT scans and MRIs.

How about robots in the use of modern medicine? How about robots in the use of the manufacturing process? Well, my colleagues will remember the one thing on the space shuttle that had the name of another country; it was the Canadarm. It was the robotic arm that was birthed in the cargo bay of the space shuttle. It was used to deploy, maneuver, and capture payloads. It has now been the forerunner of the neuroArm, a surgical device that has successfully performed dozens of tumor removals by robotic surgery.

Now, any of the males around here over the age of 50 ought to be concerned about prostate cancer. They have a robot named DA Vinci that is built in California, even though it is named after Leonardo da Vinci, and this robotic device, with a small incision—six times—can go in and, with some of this precise photography that was developed for these cameras,

robotically remove, in this case, the prostate cancer by removing the prostate without damaging the nerves and without cutting the human body open, which takes so much more time to heal, instead of just sticking six holes in. That came directly out of the space program. It is being used to develop an image-guided autonomous robot for use in the early detection of breast cancer.

Let me give my colleagues another idea. When we get on a modern airliner today and we look out the window and we look at that swept-back wing, what do we see out there on the tip of the wing? The wing doesn't just stop as it normally does; it curves up. This is called a winglet. The winglets have these upturned features. They save billions of dollars in fuel costs.

Now, with NASA technology at the Langley Research Center and now the tests conducted at the Dryden Flight Center—now named, after the first astronaut on the moon, the Armstrong Flight Center—this winglet technology was released to Boeing, and it has saved the airline industry more than 2 billion gallons of jet fuel, and it has saved more than \$4 billion in jet fuel costs and a reduction of almost 21.5 million tons of carbon dioxide emissions, just by the design of the wing. That technology came directly out of NASA.

Here is another example. All of this is coming back to this: Why go to space? Well, we go to space because our nature is that we are explorers and adventurers. We go there because we haven't been there. We go there to explore. Our nature is one of pioneers. The frontier is now not westward, as it was in the beginning of this country, but upward. So that is certainly a reason to have the space program, but let me tell my colleagues more of how it applies to our daily lives.

How about fortified baby formula? Early 1980s research on regenerative ecosystems led to a method of algae-based food supplements that provide the long-chain polysaturated fatty acids that support brain and eye development and function. So this led to a spinoff product called Formulaid, which was patented in 1996. It can now be found in over 90 percent of infant formula sold in the United States as well as those sold around the world.

I will give another example: image sensors—image sensors to enhance cell phone cameras. In the 1990s, a NASA team had been improving digital image sensors in order to miniaturize cameras on spacecraft while maintaining the scientific image quality. So this was spun off into commerce, and the company that commercialized the technology has shipped over 1 billion sensors for use in applications such as—now, does this sound familiar—digital cameras, camera phones, web cameras, automotive cameras. They are even developing something where you will swallow a pill; only it is not a pill. It is an ingestible camera for imaging the patient's gastrointestinal tract.

Let me tell my colleagues about another one. I had a visit from Tallahassee Community College today. They showed me what they could do with a 3-D printer. I ask unanimous consent to show this in front of the Senate.

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

Mr. NELSON. We are doing this on the space station right now. We are putting together tools so that if we don't have a tool in space or if we were on the long journey to Mars and we did not have a tool that we needed to repair something, we could send the messages up to the spacecraft and 3-D print the tools that we need. So long-term space missions like the one to Mars are going to benefit from this on-board manufacturing capability.

Spare parts—what happens if we get up there and we don't have enough? Well, we can print it. Engineers are even experimenting with creating a completely 3-D printed high-performance rocket engine. Can my colleagues believe that? So that would advance manufacturing technologies that could benefit a number of us right here on the face of the Earth.

So the excitement of this—even though some would look at the President's request for NASA and see that it is \$600 million over what he requested last year, but it is actually almost flat-line to what we actually appropriated. Don't be discouraged by that because in this sense the excitement is gathering as we are about to launch humans—Americans on American rockets. That is going to occur next year, as we send crews to and from the International Space Station. As a result, we therefore do not have to rely on the proven Russian Soyuz that gets our crews to and from today. Now we will have the capability of not only transporting cargo to and from but our American astronauts.

Even though the President's request falls short in some areas, I think the President's request has been overcome with what we have done here in the Congress, with a substantial increase in this current fiscal year over and above last year and with the excitement of human space flight again within our grasp on American rockets, as well as this excitement of defining, creating, and manufacturing new technologies for space flight that will benefit us here on the face of the Earth.

If it sounds like I am a cheerleader, indeed I am a cheerleader. When I see the miracles of modern medicine, when I see the increased capabilities of exploring the heavens and now almost back to the original light emitted from the big bang, and when we start to uncover the new discoveries that expand our horizons, indeed, I am a cheerleader. For that, I am grateful.

I commend the Senate to keep this space program going at a fast pace as we increasingly get back into the total business, both manned and unmanned, of space exploration.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

(The remarks of Mr. COTTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 2123 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, over the course of the last year and a half, I have come down to the floor fairly regularly to tell some simple stories about victims of gun violence all across the country. The idea is that if the overwhelming data of those killed through gun violence—31,000 a year; 2,600 a month; 86 a day—if these mind-numbing numbers don't move this body to action, then maybe the voices of the victims, the stories of the victims of gun violence may eventually thaw the ice of this Congress and cause us to act in some way, shape or form to reduce this scourge of gun violence—whether it be tightening the Nation's gun laws, which are the loosest in the world, whether it be to pass mental health legislation that will address those who are wrestling with demons manifested eventually in gun homicides or whether it be giving more resources to gun enforcement to simply enforce the laws on the books. We have done nothing. We have done nothing since the murders of Sandy Hook, CT, to address this epidemic of gun violence. It is about time that we do.

On New Year's Eve, I spent most of that day tweeting out the 370-plus instances of mass shootings over the course of 2015. Think about that for a second. There were more mass shootings in 2015 than there were days in the year. Just to be honest, I will tell you what I believe to be a mass shooting. I am talking about a shooting in which there were more than four people shot. If there were more than four people shot in your neighborhood, that would probably be something you would be talking about, that would probably rise to the level of being something serious enough to change behavior or to call for a change in policy. There were 370 instances in 2015 where more than 4 people were shot at one given time—more than one per day. So I tweeted out to every single one of them on the day before the year turned to 2016 just to give people a sense all in one place of how big this problem of mass shootings is. Of course, that is only the tip of the iceberg.

If on the average day there are 4, 5, 6 or 7 people being shot in episodes of mass violence, there are another 80 that are killed through other episodes of gun violence. Many of those are suicides, but many of those are just the day-to-day gun violence incidents that happen across this country, most of which happen in our cities.

So I want to share a few of those stories here with you today.

A lot of attention gets paid to those who die in episodes of mass violence. This is a binder that is basically full of the stories of the individuals who were killed in mass shootings over the past couple of years. This doesn't even begin to account for the individuals who are killed every day on the streets of Chicago and New Haven and Los Angeles and New Orleans, people such as Jonathan Aranda, who was 19 years old when he was killed just before Christmas of 2015. He was killed in the morning hours of December 8. He had just graduated from Eli Whitney Technical High School, which is located in Hamden, CT.

His cousin said:

He was getting out of work, stopped at a friend's house to talk about cars and this senseless act of violence happened. He was quick to lend a hand when you needed help without asking for anything in return. He worked a third shift job to come home, rest and help at home.

His younger sister, Genesis, said that her brother was "a humble and loving person, he was a person who never picked fights. He was quick to lend a hand when you needed help without asking for anything in return."

Jonathan's cousin Edgar said he was a "very, very likeable kid. . . . He didn't have a problem with anybody."

The community has been devastated by this loss. He was liked by everybody. He cared deeply for his family. Jonathan was 19 years old when he was killed after stopping at a friend's house—after getting off of work—to talk about cars.

Treesa Wiley was killed just a few days ago in Rockford, IL. She was fatally shot while she was visiting a friend in her home. An unknown person forced entry into the home and shot Wiley and her friend. She lived paycheck to paycheck, but she was still immensely generous with her friends and family, showering them with love, attention, and gifts.

Her uncle said of Treesa:

She didn't have children herself, but every child that she met was her child. That's why she enjoyed that work so much. She enjoyed giving back to the community because it had given her so much."

Her friends described her as "bubbly," "angelic," and "lovable." Her favorite color was purple. Her favorite team was the Green Bay Packers. She loved red lipstick. She had overcome a learning disability to get a 2-year degree. She was killed while she was studying to get her bachelor's degree.

A friend said:

She was the most loving and honest friend you could hope for. . . . I can't think of one person who didn't like Treesa.

Raven White was 16 years old when about a month ago she was killed in Birmingham, AL. She was fatally shot in her car in the early morning hours of January 8. It looks as if it was a robbery. She was a junior in high school, and she was 6 months pregnant.

Her mother said Raven was very outgoing.

I know she loved school. Even after getting pregnant, she made good grades and didn't miss a day of school.

She was planning to go back to the volleyball team that she played on after giving birth. She had just gotten off work at Walmart hours before the shooting. "All I want is to hold my grandbaby once, but I can't," said Raven's mother, Tangee Dixon.

Miguel Arguelles was 22 when he was killed in Bridgeport, CT. He was shot in the neck and the shoulder during a shooting at the Charles F. Greene Homes housing complex. Police say he wasn't a target, but he was hit by stray bullets. He was 22 years old. At the hospital, Miguel's mother pounded his chest, urging him to come back to life, saying: "Mommy's here. C'mon, baby, c'mon, baby. Mommy's here."

A veteran officer said the nurses were crying, the priest was crying, and even the police were crying while watching this.

It was one of the saddest things I've seen. You feel so helpless.

His mother said he lit up the room when he walked in.

You saw his teeth every time he smiled—he brought a smile to your face. . . . I just want to hug him. I just want to tell him I love him.

"He was my protector," said his sister. "He loved to make people laugh."

Jabari Saunders was 30 when he was killed in December of 2015 in Wilmington. He was shot on the very same street on which he used to walk his children to school every morning. He was a devoted father of four. His life revolved around his kids. The neighbors said the only time they would see him is with his kids. He was always smiling. It is sad. You can't even let your kids walk to school—walk to after-school stuff now.

When a neighbor's son was shot, irony of all ironies, the victim's mother recalls that Jabari visited her home every single day the week after the shooting.

He just came to pay respect. . . . I know the love he showed me when my son was killed.

Another neighbor said:

I can't say anything bad about him. He was just a nice guy.

That is 5 stories out of 2,600 a month. There is no antidote to this epidemic. There is no one law that we can pass that makes it all better, that makes this all go away. But that can't be the excuse. The excuse cannot be that because there is no panacea legislatively, we shouldn't even try. The excuse can't be that because it is impossible to erase gun violence, we shouldn't take some commonsense steps to make it all better. The excuse also can't be that laws don't make a difference, because they do.

I will leave you with this because my point really is to tell the stories of these victims, not to expound on the data, but the data is pretty irrefutable. Here are all the States where background checks are required in order to

buy a gun through a private gun sale. That is a purchase at a gun store or a purchase at a gun show. Here are all the States with no additional background check laws besides the Federal floor. The data is pretty irrefutable. On average, there is 1 additional death per 100,000 in the States with no additional background check laws than there are in the States that have additional background check laws. It is a 30-some-odd percent increase for the States that don't take extra steps to make sure criminals don't get guns.

So when people say that we shouldn't pass a background check law that 90 percent of the American public support because it won't make a difference, the data doesn't tell us that. The data actually tells us that if we take steps to make sure criminals don't get guns, fewer criminals will get guns and fewer people will be killed, because I will assure you that one of these five people whom I just listed was killed with a gun that was purchased legally. It might have been purchased in a gun show, put in the back of a van, and sold on the streets of Wilmington, Bridgeport, or New Haven.

Laws won't save all 31,000 of these lives, but they certainly will save a handful. And for the individuals, the nurses, the clergy, and the police officers who witnessed Miguel Arguelles's mother pressing on his heart trying to get him to come back to life—simply one less death would make a debate on the Senate floor worth it.

I hope that we take some steps this year, perhaps, to pass a mental health reform bill. I hope we get to where 9 out of 10 of our constituents are and pass legislation that keeps guns out of the hands of criminals. If we don't do it because of the statistics, maybe we will do it because we will start to hear the real voices of these victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 20 minutes.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, investigative author Jane Mayer has written an important piece of journalism—her new book, "Dark Money"—about the secret but massive influence-buying rightwing billionaires led by the infamous Koch brothers. Jane Mayer's book catalogs the rise and the expansion into a vast array of front groups of this operation and the role in it of two of America's more shameless villains: Charles and David Koch. Some have called this beast they have created the Kochtopus because it has so many tentacles.

The Presiding Officer may be wondering why I am talking about secret influence-buying in my climate speech.

The reason is that the story of dark money and the story of climate change denial are the same story—two sides of the same coin, as it were.

Two strategies of that Koch-led, influence-buying operation particularly bear on climate change. Indeed, they are probably the major reason we don't have a comprehensive climate bill in Congress and instead have this present little mouse of a bipartisan energy efficiency bill. "Oh, there goes Whitehouse," I am sure some listeners are saying, "off his rocker, trying to connect the Koch brothers to this climate change." Well, it is not just something I am saying; it is what the Koch brothers' own operatives say when they are crowing about their influence-buying success.

I will get to that later, but first the two strategies. One strategy is to mimic real science with phony science. Real science wants to find the truth. This phony science has no interest whatsoever in the truth. It wants to look like science, sure, but it is perfectly content to be wrong. There is an apparatus, a whole array of front groups through which this phony science is perpetrated. This machinery of phony science has been wrong over and over. It was wrong about tobacco, wrong about lead paint, wrong about ozone, wrong about mercury, and now it is wrong about climate change. They are the same organizations, the same strategies, the same funding sources, even in some cases the same people—always wrong. You would think that if they cared a hoot about right from wrong, they would change their methodology after such an unblemished record of being wrong every time. But they don't care. Truth is not their object; truth is actually their adversary.

This isn't science; it is public relations dressed up in a lab coat. It masquerades as science. But, as a visiting university president from Rhode Island recently said to me, "it uses the language of science, but its purpose is to undermine actual science." To pull off this masquerade, you have to trick people. You have to do what Ms. Mayer describes as a Koch brothers associate saying as this whole scheme was being developed. It is perhaps the most telling quote in her book. Here is what the man said. "It would be necessary," he said, to "use ambiguous and misleading names, obscure the true agenda, and conceal the means of control."

The next quote in her book is this: "This is the method that Charles Koch would soon practice in his charitable giving, and later in his political actions."

Did he ever. Misleading names. How about the John Locke Foundation, the Ethan Allen Institute. The pages listening will know these names from history: the James Madison Institute for Public Policy; the Thomas Jefferson Institute; the Franklin Center for Government & Public Integrity, with a little profile of old Ben Franklin on its letterhead; the George C. Marshall Institute, named after the hero of World

War II and the European recovery that followed. None of them have a thing to do with their illustrious namesakes; they just took the famous names to put on a veneer of legitimacy.

The George C. Marshall Institute—it sounds impressive. You might fool the occasional editorial page editor. Who does that? Maybe someone trying to hide something, “obscure the true agenda.”

Take the Mercatus Center, which the Washington Post described as a “staunchly anti-regulatory center funded largely by Koch Industries Inc.” In “Dark Money,” journalist Jane Mayer wrote that Clayton Coppin, a professor at George Mason who reviewed Bill Koch’s political activities, concluded Mercatus to be “a lobbying group disguised as a disinterested academic program.” And conceal the means of control—a large portion of the funding behind this special interest apparatus is simply not traceable. Why? Because money is funneled through organizations that exist to conceal donor identity. That is their purpose. The biggest identity-laundering shops are Donors Trust and Donors Capital Fund. Indeed, they are by far the biggest sources of funding in the web of climate-change front groups that have been stood up.

Dr. Robert Brulle of Drexel University, who studies the network of fossil fuel-backed climate denial, reports the Donors Trust and Donors Capital Fund operations are the “central component” and “predominant funder” of the denier apparatus; and at the same time he continues it is the “black box that conceals the identity of contributors.”

Jane Mayer reports in her book: “Between 1999 and 2015, Donors Trust redistributed some \$750 million from the pooled contributions to myriad conservative causes under its own name.” There were \$750 million laundered into anonymity with no telltale fossil fuel fingerprints.

This is no small operation. There are over 100 groups involved, all beholden to the same master: the fossil fuel industry. Setting up or supporting over 100 front groups may seem unduly complicated, but remember, an internal combustion engine has more than 500 parts, and we are totally comfortable with that mechanism.

According to the International Monetary Fund, this apparatus is defending a \$700 billion—billion with a “b”—effective subsidy, just in the United States of America, every year. How much work would you do—how much complication would you be willing to create—to defend \$700 billion per year? To use Jane Mayer’s telling phrase, this is a new device. Put it all together and what do you have? “The think tank as disguised political weapon.” Who is behind this elaborate scheme? I will quote from “Dark Money.”

[T]he director of research at Greenpeace . . . spent months trying to trace the funds flowing into a web of nonprofit organizations and talking heads, all denying the reality of

global warming as if working from the same script. What he discovered was that from 2005 to 2008, a single source, the Koch [brother]s, poured almost \$25 million into dozens of different organizations fighting climate reform. The sum was staggering. His research showed that Charles and David [Koch] had outspent what was then the world’s largest public oil company, ExxonMobil, by a factor of three. In a 2010 report, Greenpeace crowned Koch Industries, a company few had ever heard of at the time, the “kingpin of climate science denial.”

By the way, I should say that ExxonMobil has been actively involved in this as well, as a lot of very good recent reporting has showed. But they were outshone and outdone by the Koch brothers.

I will quote again from “Dark Money.”

