



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2016

No. 103

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 5 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, JUNE 27, 2016

The Senate met at 3 p.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.

Almighty God, the way, the truth, and the life, shine Your light upon our lawmakers as they begin a new week. Illuminate their minds with Your wisdom, that they may know what to think and do, refusing to become weary in well-doing. Lord, keep them from straying from Your precepts as they remember that those who walk with integrity walk securely. Teach them the lessons they need to learn so that they will not repeat the mistakes of the past. May they serve this land with competence and faithfulness, never forgetting their accountability to You. Cause them to hear Your words and to follow where You lead.

We pray in Your great 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 (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

ZIKA VIRUS AND VA-MILCON FUNDING BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, combatting the spread of the Zika virus should be a priority for both parties. We worked hard to forge a compromise solution that made \$1.1 billion available to fight this virus. That compromise plan already passed the Senate with unanimous support of Democrats.

We now have a bicameral agreement that provides the exact same compromise level of funding. The House did its job and approved the legislation. The Senate can now do its job to send that legislation down to the President.

Democrats joined Republicans in sounding the alarm about Zika, but now we are at the finish line, and suddenly our friends across the aisle are changing their tune. Here is what the fourth-ranking Senate Democrat recently said:

Families are looking to Congress for action on Zika. It is well past time that we delivered.

So will she help the Senate deliver tomorrow or play partisan politics?

Here is what the third-ranking Senate Democrat recently said: "Every day we wait, every day is increasing the risk that we will have problems with Zika." So will he help the Senate to take action tomorrow or play partisan politics?

The second-ranking Democrat recently said that "the mosquitoes carrying this deadly virus are on the march." So will he help the Senate arrest that march before the Fourth of July or play partisan politics?

Here is what the Democratic leader recently said: "Every day we wait is a

bad day . . . for America and the world." So will he help the Senate pass this \$1.1 billion Zika control funding compromise or play partisan politics and delay action for weeks?

The White House, which recently called for congressional action on Zika by July 4, said:

[T]he time to prepare before Zika begins to spread in the continental United States is rapidly closing. . . . [W]e need some congressional action. We need a sense of urgency and we need it now.

Democrats have tried to claim they weren't involved in negotiations over this legislation, but they were from beginning to end, and the House agreed to the funding level that Democrats supported unanimously.

Democrats have tried to trot out the "war on women" playbook, but this legislation actually provides more resources for women's health services—through hospitals, health departments, community health centers, and other public programs.

Democrats have even tried to claim that this Zika legislation would endanger clean water protections, but it won't. It contains a temporary, targeted compromise that will allow experts to actually get at mosquito control, the root cause of Zika, in an effective way while we wait for a vaccine. The agreement before us is a compromise with input from both parties, and it represents the last chance we will have to address Zika for weeks.

The CDC Director testified that the \$1.1 billion funding level will allow him "to do the things we need to do in the immediate term." He said: "The sooner we get a bill, the better."

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4565

Senate Democrats have already unanimously supported the \$1.1 billion in funding to combat the virus. Voting to block this bill now will delay Zika control funding well beyond the White House's deadlines.

So look, there is no reason Democrats should reverse course now and block funding for Zika control in the midst of mosquito season. There is no reason they should put partisan politics above the health of pregnant women and babies, and there is no reason they should block support for our veterans, either.

The legislation before us will honor commitments to the men and women who have served to protect us. It includes a significant increase for the VA to help improve the quality of health care services and benefits that our veterans have earned, it will enhance oversight and accountability at the VA, and it will help improve quality of life on military bases for soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and their families.

Our men and women in uniform make sacrifices daily on our behalf—sacrifices such as missing special moments with their families, being stationed in distant places far from home, suffering physical wounds they will carry with them long after their service is over.

Sadly, too many of our servicemembers are also burdened by wounds that cannot be seen, such as traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder. We are reminded of their daily sacrifices on this National PTSD Awareness Day.

We know that too many of our veterans and their families are unfortunately all too familiar with the challenges and sorrows this condition can bring. We know too that while our warriors may return home from the battlefield due to effective medevac and trauma care, there is a generation of warriors who will need treatment and support literally for decades to come.

We owe this support to the servicemembers who drove Al Qaeda from Afghanistan and offered the Iraqis an opportunity for a better future. We owe it to each and every veteran who has sacrificed to help keep us safe.

We have an all-volunteer force in this country. The young men and women who sign up to defend our Nation don't ask for very much, but our Nation certainly asks a lot of them. They deserve the benefits, care, and treatment they have earned.

We need to pass the Veterans Affairs and Military Construction funding bill before us as soon as possible.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

ZIKA VIRUS AND VA-MILCON FUNDING BILL

Mr. REID. Madam President, here are just a few brief words on the Zika fund-

ing matter. This conference report is full of poison pills. I will give you just a few of them.

Again, the House Republicans can't help themselves and, of course, the Senate Republicans joined with them. They have to do everything they can to whack Planned Parenthood, and that is what they do in this conference report. They restrict funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood. Can you believe that? And with this Zika problem, who does it affect? Women, and especially pregnant women. It exempts pesticide spraying from Clean Water Act prohibitions and protections, cuts veterans funding by \$500 million, cuts Ebola funding by \$107 million, and cuts ObamaCare by \$543 million.

Listen to this one. Why would they do this? They stick a provision in this that strikes a prohibition that we had placed in the legislation on displaying a Confederate flag. What they have done is just great. Any veterans facility can fly that Confederate flag. Why would they put that in this bill? Of course, it sets a terrible precedent for offsetting emergency spending, and it is missing \$800 million—what a shame.