The first peer-reviewed academic study on the topic added further detail. Robert Brulle, a Drexel University professor of sociology and environmental science, discovered that between 2003 and 2010 over half a billion dollars was spent on what he described as a massive “campaign to manipulate and mislead the public about the threat posed by climate change.” The study examined the tax records of more than a hundred nonprofit organizations engaged in challenging the prevailing science on global warming. What it found was, in essence, a corporate lobbying campaign disguised as a tax-exempt, philanthropic endeavor. Some 140 conservative foundations funded the campaign, Brulle found. During the seven-year period he studied, these foundations distributed \$558 million in the form of 5,299 grants to ninety-one different nonprofit organizations.

It is quite a “Kochtopus.”

The money went to think tanks, advocacy groups, trade associations, other foundations, and academic and legal programs. Cumulatively, this private network waged a permanent campaign to undermine Americans’ faith in climate science to defeat any effort to regulate carbon emissions.

The bottom line is if your faith in climate science is undermined, you have been had by a well-funded, complex, sophisticated scheme of disinformation.

Back to “Dark Money” again.

The cast of conservative organizations identified by Brulle was familiar to anyone who had followed the funding of the conservative movement. Among those he pinpointed as the largest bankrollers of climate change denial were foundations affiliated with the Koch and Scaife families, both of whose fortunes derived partly from oil. Also heavily involved were the Bradley Foundation and several others associated with hugely wealthy families participating in the Koch donor summits, such as the foundations run by the DeVos Family, Art Pope, the retail magnate from North Carolina, and John Templeton, Jr., a doctor and heir to the fortune of his father John Templeton, Sr., an American mutual fund pioneer who eventually renounced his U.S. citizenship in favor of living in the Bahamas, reportedly saving \$100 million on taxes. Brulle found that as the money was dispersed, three-quarters of the funds from these and other sources financing what he called the “climate change counter-movement” were untraceable.

Brulle’s conclusion, as reported by Ms. Mayer, is this:

Powerful funders are supporting the campaign to deny scientific findings about global warming and raise public doubts about the

roots and remedies of this massive global threat. At the very least, American voters deserve to know who is behind these efforts.

But it wasn’t enough for the Koch brothers to have the paid-for, phony science masquerade. You also had to drive politicians to accept the phony science. You had to make politicians willing to participate in the masquerade and put on the phony science costume. To do that, they turned to the mother’s milk of politics: money.

The money was set loose by five Republican justices on the Supreme Court when they decided *Citizens United*. *Citizens United* is described in “Dark Money” as “the polluters['] triumph.” Mayer quotes a defeated candidate the Kochs went after:

There was a huge change after *Citizens United*, when anyone could spend any amount of money, without revealing who they were, by hiding behind amorphous-named organizations, the floodgates opened. The Supreme Court made a huge mistake. There is no accountability. Zero.

The money got loaded into political organizations like Americans for Prosperity, the leading Koch brothers-backed political front group. They waved that money around like a club, touting how they were going to spend \$750 million just in this 2016 election. They told Republicans they would be so “severely disadvantaged” if they crossed them on climate change that they would be in political peril. Do the math. How much more obvious could you get?

Here is how Jane Mayer quotes their own official crowing about their victory. Remember what I said earlier? This is not me making wild allegations. This is them taking credit for what they did.

Tim Phillips gladly took credit for the dramatic spike in expressed skepticism. “If you look at where the situation was three years ago and where it is today, there’s been a dramatic turnaround,” he told the National Journal. . . .

We’ve made great headway. What it means for candidates on the Republican side is “if you . . . buy into green energy or you play footsie on this issue, you do so at your political peril. And that’s our influence. Groups like Americans for Prosperity have done it.”

That is what they say about what they are doing. And don’t think we don’t see that effect in this Chamber. The Koch brothers have had their day, doing their dirty work in the dark. I will give them that. It has been quite a racket, but the truth will come out. It always does.

Jane Mayer is not alone. Academic researchers like Robert Brulle at Drexell, Riley Dunlap at Oklahoma State University, Justin Farrell at Yale University, and Michael Mann at Penn State University are exposing the precise dimensions and functions of this denial machine. Investigative writers like Naomi Oreskes, Erik Conway, Naomi Klein, and Steve Coll are on the hunt. “Merchants of Doubt” is already a movie. Jeff Nesbit’s forthcoming book, “Poison Tea,” about how these big money boys suckered the tea

party down this road, should be illuminating. On the official side, two attorneys general appear to be looking into Exxon's role in this climate denial scheme. In short, what could well be the biggest scam to hit politics since Teapot Dome and Watergate is being unraveled and exposed.

The dirty fossil fuel money has deliberately polluted our American politics, just as their carbon emissions have polluted the atmosphere and oceans. Justice cannot come too soon for these people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENERGY POLICY MODERNIZATION BILL

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I was in the cloakroom listening to my colleague from Rhode Island talk about the issue he is clearly very passionate about relating to our climate and recognizing that in that space, as we think about energy and our energy needs as a nation, our economic security, our energy security, our national security, how that is all tangled and intertwined, I can't help but think we have colleagues from very different perspectives who have stood on this floor over the course of the past couple of weeks, and it seems that one thing we have found some level of consensus on is that it is time to update our energy policies. It has been over 8 years now since we have seen any energy policies that do anything to move us forward as a nation, that work to help us be more energy efficient, be more energy independent, move toward a cleaner energy future, embrace the technologies we have available to us. There is a recognition we need to act together to update our energy policies.

I have come to the floor this evening to speak to where we are in this process of successfully moving an energy modernization bill across the floor of the Senate. We took this up some 2 weeks ago now. I wanted to comment on some of the comments that were actually made on the floor this morning. There was a comment that was made that as Republicans we need to "get to yes" on assistance for Flint.

I have stood on the floor and have made clear there is no doubt in my mind that Flint is the site of a tragedy that should have been, could have been avoided. There is no doubt in my mind that Federal assistance could be provided to help with the city's ongoing crisis, but there is also no doubt in my mind but that this is something where we need to get to yes on a number to help Flint out. We need to get to yes,

and we need to figure out what that right amount is.

It sounds easy, and those of us who are committed to not only addressing the situation, the urgent situation we see in Flint, there is a recognition that there is a broader problem at play when we think about our Nation's infrastructure and our water infrastructures. I wanted to take a few minutes this evening to speak to that and where we are in this process and why this "getting to yes" has perhaps been more problematic than most had hoped.

I remind my colleagues that what we have been debating on the floor is an energy bill. It is a bill that was written by myself as the chairman of the Energy Committee, along with Senator CANTWELL from Washington as my ranking member. It included the Presiding Officer as a member of the committee, along with dozens of other members who serve on the Energy Committee. It has been the result of more than a year of regular process, regular order, within the committee, where we worked to consider ideas from all over the board.

We undertook an effort that some would say you just don't see around here anymore. We started with an agreement, an agreement between the chairman, myself, and the ranking member, and asked: Do we want to send a message this year about what we need to do with energy and our energy policies or do we want to bring about some change? Is it time to update our energy policies after 8 years?

The two of us agreed we wanted to make that change. We recognized that in order to do that, in order to get it through the committee with a good bipartisan vote, in order to get it to the floor, we were going to have to work together. We made that commitment, our staffs made that commitment, and we not only said we were going to do it, we did it.

We started off with a series of oversight hearings that we had in Washington, DC, and around the country, bringing people in, soliciting their ideas. After the oversight hearings, we had six legislative hearings before the committee, going through a host of different initiatives. There were 114 bills, separate bills—some from members of the committee, some from Members who were not serving on the Energy Committee but who had good ideas, and we reviewed them all, considered them as part of the bill we were building, and then we had our markup. We went into 3 days of markup before the Energy Committee. We considered over 50 different measures, 50 different measures from folks within the committee and outside the committee, Republicans and Democrats, urban and rural.

In the committee process, it was full-on. It was an open exchange. It was any good idea, any amendment that you have, if you think you have the votes, let's run it. If you think you don't and

you still want to run it anyway, let's work it. We worked that committee process. We considered 59 amendments within the committee. It was a good process, and because it was good process and it was so inclusive, we got a bill that moved out of the committee 18 to 4. The four dissenting votes were interesting. We had two Republicans who dissented and two Democrats. Even the opposition was bipartisan.

I say this by laying the groundwork for what we have built because I want colleagues to appreciate the substance of the measure we have before us with the Energy Policy Modernization Act. We then came to the floor the first of the year, the first big bill to come to the floor and take up valuable floor time, and I am pleased we were able to come to the floor early. In the time that we have been to the floor, we have dispensed with 38 amendments. Most of those have gone by voice, not because it has been a take-this-or-leave-it approach. A voice vote means it comes by unanimous consent. You have to get consent to get these before the body. We worked through a host of different issues, all over the board—whether it related to advanced nuclear or whether it related to coal research or whether it related to issues as they relate to our public lands. We have been working this throughout this process.

In fact, I think it is important to recognize that even during this time period where it has been quiet on the floor, we haven't heard people talking much about where we are with the Energy bill. Our staffs on the majority side and the minority side have been working together to clear even more amendments that have that support that we could move by voice, almost 30 additional amendments on top of what we have already done.

We are not letting the moss collect and gather as we are trying to deal with the situation that has detracted and distracted this Energy bill, and that is the nature of the Flint issue. I don't want people to think the basis of the bill which brought us here, a bill that would modernize our energy policies, a bill that would help America produce more energy, a bill that would help Americans save money, a bill that would help our Nation with our national security, our energy security, and our economic security, a bill that would help to cement our status as a global energy superpower—it is important we remember why we are here.

Others are remembering that when we left the floor on Thursday with an indeterminate path forward into how we were going to advance the Energy bill, those groups that have been interested in following this debate come to us with concern saying: Wait. Don't stop that forward movement. The Bipartisan Policy Center has sent out a letter urging us to move forward with this Energy Policy Modernization Act. ClearPath has urged us: Please, this is important to us from a clean energy perspective. Bill Gates has put out a

letter on his blog post urging us: Please don't forget that as we are talking about how to resolve this situation for Flint, MI, that we don't forget the importance of the underlying bill we are debating, which is the Energy Policy Modernization Act.

The progress we have made on this bill is critically important. Again, we are working with the ranking member to keep plugging along on all of those issues we have outstanding. We believe we have a path forward for a bipartisan bill, a bill that so many Members of this body have come to the floor and said that this is good, this is important, this is something we need to do.

We are not going to forget that, but in the meantime, what we are dealing with is this plea for assistance, Federal assistance by the people of Flint, MI. As I said last week, I don't fault that request. Coming from a State like Alaska, which has considerable needs of its own when it comes to water infrastructure, in far too many of my communities it is not a situation of aging infrastructure. It is a situation of no infrastructure, no clean water, no safe drinking water.

I understand, but I am increasingly frustrated by where we are now and how the decisions that have been made to date are effectively stopping all activity on an energy bill, even as it becomes perhaps increasingly obvious or clear that the issue related to Flint, the urgency of Flint's situation—the bigger issue we see looming when it comes to our Nation's water infrastructure, that is a problem that demands a level of scrutiny and attention that we as a Congress should give—but is the Energy Policy Modernization Act the right vehicle for what is being sought right now?

I want to make sure that not only colleagues know but people who have been following this issue know that we have been working in good faith toward a solution that will help address the situation in Flint. Many of my Republican colleagues are working with the Senators from Michigan to try to find a good-faith solution. I have been engaged in this from the very get-go. I have been working on this issue, as have many Republican members.

We found some programs out there that make sense for providing assistance. The State revolving fund is one we have looked to and have, along with our staffs, spent considerable hours debating the merits of different approaches and drafting language for them in the hope of being able to resolve scoring issues and generally trying to seek a path forward.

While others were enjoying the Super Bowl on Sunday, my staff was not. Actually, the Senator from Washington and I happened to be on the same airplane when we were coming back from the west coast so we could be here to work on this bill, and we missed the game as well. Our staffs were going back and forth with CBO to determine if the solutions that we had laid down

were going to work. Were they going to meet the scoring issues? Were they going to avoid the blue slip issues? Was it going to be a viable path forward? We have been doing this since day one.

I think it is important to outline these issues to people so that when someone suggests that somehow or other we just need to "get to yes" quickly, they know that there is a range of factors that have complicated our efforts. It doesn't help that the Energy bill that has drawn widespread acclaim for having a very open process has to now try and deal with the situation in Flint, so there hasn't been an open process. In fact, there hasn't been a process. I think that is part of what is complicating this situation.

This is a big issue. There is an urgency to address Flint's situation, which is maybe more specific, but again, this is bigger than Flint. We heard from colleagues on both sides of the aisle about the issues around their respective States and around our country which we are going to have to be dealing with.

We have an amazing, complete process with the Energy bill that we have methodically and consistently—almost over the top—gone through a process, and now we have something that is kind of been airdropped in, to use an expression around here, that is not as easy as people would suggest. It is not something where you can say: Just throw some money at it. We are not helped by attempts to federalize the process, regardless of the Federal Government's share of the responsibility in it. I believe there is a proportionate share where we have to be there to help.

We are not helped by the President's decision not to issue a disaster declaration but instead to grant a much more limited emergency declaration, and then we are not necessarily helped by the President's budget that he laid down today. He didn't request funding for Flint in this massive budget proposal. In fact, the level of funds that we have been looking at that could help Flint—the State revolving funds—have not increased. What we have actually seen is a decrease in the Clean Water Fund. That is not going to help us because we recognize that we have to address those issues as well. Also, we are not helped when they ask for far more Federal dollars than the city of Flint may be capable of spending over the next year. We have been trying to identify and discern what would help.

I had a conversation with the Governor of Michigan to try to discern it. I have talked to the Senators from Michigan, and I have talked to the House Members from Michigan. We have at least four Flint-related amendments that are pending to the Energy bill from the Michigan delegation alone, but again, in terms of the extent of the repairs that need to be made, does it include all of the pipes in Flint? Are they trying to get a corrosion control system in place? Is that it? Do we

have a final estimate for what those repairs will cost and the plan of action that will be required?

I appreciate the response of the Senator from Michigan when there was a little bit of back and forth with the Senator from Texas, saying that in her bill there is a requirement to detail how the money will be spent. I truly appreciate that part of it. We are being put in a situation where we are trying to define the right amount here, and it is important that we get that right. As important as it is for us to get to yes and figure out what we can do to help Flint in a way that is fair to Flint and fair overall, we have to get it right as well.

Again, I was reading some newsclips last night. The New York Times had an article about how all around the country we are seeing other States that are setting up an alarm in terms of situations within their communities—from Pennsylvania to Ohio to California—where there is a need to not only improve the current infrastructure, but there are issues in these communities that have raised a level of concern that we should all be concerned and care about. So how we approach this issue and how we make sure that—in an effort to kind of rush money out the door to Flint alone—we don't put ourselves in a place where we commit to a course of action where the Federal Government pays for all of the costs for local water systems. We can't legislate crisis by crisis, community by community, or pretend that the Federal Government is not already \$19 trillion in debt. We have to do right by this. We want to address the urgency—I want to address the urgency—for the people in Flint, but I also want to make sure we do it right.

I think most Members recognize that our solution is going to have to be national in scope because there are other communities in other States that may also need help. Most Members know that our answers must be responsible in light of our already difficult fiscal situation, and most Members are at least willing to consider the legislation that provides assistance so long as it doesn't violate our Senate rules, the Constitution, or add to the Federal deficit. Again, that is why we are kind of sitting here today, Tuesday evening.

There are a couple of plans that have been viewed as viable because they meet that criteria. They meet the criteria in terms of not adding to the Federal deficit, not violating the rules of the Senate, and not violating our Constitution, and it is interesting that both of those measures are actually measures that come from this side of the aisle.

I note that the majority leader is on the floor, and I will defer to him at his convenience; otherwise, I will continue with my comments.

I laid down an offer last week. The offer would make \$550 million available, \$50 million would be made available through State-revolving grants.

This money could help the people of Flint and other communities that have contaminated drinking water. It gives access to \$500 million in loans. It is fully paid for. It is one of the few viable offsets that we have found within the jurisdiction of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee where I am the chairman, and I think that is part of the issue that we need to be discussing here. It is so important to make sure—as we look to these pay-fors—we can make an agreement on the pay-fors, and I believe this one is viable because I believe it is one we can agree on.

Last week I asked unanimous consent to have this amendment pending for a vote, but that was rejected. The second proposal was one made by Chairman INHOFE, who is the chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction, and last week he also introduced an amendment that was fully paid for. He used funds that are available from an all-but-dormant loan program at the Department of Energy which is used to subsidize the auto industry. We can go back and forth about the merits of that fund, but the fact remains that it would have been a viable pay-for for the measure that Senator INHOFE laid down. It, too, was rejected even though it was effectively an offer to prioritize assistance for the families and the children in Flint over some of the major corporations, and we were told no. That is kind of where we are right now. If you want to know why the negotiations aren't proceeding as quickly and as smoothly as they had hoped, I think that is one of the reasons we are where we are.

The fact is, many of us are willing and trying valiantly, and in many cases desperately, to get to yes, but we can't get to yes on just anything. We cannot accept something that is not paid for. Quite honestly, we can't do something that would jeopardize and doom the underlying Energy bill, and I think we can't get to yes on something that provides more funding than could reasonably be used in the short term or ignores the problems that we are facing in other parts of the country.

We have looked at how we can separate this and how we can work it out as a stand-alone measure. I think it needs to be made a priority. I think Chairman INHOFE, who is on the EPW, has made it one, but I think it needs to be separate and apart from what we are doing on this bipartisan Energy bill which already includes priorities from over 62 Members of the Senate.

I don't think it is too much to ask that our Energy bill be allowed to move forward in the meantime. If we had been able to move forward as we had planned, we would have tucked this legislation away last Thursday, and we would have had a full week to buckle down and figure out a path forward for Flint and for the Nation. Instead, here we are on a Tuesday, we have a recess coming up at the end of the week, and we haven't had an oppor-

tunity to approve these almost 30 amendments that could go by voice. We are kind of at a stall spot.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I will.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I just want to assure the chairman of the Energy Committee that we are not giving up on this bill. It has too much support on a bipartisan basis for us to walk away from it, and I know all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle appreciate the ongoing efforts the Senator has made to deal with the other issue that has arisen here, regrettably right when she was on the verge of achieving an agreement here. I know the Senator from Alaska will stick with it, and I am behind this effort all the way.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I appreciate those comments, and I appreciate the support of the majority leader. I had an opportunity to speak with the minority leader earlier today, and he reiterated the priority of this Energy bill. To my colleagues and those who have been urging us to carry on and continue, know that we are doing exactly that and that I remain committed to not only the Energy Policy Modernization Act, but I am committed to finding a path forward as we deal with the important issue that relates to Flint and also relates to the rest of the Nation when it comes to the security and safety of our water supply.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

INTERNET TAX FREEDOM FOREVER ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, I think many Americans would agree with the following statement: The Internet should remain open and free. Politicians should certainly not try to tax it.

Congress passed a temporary ban on Internet taxes back in 1998. It was an important bipartisan win for the American people, but Congress has never made that ban permanent. In fact, there have been eight different short-term extensions of the Internet tax ban. It is time we made it permanent. It is time we made it permanent.

The bipartisan Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act has 51 cosponsors. It was introduced by the top Republican on the Commerce Committee and the top Democrat on the Finance Committee. In my office we have received many, many messages from Kentuckians who support this measure.

Here is what the bipartisan Internet Tax Freedom Forever Act would do. It would ensure any existing Internet taxes are phased out permanently. It would ensure any new attempts to tax the Internet are prohibited permanently. It would ensure Americans' access to information and online communications remain open and free permanently.

The House already passed this kind of commonsense bipartisan legislation to make the ban on Internet taxes permanent. It is time we did it here in the Senate. The action I am about to take will allow us to have that chance on Thursday of this week.

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report accompanying H.R. 644.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 644, which will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644), to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes, having met, have agreed that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment and the House agree to the same, signed by a majority of the conferees on the part of both Houses.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of December 9, 2015.)

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 644, an act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Chuck Grassley, Shelley Moore Capito, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Thad Cochran, John Thune, John Hoeven, Tim Scott, Lisa Murkowski, Rob Portman, Kelly Ayotte, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived with respect to the cloture motion.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I just filed cloture on the Customs conference report. The House has passed this commonsense bipartisan bill, and it is time for the Senate to do it as well.

MORNING BUSINESS

“I WANT TO LIVE”

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, over nearly four decades of public service, I have long endeavored to protect the rights of the unborn. As I have fought to uphold pro-life values in Congress, I have been inspired by countless individuals who are equally committed to the cause.

Last month, I was particularly moved when I listened to a recording of “I Want to Live”—a song composed by singer-songwriter Russ Marsh. Marsh writes this song from the perspective of an unborn child eager to live and be loved. The lyrics underscore a truth too often overlooked in the debate over abortion—that each unborn child is a living soul.

I ask unanimous consent that this song be printed in the RECORD.

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

“I WANT TO LIVE”—MUSIC AND LYRICS BY
RUSS MARSH

VERSE 1

I want to live. Can't you see my life's begun?
Don't you think I feel the pain? I'm the
helpless one. I want to live to feel the
gentle rain fall upon my face. And to
see the light of day.

I want to live to see your smiling face, have
you hold me in your arms. Don't leave
me here to die. Please take me home.
Won't you give me a chance to have
the things you have

And a life that's full of love.

CHORUS

I want to live to see the morning sun. I want
to live to see my Mommy and Daddy.
Let me live. Don't take my life away.
I want to live to be all that I can be.

VERSE 2

I want you to live. Can't take your life away;
'cause I would feel the pain if you're
not here with me. I want you to live.
Forgive me, won't you please.

You will see the light of day and I'll take
you home with me.

The years have passed. You've seen all that
I have done. My life's a happy one. And
I want to Thank You Mom.

CHORUS

You let me live to see the morning sun. You
let me live to see my Mommy and
Daddy. You let me live. Didn't take my
life away. You let me live to be all that
I can be.

CHILDREN'S CHORUS

I want to live to see the morning sun. I want
to live to see my Mommy and Daddy.
Let me live. Don't take my life away.
I want to live to be all that I can be.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING RAY BISHOP

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of a great Wyoming citizen: Col. Raymond “Ray” Corbett Bishop, retired. Col. Bishop was an experienced leader who devoted his life to serving the country and State he loved.

Ray grew up as part of a military family originally from Douglas, WY. His formative years were spent in a number of States, including Hawaii and Utah. Though he traveled extensively with his parents, Loren and Eleanor, and his two siblings, John and Helen, Ray's roots were firmly planted on Wyoming soil. He returned to the State to attend college at the University of Wyoming. In 1970, he graduated with his bachelor of science degree in ecology and received his commission from the U.S. Air Force ROTC program. This distinct honor became the first in a long line of achievements earned while serving his country.

Ray had a successful career in the U.S. Air Force. He was driven and focused and honorably served his country for over 25 years. He had a distinct talent for flying. Throughout his service, Ray completed two combat tours in Vietnam and logged over 4,100 hours of flight time piloting B-52 and C-7A aircraft. Ray continued his record of leadership with a number of other assignments. He was commander at a number of bases, including 325th Bomb Squadron Commander at Fairchild Air Force Base, Operations Commander at Anderson Air Force Base, and Wing Commander at Castle Air Force Base. He was also a skilled educator, providing training for T38 pilots and serving as the Strategic Air Command Chair at the Air War College in Alabama.

Ray met each new assignment with enthusiasm and fortitude. He earned many accolades during his years of service. In addition to the Air Force Commendation Medal, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross and numerous other Meritorious Service Medals. These accomplishments and his Active-Duty service highlight his extraordinary patriotism.

Following his military career, Ray continued his service in the aviation industry as the director of airports for Kern County, California. He served in this position until 2006, when Wyoming welcomed his return. Settling in Jackson, he became the director of the Jackson Hole Airport. He successfully rose to the challenge of directing the only commercial airport located in a national park. In the years he served as director, Ray brought the airport to new heights of success. Under his guidance, the airport experienced over \$80,000,000 in capital improvements, including a complete renovation and expansion of the main terminal.

Safety was Ray's first priority, and the runway was improved with several safety features that many larger airports have yet to implement. During his tenure, the airport received both airline and FAA accolades and national recognition for the terminal updates. Ray loved Grand Teton National Park, and he was proud of the strong working relationship between the park and the airport's board members that made the airport renovations possible.

Ray retired in late 2014 and decided to remain in the area so that he could

continue to enjoy the scenic beauty of the Jackson Hole area. According to friends, Ray was most at peace when he was in his boat on Jackson Lake. In addition, he was a seasoned triathlete and had been training to run in an international marathon.

Ray is survived by his wife, Debbie, and his children, Brian and Kristina Bishop, Abbey and Mike Donley, and Clark and Christine Bishop. He loved his grandchildren, Megan Bishop, Elise Bishop, and William Donley; his sister, Helen Thompson, and her husband, Fred.

Wyoming flies a little higher because of Ray Bishop's service. We thank Ray for his service to our Nation and Wyoming. We will miss him, but we are confident that his legacy lives on and can be seen by all who visit the Jackson Hole Airport.●

REMEMBERING CLAYTON JAMES

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to remember the life of a great Wyoming citizen, Clayton James. A longtime Jackson Hole resident, Clay was well-loved by all in the community. I am honored to recognize Clay's lifetime of accomplishments.

Born in St. Louis, Clay first felt the call of the West in college. He attended Arizona State University, eventually graduating with a bachelor of science degree in business. He held several jobs during the academic year, but his summers were reserved for the great beauty of Grand Teton National Park. It was here that he first began working for the Grand Teton Lodge Company. During this time, he learned to appreciate the natural beauty of the park, while also gaining firsthand experience in the hospitality industry.

This experience proved useful upon his graduation. He returned to the Grand Teton Lodge Company as a full-time employee. The company was part of the Rockefeller RockResort Company, owned by Laurance Rockefeller. Clay's career in the resort management and development sector was largely the result of his relationship with Rockefeller. Shortly after being hired, he was selected to open a new Rockefeller resort in the British Virgin Islands; thus began a nearly 20-year career of opening, operating, and managing resorts and hotels.

Clay was an outstanding representative for Wyoming's tourism industry. In working with the RockResort Company, Clay travelled extensively, opening resorts across the United States. During one such assignment in Hawaii, he met his future wife, Shay. They were married in 1966. And although they traveled frequently, often with family in tow, Clay never lost his love for the Teton Mountain Range. In 1984, they settled in Jackson Hole permanently, and he again returned to the Grand Teton Lodge Company as the general manager. His love for the resort and his staff was truly remarkable. When he retired in 2006, Clay was

the well-admired president of the company.

Clay was deeply passionate about conservation. He believed that it was possible to preserve the diverse ecosystem in Grand Teton National Park while also welcoming the millions of visitors who came to enjoy its splendors each year. This guiding principle led to his involvement in the transfer of the historic JY Ranch to the National Park Service. Owned by the Rockefeller Estate, the JY Ranch was a parcel of about 33,000 acres that was originally purchased by John Rockefeller, Jr., in the early 20th century. In 2007, Laurance Rockefeller asked Clay to manage this important transition. The project was completed in 2008, and the Laurance S. Rockefeller Preserve was opened in Grand Teton National Park for the public to enjoy. Clay was especially proud of this achievement because it brought so many of his passions together.

Clay's extensive background in hotel management, as well as his experience as a concessionaire in Grand Teton National Park, was especially useful during his service on the Jackson Hole Airport's board of directors. This experience, coupled with his unique perspective, made Clay an effective liaison between the National Park Service and the Jackson Hole Airport. He was instrumental in the design and construction of the airport's terminal renovation and expansion project. With Clay's advocacy, the airport was able to complete all renovations while working with the Park Service to maintain the environmental integrity of Grand Teton National Park.

Clay's penchant for giving back to the community was incredible. He devoted his free time to serving on several local and State boards and committees, each as different as his wide range of interests. He was a proud member of the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve and also served in the Army National Guard. He always strove to improve the quality of life for his family, friends, and the community of Jackson, and his impact will be felt for years to come.

Clay is survived by his wife of 49 years, Shay Orlin James, and his children and their spouses, Scott and Jennifer James and McKenzie and Robert Hammond. He loved his grandchildren Emma and Cole James and Rigdon and Riley Hammond. He also is survived by his brothers and their spouses, several nieces and nephews, and many close family friends.

It is an honor to celebrate Clay James and his extraordinary legacy of community service. He was kind, personable, and a natural leader. I know that the community of Jackson shines brighter because of his special contributions.●

REMEMBERING A. DAVID HAMILL

● Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the life of Ranson

Mayor A. David Hamill, who recently passed away at the age of 71. I first met Dave following my election to the U.S. House of Representatives in 2000, and I came to know him as a passionate advocate for the city of Ranson. We began working together very early in my House tenure, revitalizing Ranson through Federal Brownfields initiatives.

With his height, his booming voice, and his mischievous sense of humor, he certainly cut an impressive figure. And while he was in many ways a larger-than-life persona, his greatest strength was his willingness to listen. He tried to genuinely understand the needs of his constituents and the people with whom he worked. Indeed, his humility was evident in an excerpt from the open letter he wrote to the city last month, sharing his worsening prognosis. He wrote, "I have tried to do what is best for the City of Ranson—sometimes my result may not have been successful as I planned, but it was not for my lack of passion or desire to do the right thing."

Born in Kitchener, Ontario, Dave met his wife, Helen, while working in Macon, GA. Although they married in Canada, Dave would always submit job applications to local employers when he and Helen would return to her hometown of Ranson, WV. They would return to Ranson for good in 1979 when Dave was hired at Abex, in nearby Winchester, VA. Dave rose to become a certified purchasing manager and negotiated purchasing contracts for the company's eight factories in its North American division. When Dave became a U.S. citizen, he almost immediately began his public service career. Beginning with the planning commission, Dave soon became a member of Ranson's city council. In 1987, he was appointed mayor and was subsequently reelected seven consecutive times, most recently in 2013.

Dave will be celebrated for his many accomplishments as mayor, including his work with the Brownfields initiative, the redevelopment surrounding the American Public University System campus, Ranson's annexations for future growth, the city's streetscape projects, Ranson's youth football field, and the Fairfax Boulevard extension project. The list could certainly go on, but to highlight only the accomplishments of the man would be to overshadow Dave's spirit and his dedication to the city he served.

In addition to his wife, Helen, Dave is survived by his three children: Cindy, Melissa, and James; and nine grandchildren. In addition to his public service, Dave was also very active in the United Methodist Church, where he was a lay speaker and lay member to the Methodist Annual Conference.

I will miss Mayor Dave Hamill, as will all who knew him. I am honored to have worked with this talented individual and am proud to have called Dave my friend for more than 15 years. Today I ask my colleagues to join me

in honoring the memory of "Ranson's Champion."●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017—PM 41

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying reports and papers; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations:

THE BUDGET MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT
To the Congress of the United States:

As I look back on the past seven years, I am inspired by America's progress—and I am more determined than ever to keep our country moving forward. When I took office, our Nation was in the midst of the worst recession since the Great Depression. The economy was shedding 800,000 jobs a month. The auto industry was on the brink of collapse and our manufacturing sector was in decline. Many families were struggling to pay their bills and make ends meet. Millions more saw their savings evaporate, even as retirement neared.

But thanks to the grit and determination of the American people, we rescued our economy from the depths of the recession, revitalized our auto industry, and laid down new rules to safeguard our economy from recklessness on Wall Street. We made the largest investment in clean energy in our history, and made health care reform a reality. And today, our economy is the strongest, most durable on Earth.

Our businesses have created more than 14 million jobs over 70 months, the longest streak of job growth on record. We have cut our unemployment rate in half. Our manufacturing sector has added nearly 900,000 jobs in the last six years—and our auto industry just had its best year of sales ever. We are less reliant on foreign oil than at any point in the previous four decades. Nearly 18 million people have gained health coverage under the Affordable Care Act (ACA), cutting the uninsured rate to a record low. Our children are graduating from high school at the highest rate ever. And we managed to accomplish all of this while dramatically cutting our deficits by almost three-quarters and setting our Nation on a more sustainable fiscal path. Together, we have brought America back.

Yet while it is important to take stock of our progress, this Budget is

not about looking back at the road we have traveled. It is about looking forward. It is about making sure our economy works for everybody, not just those at the top. It is about choosing investments that not only make us stronger today, but also reflect the kind of country we aspire to be—the kind of country we want to pass on to our children and grandchildren. It is about answering the big questions that will define America and the world in the 21st Century.

My Budget makes critical investments while adhering to the bipartisan budget agreement I signed into law last fall, and it lifts sequestration in future years so that we continue to invest in our economic future and our national security. It also drives down deficits and maintains our fiscal progress through smart savings from health care, immigration, and tax reforms. And, it focuses on meeting our greatest challenges not only for the year ahead, but for decades to come.

First, by accelerating the pace of American innovation, we can create jobs and build the economy of the future while tackling our greatest challenges, including addressing climate change and finding new treatments—and cures—for devastating diseases.

The challenge of climate change will define the contours of this century more dramatically than any other. Last year was the hottest on record, surpassing the record set just a year before. Climate change is already causing damage, including longer, more severe droughts and dangerous floods, disruptions to our food and water supply, and threats to our health, our economy, and our security.

We have made great strides to foster a robust clean energy industry and move our economy away from energy sources that fuel climate change. In communities across the Nation, wind power is now cheaper than dirtier, conventional power, and solar power is saving Americans tens of millions of dollars a year on their energy bills. The solar industry employs more workers than the coal industry—in jobs that pay better than average.

Despite these advances, we can and must do more. Rather than shrinking from the challenge, America must foster the spirit of innovation to create jobs, build a climate-smart economy of the future, and protect the only planet we have. To speed our transition to an affordable, reliable, clean energy system, my Budget funds Mission Innovation, our landmark commitment to double clean energy research and development funding. It also calls for a 21st century Clean Transportation initiative that would help to put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work modernizing our infrastructure to ease congestion and make it easier for businesses to bring goods to market through new technologies such as autonomous vehicles and high-speed rail, funded through a fee paid by oil companies. It proposes to modernize our busi-

ness tax system to promote innovation and job creation. It invests in strategies to make our communities more resilient to floods, wildfires, and other effects of climate change. And, it protects and modernizes our water supply and preserves our natural landscapes. These investments, coupled with those in other cutting-edge technology sectors ranging from manufacturing to space exploration, will drive new jobs, new industries, and a new understanding of the world around us.

Just as a commitment to innovation can accelerate our efforts to protect our planet and create a sustainable economy, it can also drive critical medical breakthroughs. The Budget supports a new “moonshot” to finally cure cancer, an effort that will be led by the Vice President and will channel resources, technology, and our collective knowledge to save lives and end this deadly disease. It also supports the Precision Medicine Initiative to accelerate the development of customized treatments that take into account a patient’s genes, environment, and lifestyle, as well as the BRAIN Initiative, which will dramatically increase our understanding of how the brain works.

Second, we must work to deliver a fair shot at opportunity for all, both because this reflects American values and because, in the 21st Century global economy, our competitiveness depends on tapping the full potential of every American. Even as we have rebounded from the worst economic crisis of our lifetimes, too many families struggle to reach the middle class and stay there, and too many kids face obstacles on the path to success.

Real opportunity begins with education. My Budget supports the ambitious goal that all children should have access to high-quality preschool, including kids from low-income families who too often enter kindergarten already behind. It also supports States and cities as they implement a new education law that will place all students on a path to graduate prepared for college and successful careers. The bipartisan Every Student Succeeds Act sets high standards for our schools and students, ensures that States are held accountable for the success of all students, including those in the lowest performing schools, spurs innovation in education, helps schools recruit and support great teachers, and encourages States to reduce unnecessary testing. And because jobs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics are projected to grow faster than other jobs in the years ahead, the Budget makes critical investments in math and science. Through a new Computer Science for All initiative, the Budget will expand the teaching and learning of these important concepts across America’s schools, better preparing our Nation’s students for today’s innovation economy.

Higher education is the clearest path to the middle class. By 2020, two-thirds of jobs will require some education be-

yond high school. For our students and for our economy, we must make a quality college education affordable for every American. To support that goal, the Budget strengthens Pell Grants to help families pay for college by increasing the scholarships available to students who take enough courses to stay on track for on-time graduation, allowing students making progress toward their degrees to get support for summer classes, and providing scholarships to help incarcerated Americans turn their lives around, get jobs, and support their families. It also offers two years of free community college to every responsible student and strengthens the American Opportunity Tax Credit.

In addition to preparing students for careers, we must help workers gain the skills they need to fill jobs in growing industries. My Budget builds on the progress we have made to improve the Nation’s job training programs through implementation of the bipartisan Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act. It funds innovative strategies to train more workers and young people for 21st Century jobs. And it doubles down on apprenticeships—a proven pathway to the middle class—and supports a robust set of protections for the health, safety, wages, working conditions, and retirement security of working Americans.

Even as we invest in better skills and education for our workforce, we must respond to dramatic changes in our economy and our workforce: more automation; increased global competition; corporations less rooted in their communities; frequent job changes throughout a worker’s career; and a growing gap between the wealthiest and everyone else. These trends squeeze workers, even when they have jobs, even when the economy is growing. They make it harder to start a career, a family, a business, or retirement.

To address these changes and give Americans more economic security, we need to update several key benefit structures to make sure that workers can balance work and family, save for retirement, and get back on their feet if they lose a job. The Budget supports these priorities by funding high-quality child care, encouraging State paid leave policies, extending employer-based retirement plans to part-time workers, putting us on a path to more portable benefit models, and providing a new tax credit for two-earner families. It also modernizes the unemployment insurance system, so that more unemployed workers receive the unemployment benefits they need and an opportunity to retrain for their next job. And, if that new job does not pay as much initially, it offers a system of wage insurance to encourage workers to rejoin the workforce and help them pay their bills. The Budget includes tax cuts for middle-class and working families that will make paychecks go further in meeting the costs of child care,

education, and saving for retirement. It builds upon the demonstrated success of the Earned Income Tax Credit by expanding it for workers without children and non-custodial parents.

Providing opportunity to all Americans means tackling poverty. Too many Americans live in communities with under-performing schools and few jobs. We know from groundbreaking new research that growing up in these communities can put lifelong limits on a child's opportunities. Over the past few years, we have made progress in supporting families that were falling behind. For example, working family tax credits keep more than 9 million people—including 5 million children—out of poverty each year, and the ACA provides access to quality, affordable health care to millions. Nevertheless, we need to do more to ensure that a child's zip code does not determine his or her destiny. Improving the opportunity and economic security of poor children and families is both a moral and an economic imperative.

The Budget funds innovative strategies to support this goal, including helping families move to safer neighborhoods with better schools and more jobs, revitalizing distressed communities to create more neighborhoods of opportunity, preventing families experiencing a financial crisis from becoming homeless, and ensuring that children have enough to eat when school is out for the summer. It also supports efforts to break the cycle of poverty and incarceration through criminal justice reform.

Finally, as we work to build a brighter future at home, we must also strengthen our national security and global leadership. The United States of America is the most powerful nation on Earth, blessed with the finest fighting force in the history of the world.

Still, this is a dangerous time. We face many threats, including the threat of terrorist attacks and violent extremism in many forms. My highest priority is keeping the American people safe and going after terrorist networks. That is why my Budget increases support for our comprehensive strategy to destroy the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), in partnership with more than 60 other countries, by eliminating its leadership, cutting off its financing, disrupting its plots, stopping the flow of terrorist fighters, and stamping out its vicious ideology. If the Congress is serious about winning this war and wants to send a message to the troops and the world, it should specifically authorize the use of military force against ISIL.

The Budget also sustains and builds the strength of our unmatched military forces, making the investments and reforms that will maintain our Nation's superiority and ensure our advantage over any potential adversary. It also makes investments to ensure that our men and women in uniform, who sacrifice so much to defend our Nation and keep us safe, get the sup-

port they have earned to succeed and thrive when they return home.

Cybersecurity is one of our most important national security challenges. As our economy becomes increasingly digital, more sensitive information is vulnerable to malicious cyber activity. This challenge requires bold, aggressive action. My Budget significantly increases our investment in cybersecurity through a Cybersecurity National Action Plan. This Plan includes retiring outdated Federal information technology (IT) systems that were designed in a different age and increasingly are vulnerable to attack, reforming the way that the Federal Government manages and responds to cyber threats, and recruiting the best cyber talent. It will also help strengthen cybersecurity in the private sector and the digital ecosystem as a whole, enhancing cyber education and making sure companies and consumers have the tools they need to protect themselves. But many of our challenges in cybersecurity require bold, long-term commitments to change the way we operate in an increasingly digital world. That is why, to complement these steps, I am also creating a commission of experts to make recommendations for enhancing cybersecurity awareness and protections inside and outside of Government, protecting privacy and empowering Americans to take better control of their digital security.

To ensure security at home, we must also demonstrate leadership around the world. Strong leadership means not only a wise application of military power, but also rallying other nations behind causes that are right. It means viewing our diplomacy and development efforts around the world as an essential instrument of our national security strategy, and mobilizing the private sector and other donors alongside our foreign assistance to help achieve our global development and climate priorities. The Budget supports this vision with funding for effective global health programs to fight HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other illnesses; assistance for displaced persons and refugees, including from Syria; and expanding educational opportunities for girls, among many other critical development initiatives.

As we make these investments to meet our greatest challenges, we are also working to build a 21st Century Government that delivers for the American people. The Budget supports efforts to make the Federal Government more efficient and effective, through smarter IT delivery and procurement, improving digital services, eliminating outdated regulations, and recruiting and retaining the best talent. It also invests in a new approach to working in local communities, one that disrupts an outdated, top-down approach, and makes our efforts more responsive to the ideas and concerns of local citizens. The Budget supports the use of data and evidence to drive policymaking, so the Federal Government

can do more of what works and stop doing what does not.

The Budget is a roadmap to a future that embodies America's values and aspirations: a future of opportunity and security for all of our families; a rising standard of living; and a sustainable, peaceful planet for our kids. This future is within our reach. But just as it took the collective efforts of the American people to rise from the recession and rebuild an even stronger economy, so will it take all of us working together to meet the challenges that lie ahead.

It will not be easy. But I have never been more optimistic about America's future than I am today. Over the past seven years, I have seen the strength, resilience, and commitment of the American people. I know that when we are united in the face of challenges, our Nation emerges stronger and better than before. I know that when we work together, there are no limits to what we can achieve. Together, we will move forward to innovate, to expand opportunity and security, and to make our Nation safer and stronger than ever before.

BARACK OBAMA.
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 9, 2016.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE—TREATIES

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 112-1: Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Swiss Confederation (Ex. Rept. 114-1);

Treaty Doc. 113-4: The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain (Ex. Rept. 114-2);

Treaty Doc. 113-5: Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland (Ex. Rept. 114-3);

Treaty Doc. 112-8: Tax Convention with Chile (Ex. Rept. 114-4);

Treaty Doc. 114-1: Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Japan (Ex. Rept. 114-5);

Treaty Doc. 111-8: Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Luxembourg (Ex. Rept. 114-6);

Treaty Doc. 111-7: Tax Convention with Hungary (Ex. Rept. 114-7); and

Treaty Doc. 112-5: Protocol Amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters (Ex. Rept. 114-8).

The text of the committee-recommended resolutions of advice and consent to ratification are as follows:

[Treaty Doc. 112-1 Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Swiss Confederation]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Swiss Confederation for the Avoidance of Double Taxation With Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Washington October 2, 1996, signed September 23, 2009, at Washington, with a related agreement effected by an exchange of notes September 23, 2009, as corrected by an exchange of notes effected November 16, 2010 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 112-1), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Protocol is self-executing.

Section 3. Conditions

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined

by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109-20) (the “2006 German Protocol”);

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the “Belgium Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 110-3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the “2007 Canada Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 110-15);

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the “2009 France Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 111-4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

[Treaty Doc. 113-4 The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion With Respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, and a related Memorandum of Understanding signed on January 14, 2013, at Madrid, together with correcting notes dated July 23, 2013, and January 31, 2014 (the “Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 113-4), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions of section 3.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Protocol is self-executing.

Section 3. Conditions

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109-20) (the “2006 German Protocol”);

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the “Belgium Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 110-3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the “2007 Canada Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 110-15); or

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the “2009 France Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 111-4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

[Treaty Doc. 113-5 Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland]

Section. 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 13, 2013, at Warsaw (the “Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 113-5), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 112-8 Tax Convention with Chile]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Chile for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Washington February 4, 2010, with a Protocol and a related agreement effected by exchange of notes February 4, 2010, as corrected by exchanges of notes effected Feb-

ruary 25, 2011, and February 10 and 21, 2012 (the “Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 112-8), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 114-1 Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Japan]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Government of Japan for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and a related agreement entered into by an exchange of notes (together with the “proposed protocol”), both signed on January 24, 2013, at Washington, together with correcting notes exchanged March 9 and March 29, 2013 (the “Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 114-1), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions of section 3.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

Section 3. Conditions

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109-20) (the “2006 German Protocol”);

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the “Belgium Convention”) (Treaty Doc. 110-3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the “2007 Canada Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 110-15); or

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the “2009 France Protocol”) (Treaty Doc. 111-4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of

the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

[Treaty Doc. 111-8 Protocol Amending Tax Convention with Luxembourg]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed on May 20, 2009, at Luxembourg with a related agreement effected by exchange of notes also signed on May 20, 2009 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 111-8), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 111-7 Tax Convention with Hungary]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Hungary for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed at Budapest February 4, 2010, with a related agreement effected by exchange of notes on February 4, 2010 (the "Convention") (Treaty Doc. 111-7), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

[Treaty Doc. 112-5 Protocol Amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention on Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters, done at Paris May 27, 2010 (the "Protocol") (Treaty Doc. 112-5), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

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. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2514. A bill to require the Bureau of Justice Statistics to report on recidivism rates of Federal prisoners who are released early, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2515. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure criminal background checks of employees of the military child care system and providers of child care services and youth program services for military dependents; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2516. A bill to revitalize Army arsenals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2517. A bill to require a report on United States strategy to combat terrorist use of social media, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2518. A bill to authorize the use of Ebola funds for Zika response and preparedness; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2519. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2520. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the care provided by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to newborn children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. KIRK, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2521. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to improve the treatment at non-Department of Veterans Affairs facilities of veterans who are victims of military sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2522. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to build partnerships to prevent violence by extremists; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 2523. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for continued energy self-sufficiency at Fort Knox, Kentucky; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2524. A bill to insure adequate use and access to the existing Bolts Ditch headgate and ditch segment within the Holy Cross Wilderness in Eagle County, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2525. A bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2526. A bill to improve the competitiveness of United States manufacturing by designating and supporting manufacturing communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. AYOTTE,

Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 367. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 368. A resolution supporting efforts by the Government of Colombia to pursue peace and the end of the country's enduring internal armed conflict and recognizing United States support for Colombia at the 15th anniversary of Plan Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 369. A resolution affirming the importance of student data privacy and recognizing Digital Learning Day; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 134

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude industrial hemp from the definition of marihuana, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 795

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 795, a bill to enhance whistleblower protection for contractor and grantee employees.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors 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 Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) 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. 1110

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1110, a bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to publish in the Federal Register a strategy to significantly increase the role of volunteers and partners in National Forest System trail maintenance, and for other purposes.

S. 1607

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1607, a bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1775

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1775, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) 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. 2014

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers.

S. 2071

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2071, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize payments for ambulatory surgical centers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2119

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin

(Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2119, a bill to provide for greater congressional oversight of Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes.

S. 2185

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2185, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the fight against breast cancer.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dust Off crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2311, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, to make grants to States for screening and treatment for maternal depression.

S. 2322

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2322, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that over-the-road bus drivers are covered under the maximum hours requirements.

S. 2449

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2449, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to remove limitations on the ability of certain dual citizens from participating in the Visa Waiver Program.

S. 2450

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2450, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to address administrative leave for Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 2473

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2473, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide veterans the option of using an alternative appeals process to more quickly determine claims for disability compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 2474

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Pennsyl-

vania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2474, a bill to allow for additional markings, including the words "Israel" and "Product in Israel," to be used for country of origin marking requirements for goods made in the geographical areas known as the West Bank and Gaza Strip.

S. 2483

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2483, a bill to prohibit States from carrying out more than one Congressional redistricting after a decennial census and apportionment, to require States to conduct such redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2487

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) 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. 2497

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to provide protections for retail customers, and for other purposes.

S. 2505

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) 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. 2506

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2506, a bill to restore statutory rights to the people of the United States from forced arbitration.

S.J. RES. 18

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 18, a joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

S. RES. 99

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 99, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to fulfill its promises of assistance in the case of Robert Levinson, the longest held United States civilian in our Nation's history.

S. RES. 349

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 349, a resolution congratulating the Farm Credit System on the celebration of its 100th anniversary.

AMENDMENT NO. 3107

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3107 intended to be proposed to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3120

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3120 intended to be proposed to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3133

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3133 intended to be proposed to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2514. A bill to require the Bureau of Justice Statistics to report on recidivism rates of Federal prisoners who are released early, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act that has been voted out of the Judiciary Committee.

There is much debate about the wisdom of this bill. That is, like most bills we discuss in this Chamber, a judgment call. But there cannot be debate over the facts of this bill. We have to be very clear on what this bill, by its own text, is designed to do.

Proponents of the bill often invoke four phrases to describe the felons to be released under the terms of the bill: "first-time," "nonviolent," "low-level," "drug possession" offenders. Yet none of these four terms is accurate.

By its text, the bill will apply sentence reductions not to first-time offenders but to repeat offenders—some many times over. These are felons who have made the conscious choice to commit crimes over and over.

By its text, the bill will not just apply to so-called "nonviolent offenders" but to thousands of violent felons and armed career criminals who have used firearms in the course of their drug felonies or crimes of violence.

By its text, the bill will reduce sentences not for those convicted of sim-

ple possession but for major drug traffickers—ones who deal in hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of heroin and thousands of pounds of marijuana. And let's be clear. Drug trafficking is not nonviolent, as the bill's proponents often claim. It is built on an entire edifice of violence, stretching from the narcoterrorists of South America to the drug-deal enforcers on our city streets. If you think dealing drugs on a street corner while armed with a gun is a nonviolent offense, you probably live in a rich suburb or a gated community.

By its text, this bill will apply to felons convicted as juveniles of murder, rape, assault, and other crimes for which they were justly tried as adults.

By its text, this bill will apply to repeat felons whose past crimes include kidnapping, carjacking, armed robbery, and other violent crimes.

By its text, this bill will make eligible for early release into America's communities thousands of drug traffickers and other violent felons. And when we catch such criminals going forward, we will not be able to keep them locked up for the same sentences.

It has been reported that the bill's sponsors are preparing to release a revised bill, one that would address some of the many shortcomings. Regarding this news, I thank the sponsors for acknowledging that the bill as passed by committee does, in fact, apply to serious drug traffickers and other violent felons. I look forward to evaluating the new legislative text, and I hope it addresses these problems. Until then, though, we can only examine more closely the bill as passed by the committee and its consequences.

Make no mistake, the consequences of this bill are all too predictable. Sadly, more than half of released prisoners are rearrested within 1 year, and 77 percent are rearrested within 5 years. We can be sure, then, that we will see more crimes committed by those who might be released early—thanks to this bill. That is indisputable. Those new crimes will wreak havoc on the citizens, families, and communities in each of our States.

This risk is not hypothetical. Sterile statistics do not adequately convey the severity of the threat of mass recidivism. Last month in Columbus, OH, a man named Wendell Callahan brutally killed his ex-girlfriend and her two young daughters. In what was described as a "stabbing rampage," Callahan murdered Erveena Hammonds, her 10-year-old daughter Anaesia, and Anaesia's little sister, 7-year-old Brea.

These murders were an atrocity, and they were completely avoidable. Wendell Callahan walked out of Federal prison in August 2014, but his original sentence should have kept him in jail until 2018. If he had been in jail instead of on the streets, a young family would still be alive today.

Callahan walked out of jail early because the U.S. Sentencing Commission reduced sentences retroactively for

hardened violent criminals like him. The Commission first reduced sentencing guidelines in 2007. It did so again in 2010 and again in 2014. That is three major systemic sentencing reductions in the span of a mere 7 years. The result is that 46,000 Federal convicts will walk from jail early. Wendell Callahan was one among that 46,000. There will be many more like him. While we pray against all odds that none of them go on to commit a triple-murder like Wendell Callahan did—or any other heinous crime—I am afraid our prayers will go unanswered, at least in part.

The U.S. Sentencing Commission is an independent judicial agency that provides uniform sentencing guidelines to judges. Congress didn't have a hand in those sentencing reductions, but with the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act, the Senate would impose a fourth major sentencing reduction within 8 years—one that is deeper and broader than the reductions imposed by the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

This is badly misguided. The Senate would be launching a massive social experiment in criminal leniency without knowing the full consequences of the first three reductions imposed by the Sentencing Commissions. This experiment threatens to undo the historic drops in crime that we have seen over the last 25 years.

That drop in crime rate was no accident. It was the result of higher mandatory minimums put in place in the 1980s, coupled with vigilant policing strategies pioneered by scholars like Jim Wilson and practiced by elected leaders like Rudy Giuliani and other American mayors and law enforcement officials. The combination of mandatory minimums and innovative policing is not a haphazard anticrime strategy. It is one that was reached through tough trial-and-error performed at local, State, and, eventually, the Federal levels. It is one that arose from advocacy that originated in the communities and cities that were hardest hit by the drug trade. It is one that has a proven record of success, not in terms of crime rates but in terms of lives saved, families protected, and communities healed.

The connection between higher mandatory minimums and lower crime is often lost on those unfamiliar with this history or blinded by ideology. For example, in 1997 the New York Times reported: "Crime Keeps On Falling, but Prisons Keep On Filling." One year later, in 1998, the Times added: "Prison Population Growing Although Crime Rate Drops." In 2004 the Times reiterated yet again, just for good measure: "Despite Drop In Crime, An Increase In Inmates." You can't make this stuff up, yet it is real and appears to be all too soon forgotten.

Like most conservative achievements, the reduction in crime over the past generation is built on the hard lessons of experience. We should not lightly abandon the criminal justice wisdom accumulated over decades to the passing fashions of current thinking. We

should not blithely move from a proven strategy of accountability and vigilance to an experimental theory of leniency. We should not trade away concrete, hard-won gains when the results may be devastating to American communities.

The Senate and the American people need to consider any change to our sentencing laws with full information. We need to know if this sentencing leniency bill will return us closer to the days of the 1970s and 1980s, when our cities were besieged by the drug trade and whole communities were being rotted out as a result. We need to debate sentencing changes with all the data available to us, and we need to do this with eyes wide open.

That is why today, together with Senators HATCH, SESSIONS, and PERDUE, I am introducing the Criminal Consequences of Early Release Act. This is a simple but very needed bill. It will require the Federal Government to report on the recidivism rates of the 46,000 Federal inmates to be released early under the Sentencing Commission's reductions, and it will require the same reporting for any prisoners released early under any future reductions mandated by Congress.

The report required by this bill will make clear how many crimes are being committed by released felons who would otherwise still be in prison. It will make clear what types of crimes—from drug trafficking to assault to robbery to murder—are being committed by these felons. It will make clear in which States these crimes are occurring.

Currently this type of data is extremely hard to compile. It is not reported by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and any information we do have comes mostly through anecdotes and sporadic media reports. Full information on the criminal consequences of early release must be published in detail. Before voting on any bill to reduce sentences, Senators need to understand fully the criminal consequences of prior sentence reductions.

To hold Senators accountable for their votes, the American people need to understand how their communities are being affected. When the Federal Government decides to release thousands of violent criminals onto the streets, no legislator or official should be able to plead ignorance. If people are being killed, drugs trafficked, property stolen, and children kidnapped by felons who should have been in prison but instead are out on the streets, then the people in our States and communities deserve to know that.

I want to be clear. To those who support the Sentencing Reform Corrections Act, we are not in full disagreement. Like you, I oppose jail for first-time drug users with no prior record. It is vanishingly rare for such offenders to be prosecuted and jailed in the Federal system, of course, but it remains true that the better option for them—particularly if they are addicts—would

be drug treatment. Like you, I believe that our prisons should not be an anarchic jungle that is a danger to both prisoners and corrections officers. Like you, I believe that those prisoners who will someday complete their sentences and reenter society should be given a chance to rehabilitate and redeem themselves while in prison so they do not commit additional new crimes once they are out of prison. Like you, I do believe there exists a possibility of a manifestly unjust sentence.

So I suggest: Let's work on that bill. Let's work on a bill that identifies and addresses all first-time drug possession inmates in the Federal system but keeps drug traffickers and other violent offenders in prison to finish their sentences. Let's improve prison conditions and give prisoners a shot at redemption and a better life while protecting our communities. If you wish, let's work on a bill to speed the consideration of commutation and pardon applications because, if you want to undo manifestly unjust sentences, we can help the President use his constitutional power of pardon and commutation as a precise scalpel to identify and remedy those very rare cases of manifestly unjust sentences. What we should not do is use the blunt instrument of releasing thousands of violent felons and major drug traffickers back onto our streets early.

The President has a constitutional power to remedy unjust sentences, but you know what power he doesn't have? The power to bring back to life the victims who are murdered by prisoners released early or sentenced inadequately.

In the discussion about the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act, there is much talk about legacy, and, in particular, a legacy of President Obama after he leaves office. If considerations of legacy should factor into the debate, I would close with this observation. Legacies are not necessarily positive. They can be negative and deeply tragic. If supporters of this bill and President Obama are wrong, if this grand experiment in criminal leniency goes awry, how many lives will be ruined and how many dead? How much of the anticrime progress of the last generation will be wiped away for the next?

Those are the questions we must ask as we consider this bill. If we ask them honestly, soberly, and with full information, we will invariably be led to one conclusion: We should not grant early release to thousands of drug traffickers and other violent criminals nor should we shorten their sentences in the future.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2519. A bill to provide for incentives to encourage health insurance coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, it has been more than 5 years since ObamaCare was signed into law. Since

then, the American people have only seen higher health care costs, less access, decreased quality of care, and fewer choices.

Every day I hear from Arizonans who have been forced to give up the health insurance plans they liked and now face skyrocketing monthly premiums and never-ending wait times for appointments. Moreover, I have spoken with small business owners across my State who have been forced to choose between complying with costly government mandates, laying off employees or, worse, closing their doors.

For 5 long years, the American people have been unfairly burdened by this failed law, and the negative effects are only expected to grow. According to the Department of Health and Human Service's own data, 24 insurance plans in the ObamaCare exchanges were expected to see double-digit rate hikes in 2016, while residents of Phoenix, AZ, were expected to see their premiums increase by roughly 19 percent. The highest average premium increase in Arizona was projected to reach a whopping 78 percent.

ObamaCare's numerous failures are well established. Take, for example, the President's broken promise that Americans who liked their health care plans and doctors could keep them; skyrocketing premiums and deductibles; 21 tax increases that both the CBO and the Joint Committee on Taxation predict would be passed on to the consumer; over \$1 billion wasted on failed ObamaCare-established health care co-ops; and an estimated 2 million full-time equivalent workers expected to lose their jobs by 2024, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

For these reasons, a majority of Americans today oppose the President's failed health care law. They are counting on us, their elected representatives in Congress, to fight to fully repeal and replace it. That is why I was proud to partner with my Republican colleagues in sending the first ObamaCare repeal to the President's desk. That is also why I am proud to stand before the Congress today to reintroduce the Empowering Patients First Act along with my friend, the Senator from Georgia, Mr. PERDUE, to replace the President's failed law with health care reform that puts patients and physicians back in charge of their health care decisions. The Empowering Patients First Act is companion legislation to a bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman TOM PRICE that would fully repeal the Affordable Care Act and replace it with solutions that put patients, families, and doctors back in charge of their medical decisions—not Washington bureaucrats.

It is past time for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to wake up to the reality that ObamaCare is the wrong solution to health care reform. Just consider a recent report by the Galen Institute which notes that since the President's health care law was

passed in 2010, it has undergone 70 significant changes through either acts of Congress, administrative actions, or the U.S. Supreme Court. Let me repeat that. ObamaCare has been changed a total of 70 times—in many cases through unilateral action—in order to protect the American people from its damaging effects.

I am as convinced today as I was 7 years ago when I stood on this floor to propose the first Republican amendment to ObamaCare that this law is the wrong approach to health care reform.

The bill I am reintroducing today would create policies that empower patients and doctors to take charge of their health care decisions, including by ensuring no one is priced out of the market, including individuals with pre-existing conditions; building on and expanding health savings accounts and other models to drive down costs; establishing age-adjusted tax credits for health insurance; equalizing tax treatment of employer-sponsored plans and plans purchased by individuals by letting individuals buy health insurance with pretax dollars; enhancing coverage options by letting small business owners band together across State lines through association health plans to create more affordable and comprehensive health care; letting consumers buy insurance across State lines; curbing defensive medicine and lawsuit abuse through tort reform; and making coverage more affordable by enabling individuals to own their insurance, like a 401(k) plan, so they can take it with them across State lines and if they change jobs. That only makes sense.

Americans deserve an alternative to the mandates, high costs, and bureaucratic mess that have been created by ObamaCare. The Empowering Patients First Act would repeal ObamaCare once and for all and replace it with health care reform that gives patients, families, and doctors the power to make medical decisions—not bureaucrats in Washington.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 367—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 367

Whereas a competitive global economy requires workers who are trained in skilled professions;

Whereas, according to the National Association of Manufacturers, 80 percent of respondents indicated a moderate to severe shortage of qualified skilled production employees, including front-line workers such as machinists, operators, craft workers, distributors, and technicians;

Whereas career and technical education (referred to in this preamble as “CTE”) ensures that competitive and skilled workers are ready, willing, and capable of holding jobs in high-wage, high-skill, and in-demand career fields such as science, technology, engineering, mathematics, nursing, allied health, construction, information technology, energy sustainability, and many other career fields that are vital in keeping the United States competitive in the global economy;

Whereas CTE helps the United States meet the very real and immediate challenges of economic development, student achievement, and global competitiveness;

Whereas approximately 14,000,000 students are enrolled in CTE across the country with CTE programs in nearly 1,300 public high schools and 1,700 2-year colleges;

Whereas of the 20 fastest growing occupations—

(1) 10 require an associate’s degree or a degree with fewer requirements;

(2) 13 with the largest numbers of new jobs projected require on-the-job training, an associate’s degree, or a certificate; and

(3) nearly all require real-world skills that can be mastered through CTE;

Whereas CTE matches employability skills with workforce demand and provides relevant academic and technical coursework leading to industry-recognized credentials for secondary, postsecondary, and adult learners;

Whereas CTE affords students the opportunity to gain the knowledge, skills, and credentials needed to secure careers in growing, high-demand fields;

Whereas CTE students were significantly more likely than non-CTE student to report having developed problem-solving, project completion, research, math, college application, work-related, communication, time management, and critical thinking skills during high school; and

Whereas students at schools with highly integrated rigorous academic and CTE programs have significantly higher achievement in reading, mathematics, and science than students at schools with less integrated programs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates February 2016 as “Career and Technical Education Month” to celebrate career and technical education across the United States;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education month;

(3) recognizes the importance of career and technical education in preparing a well-educated and skilled workforce in the United States; and

(4) encourages educators, counselors, and administrators to promote career and technical education as an option to students.

SENATE RESOLUTION 368—SUPPORTING EFFORTS BY THE GOVERNMENT OF COLOMBIA TO PURSUE PEACE AND THE END OF THE COUNTRY’S ENDURING INTERNAL ARMED CONFLICT AND RECOGNIZING UNITED STATES SUPPORT FOR COLOMBIA AT THE 15TH ANNIVERSARY OF PLAN COLOMBIA

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORKER, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the

following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 368

Whereas, on October 1, 2000, President William Clinton, having worked with the support of Republican majorities in the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives, commenced implementation of the first United States foreign assistance package in support of Plan Colombia;

Whereas Plan Colombia has received steadfast commitments from the administrations of Presidents William Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barack Obama, and continuously has been strengthened by broad bipartisan support in the United States Congress;

Whereas the United States Congress, through Plan Colombia, has appropriated more than \$9,000,000,000 in foreign assistance to support initiatives of the Government of Colombia to combat the illicit narcotics trade and terrorism, confront irregular armed actors, advance democratic governance, promote economic growth, defend human rights, and pursue a strategy towards sustainable peace;

Whereas the Government of Colombia, throughout the administrations of Presidents Andrés Pastrana, Álvaro Uribe, and Juan Manuel Santos, has made investments in Plan Colombia and carried out transformational efforts to consolidate domestic security, socioeconomic development, and the rule of law that far exceed those contributions made by the United States;

Whereas the United States and Colombia have forged a resolute bond through the implementation of Plan Colombia, which has been bolstered by the support of hundreds of thousands of Colombian-Americans and their contribution to American life;

Whereas, over the past 15 years, levels of crime and violence have subsided sharply in Colombia, with annual per capita homicide rates declining from 62 per 100,000 people in 1999 to 27 per 100,000 people in 2014, and the annual number of kidnappings decreasing from more than 3,000 in 1999 to less than 300 in 2014;

Whereas the alignment of improved security and sound economic policies has translated into steady growth in Colombia’s Gross Domestic Product, which increased from \$86,000,000,000 in 1999 to more than \$377,000,000,000 in 2014, and led to greater Foreign Direct Investment, which grew from \$1,500,000,000 in 1999 to one of the highest in Latin America at \$16,000,000,000 in 2014;

Whereas the Government of Colombia has made impressive strides in reducing poverty during the last 15 years, with the poverty rate decreasing from 64 percent in 1999 to 28.5 percent in 2014, according to the World Bank;

Whereas, since 1999, the Government of Colombia has expanded the presence of the state across all 32 territorial departments, has contributed to the professionalism of the Colombian judiciary, and has improved the capacity of the Colombian Army, Navy, Air Force, and National Police;

Whereas, in November 2012, the Government of Colombia entered into talks to negotiate an end to the country’s enduring conflict with the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC), a guerilla movement that has ties to the illicit narcotics trade, has kidnapped Colombian and United States civilians, and has been designated by the United States Department of State as a Foreign Terrorist Organization;

Whereas a half-century of conflict has taken a devastating toll on Colombia’s civilian population, has claimed the lives of more than 220,000 people, and has left more than

6,500,000 people internally displaced, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees;

Whereas the internal armed conflict has victimized all Colombians, including women, children, and Afro-descendant and indigenous peoples, and has led to the repeated targeting of leading representatives of civil society, including trade unionists, journalists, human rights defenders, and other community activists;

Whereas efforts to achieve lasting peace in Colombia must address the hardships faced by victims of the armed conflict, as exemplified by the Government of Colombia's Law on Victims and Restitution of Land of 2011;

Whereas the prospects for national reconciliation and sustainable peace in Colombia rely on the effective delivery of justice for victims of the conflict and the ability to hold accountable and appropriately punish perpetrators of serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law; and

Whereas a potential accord between the Government of Colombia and the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) represents an opportunity to end the enduring conflict in Colombia and bring peace to the Americas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the unwavering support of the Government and people of the United States for the people of Colombia in their pursuit of peace and their aspiration to live in a country free of violent conflict;

(2) commends efforts to bring an end to Colombia's enduring internal armed conflict;

(3) maintains its commitment to the victims of Colombia's armed conflict and urges the negotiating parties to forge an agreement that holds accountable perpetrators of serious violations of human rights and international humanitarian law and ensures that they are appropriately punished;

(4) encourages the Government of Colombia to promote informed public debate about the details of a potential peace accord in advance of voter ratification;

(5) encourages the Secretary of State to develop a comprehensive, multiyear strategy to ensure the successful implementation and sustainability of a potential peace accord in Colombia, if such an accord is endorsed by the Colombian people, and further strengthen the close bilateral partnership shared by the Governments of the United States and Colombia; and

(6) reaffirms its commitment to continued partnership between the United States and Colombia on issues of mutual security, including counternarcotics cooperation, combating transnational organized crime, and ensuring justice for those who have caused indelible harm to our populations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 369—AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT DATA PRIVACY AND RECOGNIZING DIGITAL LEARNING DAY

Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 369

Whereas, on February 17, 2016, Digital Learning Day is recognized;

Whereas laws must sufficiently protect the personal information of students as data becomes a form of currency;

Whereas, without sufficient safeguards, student information could end up in the hands of criminals or other bad actors around the world;

Whereas Digital Learning Day highlights the many ways in which technology can enhance the classroom experience;

Whereas teachers and schools use technology and digital information in innovative ways that benefit students;

Whereas schools use electronic records to update student information and transfer electronic records from one school to another school; and

Whereas it is important to maintain student privacy and ensure the data is stored safely and securely: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That Congress recognizes—

(1) the benefits of digital learning and the importance of student privacy; and

(2) that policies should safeguard student data and encourage innovative educational technologies.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3295. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2953 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the bill S. 2012, to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3296. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2109, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop an integrated plan to reduce administrative costs under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3295. Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2953 proposed by Ms. MURKOWSKI to the bill S. 2012, to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle E of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 44. NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL.

(a) NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL CHALLENGE FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1049 of title 54, United States Code (as amended by section 5001(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§104909. National Park Centennial Challenge Fund

“(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to establish a fund in the Treasury—

“(1) to finance signature projects and programs to enhance the National Park System as the centennial of the National Park System approaches in 2016; and

“(2) to prepare the System for another century of conservation, preservation, and enjoyment.

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) CHALLENGE FUND.—The term ‘Challenge Fund’ means the National Park Centennial Challenge Fund established by subsection (c)(1).

“(2) QUALIFIED DONATION.—The term ‘qualified donation’ means a cash donation or the pledge of a cash donation guaranteed by an irrevocable letter of credit to the Service that the Secretary certifies is to be used for a signature project or program.

“(3) SIGNATURE PROJECT OR PROGRAM.—The term ‘signature project or program’ means any project or program identified by the Secretary as a project or program that would further the purposes of the System or any System unit.

“(c) NATIONAL PARK CENTENNIAL CHALLENGE FUND.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund, to be known as the ‘National Park Centennial Challenge Fund’.

“(2) DEPOSITS.—The Challenge Fund shall consist of—

“(A) qualified donations that are transferred from the Service donation account, in accordance with subsection (e)(1); and

“(B) such amounts as are appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury, in accordance with subsection (e)(2).

“(3) AVAILABILITY.—Amounts in the Challenge Fund shall—

“(A) be available to the Secretary for signature projects and programs under this title, without further appropriation; and

“(B) remain available until expended.

“(d) SIGNATURE PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.—

“(1) DEVELOPMENT OF LIST.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall develop a list of signature projects and programs eligible for funding from the Challenge Fund.

“(2) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Natural Resources of the House of Representatives the list developed under paragraph (1).

“(3) UPDATES.—Subject to the notice requirements under paragraph (2), the Secretary may add any signature project or program to the list developed under paragraph (1).

“(e) DONATIONS AND MATCHING FEDERAL FUNDS.—

“(1) QUALIFIED DONATIONS.—The Secretary may transfer any qualified donations to the Challenge Fund.

“(2) MATCHING AMOUNT.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Challenge Fund for each fiscal year through fiscal year 2020 an amount equal to the amount of qualified donations received for the fiscal year.

“(3) SOLICITATION.—Nothing in this section expands any authority of the Secretary, the Service, or any employee of the Service to receive or solicit donations.

“(f) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall provide with the submission of the budget of the President to Congress for each fiscal year a report on the status and funding of the signature projects and programs.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections affected for title 54, United States Code (as amended by section 5001(b)), is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 104908 the following:

“§104909. National Park Centennial Challenge Fund.”.

(b) SECOND CENTURY ENDOWMENT FOR THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 1011 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 101121. SECOND CENTURY ENDOWMENT FOR THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Park Foundation shall establish an endowment, to be known as the ‘Second Century Endowment for the National Park System’ (referred to in this section as the ‘Endowment’).

“(b) CAMPAIGN.—To further the mission of the Service, the National Park Foundation may undertake a campaign to fund the Endowment through gifts, devises, or bequests, in accordance with section 101113.

“(c) USE OF PROCEEDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On request of the Secretary, the National Park Foundation shall expend proceeds from the Endowment in accordance with projects and programs in furtherance of the mission of the Service, as identified by the Secretary.

“(2) MANAGEMENT.—The National Park Foundation shall manage the Endowment in a manner that ensures that annual expenditures as a percentage of the principal are consistent with Internal Revenue Service guidelines for endowments maintained for charitable purposes.

“(d) INVESTMENTS.—The National Park Foundation shall—

“(1) maintain the Endowment in an interest-bearing account; and

“(2) invest Endowment proceeds with the purpose of supporting and enriching the System in perpetuity.

“(e) REPORT.—Each year, the National Park Foundation shall make publicly available information on the amounts deposited into, and expended from, the Endowment.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections affected for title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 101120 the following:

“§101121. Second Century Endowment for the National Park System.”.

(c) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY PROTECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1049 of title 54, United States Code (as amended by subsection (a)(1)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 104910. Intellectual property

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) SERVICE EMBLEM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘Service emblem’ means any word, phrase, insignia, logo, logotype, trademark, service mark, symbol, design, graphic, image, color, badge, uniform, or any combination of emblems used to identify the Service or a component of the System.

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘Service emblem’ includes—

“(i) the Service name;

“(ii) an official System unit name;

“(iii) any other name used to identify a Service component or program; and

“(iv) the Arrowhead symbol.

“(2) SERVICE UNIFORM.—The term ‘Service uniform’ means any combination of apparel, accessories, or emblems, any distinctive clothing or other items of dress, or a representation of dress—

“(A) that is worn during the performance of official duties; and

“(B) that identifies the wearer as a Service employee.

“(b) PROHIBITED ACTS.—

“(1) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE EMBLEM OR UNIFORM.—No person shall, without the written permission of the Secretary—

“(A) use any Service emblem or uniform, or any word, term, name, symbol or device or any combination of emblems to suggest any colorable likeness of the Service emblem or Service uniform in connection with goods or services in commerce if the use is likely to cause confusion, or to deceive the public into believing that the emblem or uniform is from or connected with the Service;

“(B) use any Service emblem or Service uniform or any word, term, name, symbol, device, or any combination of emblems or uniforms to suggest any likeness of the Service emblem or Service uniform in connection with goods or services in commerce in a manner reasonably calculated to convey the impression to the public that the goods or services are approved, endorsed, or authorized by the Service;

“(C) use in commerce any word, term, name, symbol, device or any combination of

words, terms, names, symbols, or devices to suggest any likeness of the Service emblem or Service uniform in a manner that is reasonably calculated to convey the impression that the wearer of the item of apparel is acting pursuant to the legal authority of the Service; or

“(D) knowingly make any false statement for the purpose of obtaining permission to use any Service emblem or Service uniform.

“(2) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates the provisions of paragraph (1), shall—

“(A) in the case of a first violation by an individual, be fined not more than \$5,000 per use, imprisoned not more than 180 days, or both;

“(B) in the case of a subsequent violation by an individual, be fined not more than \$100,000 per use, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both;

“(C) in the case of a first violation by a person or entity other than an individual, be fined not more than \$10,000 per use; or

“(D) in the case of a subsequent violation by a person or entity other than an individual, be fined not more than \$200,000 per use.

“(c) CIVIL CAUSE OF ACTION.—The Attorney General may, on request of the Secretary, bring a civil action in a court of competent jurisdiction, to obtain injunctive or other equitable relief and to recover damages, against a person who manufactures, reproduces, or uses the Service emblem or Service uniform, without the written permission of the Secretary.

“(d) RETENTION OF FUNDS.—Any fines collected under section (b)(2) and any damages collected under subsection (c) shall be retained by the National Park Service, until expended and without further appropriation, for use by System units and programs administered by the Service.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections affected for title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 104908 (as added by subsection (a)(2)) the following:

“§104910. Intellectual property.”.

(d) NATIONAL PARK SERVICE EDUCATION AND INTERPRETATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Division A of subtitle I of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 1007 the following:

“CHAPTER 1008—EDUCATION AND INTERPRETATION

“CHAPTER 1008—EDUCATION AND INTERPRETATION

“Sec.

“100801. Purposes.

“100802. Definitions.

“100803. Interpretation and education authority.

“100804. Interpretation and education evaluation and quality improvement.

“100805. Improved utilization of partners and volunteers in interpretation and education.

“§ 100801. Purposes

“The purposes of this chapter are—

“(1) to more effectively achieve the mission of the Service by providing clear authority and direction for interpretation and education programs that are carried out by the Service under separate authorities;

“(2) to ensure that the public encounters a variety of interpretive and educational opportunities and services during visits to System units;

“(3) to recognize that the Service provides lifelong learning opportunities and contributes to interdisciplinary learning in traditional and nontraditional educational settings;

“(4) to provide opportunities for all people to find relevance in the System; and

“(5) to strengthen public understanding of the natural and cultural heritage and the United States.

“§ 100802. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) EDUCATION.—The term ‘education’ means enhancing public awareness, understanding, and appreciation of the resources of the System through learner-centered, place-based materials, programs, and activities that achieve specific learning objectives as identified in a curriculum.

“(2) INTERPRETATION.—The term ‘interpretation’ means—

“(A) providing opportunities for people to form intellectual and emotional connections to gain awareness, appreciation, and understanding of the resources of the System; and

“(B) the professional career field of Service employees, volunteers, and partners who interpret the resources of the System.

“(3) RELATED AREA.—The term ‘related area’ means—

“(A) a component of the National Trails System;

“(B) a National Heritage Area; and

“(C) an affiliated area administered in connection with the System.

“§ 100803. Interpretation and education authority

“The Secretary shall ensure that management of System units and related areas is enhanced by the availability and utilization of a broad program of the highest quality interpretation and education.

“§ 100804. Interpretation and education evaluation and quality improvement

“The Secretary may undertake a program of regular evaluation of interpretation and education programs to ensure that the programs—

“(1) adjust to the ways in which people learn and engage with the natural world and shared heritage as embodied in the System;

“(2) reflect different cultural backgrounds, ages, education, gender, abilities, ethnicity, and needs;

“(3) demonstrate innovative approaches to management and appropriately incorporate emerging learning and communications technology; and

“(4) reflect current scientific and academic research, content, methods, and audience analysis.

“§ 100805. Improved utilization of partners and volunteers in interpretation and education

“The Secretary may—

“(1) coordinate with System unit partners and volunteers in the delivery of quality programs and services to supplement the programs and services provided by the Service as part of a Long-Range Interpretive Plan for a System unit;

“(2) support interpretive partners by providing opportunities to participate in interpretive training; and

“(3) collaborate with other Federal and non-Federal public or private agencies, organizations, or institutions for the purposes of developing, promoting, and making available educational opportunities related to resources of the System and programs.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for division A of subtitle I of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 1007 the following:

“1008. Education and Interpretation 100801”.

(e) PUBLIC LAND CORPS AMENDMENTS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 203(10)(A) of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1722(10)(A)) is amended by striking “25” and inserting “30”.

(2) PARTICIPANTS.—Section 204(b) of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C.

1723(b)) is amended in the first sentence by striking “25” and inserting “30”.

(3) **HIRING.**—Section 207(c)(2) of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C., 1726(c)(2)) is amended by striking “120 days” and inserting “2 years”.

(f) **VOLUNTEERS IN PARKS PROGRAM.**—Section 102301(d) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “is” and inserting “are”; and

(2) by striking “not more than \$3,500,000” and inserting “such sums as are necessary”.

(g) **NATIONAL PARK FOUNDATION.**—

(1) **BOARD OF DIRECTORS.**—Subchapter II of chapter 1011 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in section 101112—

(i) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The National Park Foundation shall consist of a Board having as members at least 6 private citizens of the United States appointed by the Secretary, with the Secretary and the Director serving as ex officio members of the Board.”; and

(ii) by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) **CHAIRMAN.**—

“(1) **SELECTION.**—The Board shall select a Chairman of the Board from among the members of the Board.

“(2) **TERM.**—The Chairman of the Board shall serve for a 2-year term.”; and

(iii) in section 101113(a)—

(I) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(II) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) **COORDINATION WITH SERVICE.**—Activities of the National Park Foundation under paragraph (1) shall be undertaken after consultation with the Secretary to ensure the activities are consistent with the programs and policies of the Service.”.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 1011 of title 54, United States Code (as amended by subsection (b)(1)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“**SEC. 101122. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subchapter \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2026.

“(b) **USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.**—Amounts made available under subsection

(a) shall be provided to the National Park Foundation for use for matching, on a 1-to-1 basis, contributions (including money, services, or property) made to the National Park Foundation.

“(c) **PROHIBITION OF USE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**—No Federal funds made available under subsection (a) shall be used by the National Park Foundation for administrative expenses of the National Park Foundation, including for salaries, travel and transportation expenses, and other overhead expenses.”.

(B) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections affected for title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 101121 (as amended by subsection (b)(2)) the following:

“§101122. Authorization of appropriations.”.

SA 3296. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2109, to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop an integrated plan to reduce administrative costs under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 10, line 5, insert “for 7 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act” after “each year”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

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

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 9, 2016, at 5 p.m., to conduct a classified briefing entitled “Administration Update on the Way Forward in Syria and Iraq.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 9, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 9, 2016, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FISHERIES, WATER, AND WILDLIFE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Water, and Wildlife of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 9, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, “Federal Interactions with State Management of Fish and Wildlife.”

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on February 9, 2016, at 2:30 p.m.

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

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul Grove:									
Burma	Kyat		1,087.00		440.00				1,527.00
Japan	Yen		1,169.01						1,169.01
United States	Dollar				5,423.10				5,423.10
Jason Wheelock:									
Burma	Kyat		1,087.00						1,087.00
Japan	Yen		1,169.01						1,169.01
United States	Dollar				5,423.10				5,423.10
Senator Lamar Alexander:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Sara Fairchild:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Senator Susan Collins:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Elizabeth McDonnell:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Senator Thad Cochran:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Kay Webber:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Linda Good:									
Italy	Euro		2,275.83						2,275.83
Greece	Euro		732.09						732.09
Patrick Magnuson:									
Japan	Yen		672.75						672.75
United States	Dollar				7,184.80				7,184.80
Michael Bain:									
Japan	Yen		672.75						672.75
United States	Dollar				6,935.60				6,935.60
Senator Brian Schatz:									
Jordan	Dinar		685.96		221.24		91.07		998.27
Germany	Euro		306.15		521.42		145.36		972.93
United States	Dollar				18,399.50				18,399.50
William Rogers:									
Jordan	Dinar		685.96		221.23		91.06		998.25
Germany	Euro		306.15		521.42		145.35		972.92
United States	Dollar				12,957.50				12,957.50
Adam Yezerski:									
Tanzania	Tanzanian Franc		309.00						309.00
Rwanda	Rwandan Franc		297.00						297.00
United States	Dollar				8,039.20				8,039.20
*Delegation Expenses:									
Japan	Yen						1,918.52		1,918.52
Burma	Kyat						1,517.00		1,517.00
Greece	Euro						10,128.00		10,128.00
Italy	Euro						1,522.08		1,522.08
Jordan	Dinar				442.47		182.13		624.60
Germany	Euro				1,042.84		290.71		1,333.55
Total			29,503.18		67,773.42		16,031.28		113,307.88

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, Feb. 1, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jonathan Epstein:									
United States	Dollar				12,000.20				12,000.20
Belgium	Euro		913.95						913.95
*Delegation Expenses:									
Belgium	Euro				1,150.16				1,150.16
David E. Sayers:									
United States	Dollar				17,811.00				17,811.00
Australia	Dollar		1,777.00						1,777.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Australia	Dollar				696.00				696.00
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
United States	Dollar				15,629.50				15,629.50
Greece	Euro		511.27						511.27
Ukraine	Hrynia		293.41						293.41
Germany	Euro		448.22						448.22
Brian McKeon:									
United States	Dollar				11,503.50				11,503.50
Greece	Euro		479.83						479.83
Ukraine	Hrynia		293.75						293.75
Germany	Euro		467.88						467.88
Josh Lucas:									
United States	Dollar				12,099.90				12,099.90
Greece	Euro		539.15						539.15
Ukraine	Hrynia		293.75						293.75
Germany	Euro		448.22						448.22
*Delegation Expenses:									
Greece	Euro						4,356.66		4,356.66
Ukraine	Hrynia						379.06		379.06
Germany	Euro						1,000.47		1,000.47
United Kingdom	Pound				13.34				13.34
Steven Barney:									
United States	Dollar				21,103.08				21,103.08
Israel	Shekel		1,369.64						1,369.64
United Kingdom	Pound		524.01						524.01
James B. Hickey:									
United States	Dollar				21,025.56				21,025.56
Israel	Shekel		1,369.64						1,369.64
United Kingdom	Pound		615.01						615.01
Samantha Clark:									
United States	Dollar				21,071.56				21,071.56
Israel	Shekel		1,369.64						1,369.64
United Kingdom	Pound		615.01						615.01
Jonathan Clark:									
United States	Dollar				21,080.68				21,080.68
Israel	Shekel		1,369.64						1,369.64
United Kingdom	Pound		615.01						615.01
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel				495.90		660.33		1,156.23
United Kingdom	Pound						186.06		186.06

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David E. Sayers:									
United States	Dollar				19,351.00				19,351.00
Japan	Yen		383.47						383.47
Philippines	Peso		1,380.34						1,380.34
Ozge Guzelsu:									
United States	Dollar				24,026.05				24,026.05
Japan	Yen		419.50						419.50
Philippines	Peso		1,386.75						1,386.75
*Delegation Expenses:									
Philippines	Peso						437.23		437.23
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				18,183.00				18,183.00
Turkey	Lira		315.00						315.00
Kuwait	Dinar		265.00						265.00
Qatar	Riyal		584.96						584.96
Hungary	Forint		285.00						285.00
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				25,960.80				25,960.80
Turkey	Lira		355.00						355.00
Kuwait	Dinar		265.00						265.00
Qatar	Riyal		595.00						595.00
Hungary	Forint		278.00						278.00
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				25,783.70				25,783.70
Turkey	Lira		108.00						108.00
Kuwait	Dinar		357.00						357.00
Qatar	Riyal		549.96						549.96
William G.P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				25,932.40				25,932.40
Turkey	Lira		98.00						98.00
Kuwait	Dinar		337.00						337.00
Qatar	Riyal		320.00						320.00
Michael Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				16,700.00				16,700.00
Turkey	Lira		365.00						365.00
Kuwait	Dinar		265.00						265.00
Qatar	Riyal		557.96						557.96
*Delegation Expenses:									
Turkey	Lira				166.38				166.38
Kuwait	Dinar						172.52		172.52
Qatar	Riyal						69.15		69.15
Robert Soofer:									
United States	Dollar				17,936.50				17,936.50
United Kingdom	Pound		1,336.25						1,336.25
France	Dollar		530.30						530.30
Jonathan Epstein:									
United States	Dollar				17,870.50				17,870.50
United Kingdom	Pound		1,465.24						1,465.24
France	Dollar		530.30						530.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Kingdom	Pound						509.20		509.20
France	Dollar				1,745.00				1,745.00
James B. Hickey:									
United States	Dollar				19,268.60				19,268.60
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		990.04						990.04
Qatar	Riyal		389.89						389.89
Kuwait	Dinar		979.36						979.36
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				19,268.60				19,268.60
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		90.04						90.04
Qatar	Riyal		389.89						389.89
Kuwait	Dinar		884.36						884.36
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				19,268.60				19,268.60
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		939.04						939.04
Qatar	Riyal		389.89						389.89
Kuwait	Dinar		889.36						889.36
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				10,897.60				10,897.60
Kuwait	Dinar		669.36						669.36
Samantha Clark:									
United States	Dollar				15,441.30				15,441.30
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		497.53						497.53
William G.P. Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				15,441.30				15,441.30
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		358.43						358.43
Michael Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				11,015.08				11,015.08
Kuwait	Dinar		844.36						844.36
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				52.25				52.25
Qatar	Riyal						108.77		108.77
Kuwait	Dinar						900.00		900.00
Afghanistan	Afghani						923.00		923.00
Ozge Guzelsu:									
United States	Dollar				11,184.60				11,184.60
Myanmar	Burmese Kyat		1,395.00						1,395.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Myanmar	Burmese Kyat						371.50		371.50
David E. Sayers:									
United States	Dollar				14,365.80				14,365.80
Japan	Yen		787.00						787.00
Singapore	Dollar		712.00						712.00
Jason Potter:									
United States	Dollar				14,365.80				14,365.80
Japan	Yen		787.00						787.00
Singapore	Dollar		712.00						712.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Japan	Yen				1,102.75				1,102.75
Senator Tim Kaine:									
United States	Dollar				764.49				764.49
Canada	Dollar		442.90						442.90
Christian Brose:									
United States	Dollar				764.49				764.49
Canada	Dollar		116.00						116.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Ryan Colvert:									
United States	Dollar				764.49				764.49
Canada	Dollar		57.25						57.25
Nicole Porreca:									
United States	Dollar				764.49				764.49
Canada	Dollar		57.25						57.25
*Delegation Expenses:									
Canada	Dollar					9,035.50			9,035.50
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
Christian Brose:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
Iraq	Dinar		122.00						122.00
James B. Hickey:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
Iraq	Dinar		122.00						122.00
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
Iraq	Dinar		5.00						5.00
Craig Abele:									
United States	Dollar				12,634.30				12,634.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
Iraq	Dinar				16,800.00				16,800.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham				243.03				243.03
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				9,207.56				9,207.56
Israel	Shekel		570.00						570.00
Jordan			1,139.67						1,139.67
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				9,340.60				9,340.60
Israel	Shekel		565.00						565.00
Jordan	Dinar		1,164.67						1,164.67
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar				13,764.86				13,764.86
Israel	Shekel		572.00						572.00
Jordan	Dinar		761.11						761.11
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel				374.07		745.80		1,119.87
Jordan	Dinar				293.45		325.04		618.49
Daniel Lerner:									
United States	Dollar				12,082.00				12,082.00
Germany	Euro		520.75						520.75
Total			46,567.21		641,977.32		20,180.29		708,724.82

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, Feb. 1, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Elizabeth Warren:									
Greece	Euro		184.37						184.37
Ukraine	Hryvnia		73.59						73.59
Germany	Euro		150.48						150.48
United States	Dollar				15,629.50				15,629.50
Jonathan Donenberg:									
Greece	Euro		212.25						212.25
Ukraine	Hryvnia		58.48						58.48
Germany	Euro		88.00						88.00
United States	Dollar				16,040.00				16,040.00
Total			767.17		31,669.50				32,436.67

SENATOR RICHARD C. SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
Jan. 11, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Kusai Merchant:									
France	Euro		1,744.00		1,458.10		3,033.00		6,235.10
Total			1,744.00		1,458.10		3,033.00		6,235.10

SENATOR MICHAEL B. ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, Jan. 29, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Quinalty:									
United States	Dollar				2,223.30				2,223.30
Ireland	Euro		791.20						791.20
Jeffrey Farrah:									
United States	Dollar				2,223.10				2,223.10
Ireland	Euro		791.20						791.20
John Branscome:									
United States	Dollar				2,223.10				2,223.10
Ireland	Euro		791.20						791.20
Shawn Bone:									
United States	Dollar				2,223.10				2,223.10
Ireland	Euro		791.20						791.20
Senator Brian Schatz:									
France	Euro		1,173.06						1,173.06
*Delegation Expenses:							608.09		608.09
Dale Hahn:									
France	Euro		1,296.23						1,296.23
*Delegation Expenses:							608.09		608.09
Total			5,634.09		8,892.60		1,216.18		15,742.87

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN THUNE,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
Feb. 2, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Angus King, Jr.:									
United States	Dollar				1,836.50				1,836.50
Ireland	Krona		507.25						507.25
Margaret Williams:									
United States	Dollar				2,419.60				2,419.60
Ireland	Krona		507.25						507.25
*Delegation Expenses:							4,158.00		4,158.00
Senator Al Franken:									
France	Euro		1,371.74						1,371.74
Ali Nouri:									
United States	Dollar				524.00				524.00
France	Euro		2,169.59						2,169.59
*Delegation Expenses:							1,250.92		1,250.92
Total			4,555.83		4,780.10		5,408.92		14,744.85

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources,
Jan. 21, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Euro		780.00						780.00
Senator Sheldon Whitehouse:									
France	Euro		2,796.00						2,796.00
Senator Jeff Merkley:									
France	Euro		1,299.00						1,299.00
Senator Edward J. Markey:									
France	Euro		1,621.00						1,621.00
Senator Cory A. Booker:									
United States	Dollar				5,224.40				5,224.40
France	Euro		1,379.53						1,379.53
Jan Brunner:									
United States	Dollar				1,121.80				1,121.80
France	Euro		5,913.00						5,913.00
Brandon Elsner:									
United States	Dollar				1,112.90				1,112.90
France	Euro		5,165.00						5,165.00
Ann Mesnikoff:									
United States	Dollar				1,602.90				1,602.90
France	Euro		5,709.00						5,709.00
Frederick Illston:									
United States	Dollar				1,602.90				1,602.90
France	Euro		6,522.00						6,522.00
Kathryn R. Thomas:									
United States	Dollar				1,416.10				1,416.10
France	Euro		4,775.00						4,775.00
Emily Enderle:									
United States	Dollar				1,406.90				1,406.90
France	Euro		2,200.00						2,200.00
Aaron Goldner:									
France	Euro		784.00						784.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jeremiah Baumann:									
France	Euro		1,435.00						1,435.00
Adrian Deveny:									
United States	Dollar				610.80				610.80
France	Euro		4,210.00						4,210.00
Ana Unruh Cohen:									
United States	Dollar				1,122.10				1,122.10
France	Euro		5,647.00						5,647.00
Jessica Clowser:									
United States	Dollar				1,652.90				1,652.90
France	Euro		5,300.00						5,300.00
Adam Zipkin:									
France	Euro		1,290.00						1,290.00
Philip Moore:									
United States	Dollar				1,122.10				1,122.10
France	Euro		4,688.00						4,688.00
Brian Clifford:									
United States	Dollar				1,088.20				1,088.20
France	Euro		1,526.00						1,526.00
Amanda Gunasekara:									
United States	Dollar				1,121.90				1,121.90
France	Euro		5,502.00						5,502.00
Ryan Jackson:									
France	Euro		1,559.00						1,559.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro						10,945.04		10,945.04
Total			70,100.53		20,205.90		10,945.04		101,251.47

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE,
Chairman, Committee on Environment & Public Works, Feb. 2, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Dan Coats:									
Italy	Euro		750.02						750.02
Greece	Euro		459.66						459.66
Terry Snell:									
Italy	Euro		722.90						722.90
Greece	Euro		445.98						445.98
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						2,426.14		2,426.14
Shane Warren:									
Philippines	Peso		2,593.68						2,593.68
United States	Dollar				12,938.50				12,938.50
Everett Eissenstat:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,125.40						1,125.40
United States	Dollar				12,535.10				12,535.10
Shane Warren:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,176.51						1,176.51
United States	Dollar				12,535.10				12,535.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						1,512.35		1,512.35
Theda Khrestin:									
Estonia	Euro		689.09						689.09
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,165.42						1,165.42
United States	Dollar				12,271.60				12,271.60
Tyler Brace:									
Estonia	Euro		603.58						603.58
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,521.59						1,521.59
United States	Dollar		45.72		11,428.60				11,474.32
Ryan Evans:									
Estonia	Euro		662.06						662.06
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,094.28						1,094.28
United States	Dollar				12,196.70				12,196.70
*Delegation Expenses:									
United States	Dollar						1,623.37		1,623.37
Total			13,055.89		73,905.60		5,561.86		92,523.35

* Delegation Expenses include transportation, embassy overtime, as well as official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, Feb. 2, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Canada	Dollar		539.21						539.21
United States	Dollar				2,100.29				2,100.29
Senator Christopher Murphy:									
Canada	Dollar		471.63						471.63
United States	Dollar				1,052.53				1,052.53
Jessica Elledge:									
Canada	Dollar		646.63						646.63

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				764.49				764.49
*Delegation Expenses:									
Canada	Dollar						7,744.71		7,744.71
Senator John Barrasso:									
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		244.00						244.00
United States	Dollar				10,615.60				10,615.60
Charles Ziegler:									
United Arab Emirates	Dollar		237.00						237.00
United States	Dollar				9,813.00				9,813.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Afghanistan	Dollar						15,900.00		15,900.00
Senator Bob Corker:									
France	Euro		673.05						673.05
Egypt	Pound		501.84						501.84
United States	Dollar				11,161.10				11,161.10
David Kinzler:									
France	Euro		848.30						848.30
Egypt	Pound		684.00						684.00
United States	Dollar				10,959.30				10,959.30
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro						1,659.00		1,659.00
Egypt	Pound						3,208.00		3,208.00
Senator Cory Gardner:									
Mexico	Peso		627.92						627.92
United States	Dollar				750.59				750.59
Chris Hansen:									
Mexico	Peso		627.92						627.92
United States	Dollar				1,190.49				1,190.49
*Delegation Expenses:									
Mexico	Peso						2,133.00		2,133.00
Senator Ben Cardin:									
France	Euro		1,436.91						1,436.91
Debbie Yamada:									
France	Euro		1,565.88						1,565.88
Josh Klein:									
France	Euro		1,464.91						1,464.91
Adam Sharon:									
France	Euro		1,060.00						1,060.00
United States	Dollar				1,086.90				1,086.90
Senator Christopher Coons:									
France	Euro		1,796.88						1,796.88
United States	Dollar				5,714.40				5,714.40
Allison Schrier:									
France	Euro		1,848.35						1,848.35
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
France	Euro		1,422.91						1,422.91
Robert Diznoff:									
France	Euro		1,554.91						1,554.91
Senator Tom Udall:									
France	Euro		1,621.00						1,621.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro						6,080.83		6,080.83
Amber Bland:									
Finland	Euro		291.12						291.12
Lithuania	Euro		798.12						798.12
Croatia	Kuna		285.28						285.28
United States	Dollar				3,093.80				3,093.80
Curtis Swager:									
Finland	Euro		243.59						243.59
Lithuania	Euro		746.60						746.60
Croatia	Kuna		261.76						261.76
United States	Dollar				3,128.80				3,128.80
Lydia Westlake:									
Finland	Euro		312.54						312.54
Lithuania	Euro		940.97						940.97
Croatia	Kuna		313.76						313.76
United States	Dollar				3,128.80				3,128.80
*Delegation Expenses:									
Lithuania	Euro						1,211.80		1,211.80
Croatia	Kuna						29.07		29.07
Jaime Fly:									
Bahrain	Dinar		289.46						289.46
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		403.27						403.27
Egypt	Pound		412.76						412.76
United States	Dollar				7,707.80				7,707.80
John Rader:									
Bahrain	Dinar		396.00						396.00
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		484.33						484.33
Egypt	Pound		517.00						517.00
United States	Dollar				7,742.80				7,742.80
*Delegation Expenses:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,379.26		1,379.26
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						688.00		688.00
Egypt	Pound						61.00		61.00
Heather Flynn:									
United Kingdom	Pound		1,035.40						1,035.40
France	Euro		978.00						978.00
Belgium	Euro		814.86						814.86
United States	Dollar				3,848.50				3,848.50
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Kingdom	Pound						186.06		186.06
Jodie Herman:									
Israel	Shekel		1,563.77						1,563.77
United States	Dollar				9,751.06				9,751.06
Dana Stroul:									
Israel	Shekel		1,521.89						1,521.89
United States	Dollar				6,399.86				6,399.86
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel						4,433.72		4,433.72
David Kinzler:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		1,000.00						1,000.00
United States	Dollar				12,822.70				12,822.70
Stacie Oliver:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		920.00						920.00
United States	Dollar				12,822.70				12,822.70

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
*Delegation Expenses:									
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						116.00		116.00
David Kinzler:									
Bahrain	Dinar		1,073.17						1,073.17
United States	Dollar				14,073.80				14,073.80
Dana Stroul:									
Bahrain	Dinar		1,073.17						1,073.17
United States	Dollar				13,574.10				13,574.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
Bahrain	Dinar						1,743.00		1,743.00
Carolyn Leddy:									
Burma	Kyat		699.33						699.33
United States	Dollar				5,704.60				5,704.60
Frank Polley:									
Burma	Kyat		621.00						621.00
United States	Dollar				5,669.70				5,669.70
Michael Schiffer:									
Burma	Kyat		747.00						747.00
United States	Dollar				5,771.00				5,771.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Burma	Kyat						9,559.50		9,559.50
Stacie Oliver:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,462.00						1,462.00
United States	Dollar				2,079.20				2,079.20
David Fite:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,126.00						1,126.00
United States	Dollar				2,079.20				2,079.20
*Delegation Expenses:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						753.28		753.28
Margaret Taylor:									
France	Euro		2,561.45						2,561.45
United States	Dollar				1,637.90				1,637.90
Nick Barbash:									
France	Euro		1,918.23						1,918.23
United States	Dollar				1,637.70				1,637.70
Michael Bednarczyk:									
France	Euro		2,628.00						2,628.00
United States	Dollar				1,637.60				1,637.60
*Delegation Expenses:									
France	Euro						1,824.24		1,824.24
Brandon Yoder:									
Colombia	Peso		1,453.81						1,453.81
United States	Dollar				806.60				806.60
Viviana Bovo:									
Colombia	Peso		796.39						796.39
United States	Dollar				848.00				848.00
Nury Gambarotti:									
Colombia	Peso		1,434.10						1,434.10
United States	Dollar				806.60				806.60
Matthew Padilla:									
Colombia	Peso		1,810.00						1,810.00
United States	Dollar				1,130.10				1,130.10
*Delegation Expenses:									
Colombia	Peso						3,083.00		3,083.00
Total			53,807.38		183,111.61		61,793.47		298,712.46

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, Jan. 27, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Ron Johnson:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		272.99						272.99
Honduras	Lempira		191.00						191.00
Senator Tom Carper:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		267.49						267.49
Honduras	Lempira		185.50						185.50
Senator Heidi Heitkamp:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		272.99						272.99
Honduras	Lempira		191.00						191.00
Senator Gary Peters:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		264.65						264.65
Honduras	Lempira		182.66						182.66
Holly Idelson:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		268.13						268.13
Honduras	Lempira		186.14						186.14
Stephen Vina:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		273.68						273.68
Honduras	Lempira		191.68						191.68
Eric Bursch:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		272.99						272.99
Honduras	Lempira		191.00						191.00
Jose Bautista:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		273.67						273.67
Honduras	Lempira		191.69						191.69
Zephrairie Buetow:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		279.48						279.48
Honduras	Lempira		212.16						212.16
Brooke Ericson:									
Guatemala	Quetzal		273.00						273.00
Honduras	Lempira		191.68						191.68
Katie Delacenserie:									
United States	Dollar				1,734.10				1,734.10

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Germany	Euro		1,668.09						1,668.09
Jason Rauch:									
United States	Dollar				4,235.90				4,235.90
Estonia	Euro		453.22						453.22
Ukraine	Hryvnia		659.16						659.16
*Delegation Expenses:									
Honduras	Quetzal						3,982.00		3,982.00
Total			7,414.05		5,970.00		3,982.00		17,366.05

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security and
Governmental Affairs, Feb. 3, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Virginia Boney:									
United States	Dollar				18,512.80				18,512.80
Estonia	Euro		419.51						419.51
Ukraine	Hryvnia		803.69						803.69
*Delegation Expenses:									
Estonia	Euro						114.32		114.32
Ukraine	Hryvnia						426.69		426.69
Senator Amy Klobuchar:									
United States	Dollar				13,712.40				13,712.40
Greece	Euro		552.02						552.02
Ukraine	Hryvnia		297.20						297.20
Asal Sayas:									
United States	Dollar				12,112.70				12,112.70
Greece	Euro		579.90						579.90
Ukraine	Hryvnia		298.34						298.34
Germany	Euro		234.95						234.95
Delegation Expenses: *									
Greece	Euro						2,904.44		2,904.44
Ukraine	Hryvnia						252.71		252.71
Germany	Euro						428.78		428.78
Total			3,185.61		44,337.90		4,126.94		51,650.45

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Jan. 26, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mike Enzi:									
Italy	Euro		1,184.45						1,184.45
Greece	Euro		687.85						687.85
Senator Johnny Isakson:									
Italy	Euro		1,184.45						1,184.45
Greece	Euro		687.85						687.85
David Cleary:									
Italy	Euro		1,178.93						1,178.93
Greece	Euro		687.85						687.85
Tara Shaw:									
Italy	Euro		1,178.93						1,178.93
Greece	Euro		687.85						687.85
Joan Kirchner:									
Italy	Euro		1,178.93						1,178.93
Greece	Euro		687.85						687.85
*Delegation Expenses:									
Italy	Euro						6,065.38		6,065.38
Greece	Euro						6,816.90		6,816.90
Total			9,344.94				12,882.28		22,227.22

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179, agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions,
Jan. 7, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Brian Walsh			926.00						926.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
			550.00		9,389.80				550.00
Emily Harding			926.00						9,389.80
			550.00		9,389.80				926.00
Ryan Tully			926.00						550.00
			550.00		7,983.00				9,389.80
Mike Pevzner			926.00						926.00
			550.00						550.00
					9,386.80				7,983.00
*Delegation Expenses						240.00			926.00
Ryan Kaldahl					13,608.20				550.00
			1,836.08						9,386.80
			535.00						240.00
Nate Adler					13,608.20				13,608.20
			1,836.08						1,836.08
			535.00						535.00
James Catella			256.00						256.00
					14,072.90				14,072.90
Brian Miller			256.00						256.00
					14,072.90				14,072.90
Emily Harding			256.00						256.00
					14,072.90				14,072.90
Ryan Tully			504.00						504.00
			300.00						300.00
			326.00						326.00
Senator Tom Cotton			504.00						504.00
			300.00						300.00
			326.00						326.00
Chris Joyner			504.00						504.00
			300.00						300.00
			326.00						326.00
Christian Cook			504.00						504.00
			300.00						300.00
			326.00						326.00
Senator Richard Burr			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.53			1,305.53
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Senator Tom Cotton			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.53			1,305.53
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Chris Joyner			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.53			1,305.53
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Christian Cook			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.83			1,305.83
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Ryan Tully			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.83			1,305.83
					14,788.85				14,788.85
James Catella			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.83			1,305.83
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Paul Matulic			509.33			14.50			523.83
			1,196.00			109.83			1,305.83
					14,788.85				14,788.85
Total			27,871.47		209,106.45		1,109.41		238,087.33

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RICHARD BURR,
Chairman, Committee on Intelligence, Feb. 4, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE (AMENDED REPORT) FOR TRAVEL FROM JULY 1 TO SEPT. 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Amb. David Killion:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		594.00						594.00
Czech Republic	Koruna		466.00						466.00
Finland	Euro		2,050.00						2,050.00
United States	Dollar				10,024.10				10,024.10
Poland	Zloty		2,600.00						2,600.00
United States	Dollar				9,272.00				9,272.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia					600.17			600.17
Czech Republic	Koruna					1,577.92			1,577.92
Finland	Euro					2,219.52			2,219.52
Poland	Zloty					239.73			239.73
Total			5,710.00		19,296.10		4,637.34		29,643.44

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROGER WICKER,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 11, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Amb. David Killion:									
Israel	Shekel		1,085.00						1,085.00
Jordan	Dinar		900.19						900.19
United States	Dollar				9,769.96				9,769.96
Serbia	Dinar		947.00						947.00
United States	Dollar				11,019.40				11,019.40
*Delegation Expenses:									
Israel	Shekel						2,044.78		2,044.78
Jordan	Dinar								
Serbia	Dinar								
Total			2,932.19		20,789.36		2,044.78		25,766.33

*Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR ROGER WICKER,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe,
Jan. 11, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 9 TO OCT. 17, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
Spain	Euro		421.00						421.00
Israel	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Jordan	Dollar		711.89						711.89
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Senator Tom Cotton:									
Spain	Euro		456.21						456.21
Israel	Dollar		485.21						485.21
Jordan	Dollar		746.03						746.03
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Senator Mike Rounds:									
Spain	Euro		421.00						421.00
Israel	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Jordan	Dollar		718.38						718.38
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Senator Joni Ernst:									
Spain	Euro		421.00						421.00
Israel	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Jordan	Dollar		713.14						713.14
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Dr. Brian Monahan:									
Spain	Euro		442.35						442.35
Israel	Dollar		471.36						471.36
Jordan	Dollar		732.18						732.18
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Thomas Hawkins:									
Spain	Euro		473.66						473.66
Israel	Dollar		502.67						502.67
Jordan	Dollar		763.49						763.49
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		6.00						6.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Stefanie Muchow:									
Spain	Euro		421.00						421.00
Israel	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Jordan	Dollar		711.89						711.89
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		14.00						14.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
Philip Maxson:									
Spain	Euro		421.00						421.00
Israel	Dollar		450.00						450.00
Jordan	Dollar		711.89						711.89
Iraq	Dollar		5.00		2,700.00				2,705.00
Kuwait	Dollar		418.81						418.81
Afghanistan	Dollar		14.00						14.00
Turkey	Dollar		354.00						354.00
*Delegation Expenses:									
Spain	Euro						2,499.17		2,499.17
Israel	New Shekel						10,588.75		10,588.75
Jordan	Dinar						3,073.25		3,073.25
Iraq	Dollar						69.80		69.80
Kuwait	Dinar						518.84		518.84
Afghanistan	Dollar						69.80		69.80
Turkey	Lira						1,081.20		1,081.20

Total	19,281.83	21,600.00	17,900.81	58,782.64
-------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State, under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Jan. 21, 2016.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM OCT. 1 TO DEC. 31, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Thomas Hawkins:									
United States	Dollar				14,788.85				14,788.85
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		382.83						382.83
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,069.50						1,069.50
Total			1,452.33		14,788.85				16,241.18

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Jan. 21, 2016.

DIRECTING DOLLARS TO
DISASTER RELIEF ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 313, S. 2109.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2109), to direct the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to develop an integrated plan to reduce administrative costs under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Directing Dollars to Disaster Relief Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

- (1) the term “administrative cost”—
- (A) means a cost incurred by the Agency in support of the delivery of disaster assistance for a major disaster; and
- (B) does not include a cost incurred by a grantee or subgrantee;
- (2) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Agency;
- (3) the term “Agency” means the Federal Emergency Management Agency;
- (4) the term “direct administrative cost” means a cost incurred by a grantee or subgrantee of a program authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) that can be identified separately and assigned to a specific project;
- (5) the term “hazard mitigation program” means the hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c);
- (6) the term “individual assistance program” means the individual assistance grant program authorized under sections 408, 410, 415, 416, 426, and 502(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174, 5177, 5182, 5183, 5189d, and 5192(a));
- (7) the term “major disaster” means a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170);
- (8) the term “mission assignment” has the meaning given the term in section 641 of the

Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 741); and

(9) the term “public assistance program” means the public assistance grant program authorized under sections 403(a)(3), 406, 418, 419, 428, and 502(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b(a)(3), 5172, 5185, 5186, 5189f, and 5192(a)).

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED PLAN FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COST REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall—

(1) develop and implement an integrated plan to control and reduce administrative costs for major disasters, which shall include—

(A) steps the Agency will take to reduce administrative costs;

(B) milestones needed for accomplishing the reduction of administrative costs;

(C) strategic goals for the average annual percentage of administrative costs of major disasters for each fiscal year;

(D) the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, including the designation of officials responsible for monitoring and measuring performance; and

(E) a timetable for implementation;

(2) compare the costs and benefits of tracking the administrative cost data for major disasters by the public assistance, individual assistance, hazard mitigation, and mission assignment programs, and if feasible, track this information; and

(3) clarify Agency guidance and minimum documentation requirements for a direct administrative cost claimed by a grantee or subgrantee of a public assistance grant program.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the plan required to be developed under subsection (a)(1).

(c) UPDATES.—If the Administrator modifies the plan or the timetable under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report notifying Congress of the modification, which shall include the details of the modification.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than November 30 of each year, the Administrator shall submit to Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the development and implementation of the inte-

grated plan required under section 3 for the previous fiscal year.

(b) REPORT UPDATES.—

(1) THREE YEAR UPDATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the Administrator submits a report under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit an updated report for the previous 3-fiscal-year period.

(2) FIVE YEAR UPDATE.—Not later than 5 years after the date on which the Administrator submits a report under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit an updated report for the previous 5-fiscal-year period.

(c) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report required under subsections (a) and (b) shall contain, at a minimum—

(1) the total amount spent on administrative costs for the fiscal year period for which the report is being submitted;

(2) the average annual percentage of administrative costs for the fiscal year period for which the report is being submitted;

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the plan developed under section 3(a)(1);

(4) an analysis of—

(A) whether the Agency is achieving the strategic goals established under section 3(a)(1)(C); and

(B) in the case of the Agency not achieving such strategic goals, what is preventing the Agency from doing so;

(5) any actions the Agency has identified as useful in improving upon and reaching the goals for administrative costs established under section 3(a)(1)(C); and

(6) any data described in section 3(a)(2), if the Agency determines it is feasible to track such data.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator submits a report to Congress under this section, the Administrator shall make the report publicly available on the website of the Agency.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Johnson amendment be agreed to; the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, 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 amendment (No. 3296) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To sunset the reporting requirement after 7 years)

On page 10, line 5, insert “for 7 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act” after “each year”.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 2109), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2109

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Directing Dollars to Disaster Relief Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “administrative cost”—

(A) means a cost incurred by the Agency in support of the delivery of disaster assistance for a major disaster; and

(B) does not include a cost incurred by a grantee or subgrantee;

(2) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Agency;

(3) the term “Agency” means the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

(4) the term “direct administrative cost” means a cost incurred by a grantee or subgrantee of a program authorized by the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) that can be identified separately and assigned to a specific project;

(5) the term “hazard mitigation program” means the hazard mitigation grant program authorized under section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c);

(6) the term “individual assistance program” means the individual assistance grant program authorized under sections 408, 410, 415, 416, 426, and 502(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174, 5177, 5182, 5183, 5189d, and 5192(a));

(7) the term “major disaster” means a major disaster declared by the President under section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170);

(8) the term “mission assignment” has the meaning given the term in section 641 of the Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 (6 U.S.C. 741); and

(9) the term “public assistance program” means the public assistance grant program authorized under sections 403(a)(3), 406, 418, 419, 428, and 502(a) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b(a)(3), 5172, 5185, 5186, 5189f, and 5192(a)).

SEC. 3. INTEGRATED PLAN FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COST REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall—

(1) develop and implement an integrated plan to control and reduce administrative costs for major disasters, which shall include—

(A) steps the Agency will take to reduce administrative costs;

(B) milestones needed for accomplishing the reduction of administrative costs;

(C) strategic goals for the average annual percentage of administrative costs of major disasters for each fiscal year;

(D) the assignment of clear roles and responsibilities, including the designation of officials responsible for monitoring and measuring performance; and

(E) a timetable for implementation;

(2) compare the costs and benefits of tracking the administrative cost data for major disasters by the public assistance, individual assistance, hazard mitigation, and mission assignment programs, and if feasible, track this information; and

(3) clarify Agency guidance and minimum documentation requirements for a direct ad-

ministrative cost claimed by a grantee or subgrantee of a public assistance grant program.

(b) CONGRESSIONAL UPDATE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall brief the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives on the plan required to be developed under subsection (a)(1).

(c) UPDATES.—If the Administrator modifies the plan or the timetable under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report notifying Congress of the modification, which shall include the details of the modification.

SEC. 4. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than November 30 of each year for 7 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on the development and implementation of the integrated plan required under section 3 for the previous fiscal year.

(b) REPORT UPDATES.—

(1) THREE YEAR UPDATE.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which the Administrator submits a report under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit an updated report for the previous 3-fiscal-year period.

(2) FIVE YEAR UPDATE.—Not later than 5 years after the date on which the Administrator submits a report under subsection (a), the Administrator shall submit an updated report for the previous 5-fiscal-year period.

(c) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Each report required under subsections (a) and (b) shall contain, at a minimum—

(1) the total amount spent on administrative costs for the fiscal year period for which the report is being submitted;

(2) the average annual percentage of administrative costs for the fiscal year period for which the report is being submitted;

(3) an assessment of the effectiveness of the plan developed under section 3(a)(1);

(4) an analysis of—

(A) whether the Agency is achieving the strategic goals established under section 3(a)(1)(C); and

(B) in the case of the Agency not achieving such strategic goals, what is preventing the Agency from doing so;

(5) any actions the Agency has identified as useful in improving upon and reaching the goals for administrative costs established under section 3(a)(1)(C); and

(6) any data described in section 3(a)(2), if the Agency determines it is feasible to track such data.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Administrator submits a report to Congress under this section, the Administrator shall make the report publicly available on the website of the Agency.

JUDICIAL REDRESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 356, H.R. 1428.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1428) to extend Privacy Act remedies to citizens of certified states, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, as follows:

(The part of the bill intended to be stricken is shown in boldface brackets and the part of the bill intended to be inserted is shown in italic.)

H.R. 1428

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Judicial Redress Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PRIVACY ACT REMEDIES TO CITIZENS OF DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.

(a) CIVIL ACTION; CIVIL REMEDIES.—With respect to covered records, a covered person may bring a civil action against an agency and obtain civil remedies, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual may bring and obtain with respect to records under—

(1) section 552a(g)(1)(D) of title 5, United States Code, but only with respect to disclosures intentionally or willfully made in violation of section 552a(b) of such title; and

(2) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 552a(g)(1) of title 5, United States Code, but such an action may only be brought against a designated Federal agency or component.

(b) EXCLUSIVE REMEDIES.—The remedies set forth in subsection (a) are the exclusive remedies available to a covered person under this section.

(c) APPLICATION OF THE PRIVACY ACT WITH RESPECT TO A COVERED PERSON.—For purposes of a civil action described in subsection (a), a covered person shall have the same rights, and be subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual has and is subject to under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, when pursuing the civil remedies described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a).

[(d) DESIGNATION OF COVERED COUNTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, designate a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a “covered country” for purposes of this section if—

(A) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has entered into an agreement with the United States that provides for appropriate privacy protections for information shared for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses; or

(B) the Attorney General has determined that the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has effectively shared information with the United States for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses and has appropriate privacy protections for such shared information.

(2) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, revoke the designation of a foreign

country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" if the Attorney General determines that such designated "covered country"—

(A) is not complying with the agreement described under paragraph (1)(A);

(B) no longer meets the requirements for designation under paragraph (1)(B); or

(C) impedes the transfer of information (for purposes of reporting or preventing unlawful activity) to the United States by a private entity or person.】

(d) DESIGNATION OF COVERED COUNTRY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, designate a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" for purposes of this section if—

(A)(i) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has entered into an agreement with the United States that provides for appropriate privacy protections for information shared for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses; or

(ii) the Attorney General has determined that the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has effectively shared information with the United States for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses and has appropriate privacy protections for such shared information;

(B) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, permits the transfer of personal data for commercial purposes between the territory of that country or regional economic organization and the territory of the United States, through an agreement with the United States or otherwise; and

(C) the Attorney General has certified that the policies regarding the transfer of personal data for commercial purposes and related actions of the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, do not materially impede the national security interests of the United States.

(2) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, revoke the designation of a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a "covered country" if the Attorney General determines that such designated "covered country"—

(A) is not complying with the agreement described under paragraph (1)(A)(i);

(B) no longer meets the requirements for designation under paragraph (1)(A)(ii);

(C) fails to meet the requirements under paragraph (1)(B);

(D) no longer meets the requirements for certification under paragraph (1)(C); or

(E) impedes the transfer of information (for purposes of reporting or preventing unlawful activity) to the United States by a private entity or person.

(e) DESIGNATION OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall determine whether an agency or component thereof is a "designated Federal agency or component" for purposes of this section. The Attorney General shall not designate any agency or component thereof other than the Department of Justice or a component of the Department of Justice without the concurrence of the head of the relevant agency, or of the agency to which the component belongs.

(2) REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may determine that an

agency or component of an agency is a "designated Federal agency or component" for purposes of this section, if—

(A) the Attorney General determines that information exchanged by such agency with a covered country is within the scope of an agreement referred to in subsection (d)(1)(A); or

(B) with respect to a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, that has been designated as a "covered country" under subsection (d)(1)(B), the Attorney General determines that designating such agency or component thereof is in the law enforcement interests of the United States.

(f) FEDERAL REGISTER REQUIREMENT; NON-REVIEWABLE DETERMINATION.—The Attorney General shall publish each determination made under subsections (d) and (e). Such determination shall not be subject to judicial or administrative review.

(g) JURISDICTION.—The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any claim arising under this section.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term "agency" has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(2) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term "covered country" means a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, designated in accordance with subsection (d).

(3) COVERED PERSON.—The term "covered person" means a natural person (other than an individual) who is a citizen of a covered country.

(4) COVERED RECORD.—The term "covered record" has the same meaning for a covered person as a record has for an individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, once the covered record is transferred—

(A) by a public authority of, or private entity within, a country or regional economic organization, or member country of such organization, which at the time the record is transferred is a covered country; and

(B) to a designated Federal agency or component for purposes of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses.

(5) DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—The term "designated Federal agency or component" means a Federal agency or component of an agency designated in accordance with subsection (e).

(6) INDIVIDUAL.—The term "individual" has the meaning given that term in section 552a(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(i) PRESERVATION OF PRIVILEGES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to waive any applicable privilege or require the disclosure of classified information. Upon an agency's request, the district court shall review in camera and ex parte any submission by the agency in connection with this subsection.

(j) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This Act shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, 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 committee-reported amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 1428), as amended, was passed.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 367, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 367) supporting the goals and ideals of Career and Technical Education Month.

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. 367) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

AFFIRMING THE IMPORTANCE OF STUDENT DATA PRIVACY AND RECOGNIZING DIGITAL LEARNING DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 369, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 369) affirming the importance of student data privacy and recognizing Digital Learning Day.

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

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as a fifth generation Montanan and engineer who worked at a cloud computing company for, 13 years, I have seen firsthand the opportunities created by advances in technology. As a father of four, I am aware of the huge role technology plays in our students' lives.

February 17, 2016, is Digital Learning Day. Students around the globe will be using technology to enhance the classroom learning experience. While digital learning offers many benefits, we must sufficiently protect the personal information of our students. Without proper safeguards in place, our children's privacy is at risk, and student data could end up in the hands of criminals and other bad actors. We need policies in place to ensure students' information and electronic records are processed and stored safely and securely.

I am committed to working with my colleagues to harness the power of digital learning while protecting the privacy of our kids.

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. 369) 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,
FEBRUARY 10, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, February 10; 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 until 10:30 a.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. 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 6:06 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 10, 2016, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 9, 2016:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SCOT ALAN MARCIEL, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNION OF BURMA.