It is like we are being dared to oppose this legislation. We have no choice.

UNITED KINGDOM EXIT FROM EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. REID. Madam President, last week the voters of the United Kingdom stunned the world by voting to exit the European Union. The vote was close, but ultimately the electorate decided to sever the United Kingdom from the European Union, an organization they had been a part of for 40 years. I was disappointed by that decision, but it was their decision.

In the aftermath of last week's referendum, I was pleased that President Obama reaffirmed our special relationship with the United Kingdom and our strong ties to the European Union. Regardless of what happens with the so-called Brexit, the United States will continue to maintain strong alliances with Britain and Europe.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS AND FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. REID. Madam President, this morning the Supreme Court issued its final set of rulings for the year for the Court's term.

I was pleased with two of the Court's decisions especially. One pertains to women's health and one with keeping guns away from dangerous individuals. In the Court's 5-to-3 decision in *Whole Woman's Health*, the Court affirmed the constitutionally protected rights of American women. The Justices struck down a Texas law that limited women's rights and restricted access to health care.

Infringing upon the rights of Texans has become all too familiar for the gov-

ernment of Texas. It is a theme they have, and they play that theme all the time and they march to it. The State has pushed laws to restrict people's right to vote. In the last general election, 600,000 Texans couldn't vote because they didn't have the right ID. The State has pushed laws to restrict people's right to vote and limit victims' ability to recover deserved damages after accidents and medical malpractice. The law restricting women's care was just the most recent example of Texas trampling on the rights of its people. So I am pleased that the Supreme Court struck down Texas' unconstitutional attempt to deprive women of health care.

In another ruling today, the Supreme Court also whacked the National Rifle Association. By a 6-to-2 decision, the Justices upheld a Federal law that bans people convicted of domestic violence from buying guns.

While the Supreme Court did its job today, I must note the many other missed opportunities in the Court over the last 4 months. Due to the Republicans historic obstruction of Judge Merrick Garland's nomination, the United States' highest Court is often deadlocked. The Court has been unable to provide definitive rulings on some of the most important issues of our time because there are not nine Justices, but only eight, due to the Republicans' obstruction. For the first time in the history of the country in a year right before an election, the Republicans have decided they are not going to allow a vote on a Supreme Court nomination. It has never happened before. By denying President Obama the chance to fill this vacancy, the Republicans have infected the Supreme Court with the same gridlock they have perfected with the Congress for the last 7 years. Eight Supreme Court Justices are simply not enough to serve the American people and the rule of law.

One Drake University constitutional law professor wrote recently:

With just eight members, the Court cannot resolve certain controversial cases. It can split 4-4, which means there is no uniform rule of law.

All told, the Supreme Court has deadlocked on seven important cases and issues.

Because of Senate Republicans, employers can deny women who are working access to contraception coverage; because of Senate Republicans, companies can misuse the private information of consumers; and because of Senate Republicans, lenders can discriminate against married women.

There are others. The most glaring example, though, was from last Thursday when the Court was unable to reach a majority decision on an important immigration case. It issued a one-sentence ruling: "The judgment is affirmed by an equally divided Court."

As former Solicitor General Walter Dellinger wrote, "Seldom have so many hopes been crushed by so few words."

These immigration programs would take millions of people out of the shadows and allow them to work and pay taxes.

Today also happens to be the third anniversary of the Senate passing a bipartisan bill to fix our Nation's immigration system by a heavy vote of 68 to 32. It was bipartisan in nature.

Three years ago, after the bill passed in the Senate, Republicans used their obstructionist ways to prevent a vote in the House of Representatives. Today, those same Republicans are obstructing a ninth Supreme Court Justice in order to kill the President's Executive actions on immigration.

Latino and immigrant families across this Nation are watching who stands with them and who stands against them. It is very easy to see. It is appalling Republicans are willing to prevent the Court from doing its job as they wait for a Donald Trump-appointed nominee. That is startling.

Just yesterday, the Republican leader refused to say if he thinks Donald Trump is qualified to be President. His silence speaks volumes.

Republicans continue to block our justice system from functioning so this unqualified bigot can reshape the Supreme Court in his image.

It is time for Republicans to stop fomenting partisanship and gridlock, even in the Nation's highest Court. America deserves a fully functioning Supreme Court.

MINERS PROTECTION ACT AND FLOODING IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. REID. Madam President, just last month, we marked the 70th anniversary of President Truman's historic promise to mine workers. President Truman promised lifetime health and pension benefits to coal miners in exchange for their continuing the back-breaking work which built our Nation, but today tens of thousands of miners and widows are in imminent danger of losing not part of their health benefits but all of them—100 percent of them. Their modest pension benefits are also at serious risk. A promise that has been kept for 70 years is about to be violated, broken. We shouldn't let that happen.

There is a bipartisan solution that would avert this crisis. Senator MANCHIN wants the Senate to vote on his Miners Protection Act, and so do I.

If it is up to Senator MCCONNELL, we are not going to be given a chance to vote before the recess, despite the gravity of the situation.

Just 2 weeks ago, more than 3,000 miners and their supporters rallied in Lexington, KY, urging congressional action. The Senate should vote on the Miners Protection Act before we recess for the political conventions that will be held this summer.

A promise made by President Truman is a promise we should keep because a promise made should be a promise kept.

Madam President, as we work to help these families, we should not forget the many West Virginians who are fighting the devastating flooding that has ravaged that State. Twenty-five have died. Our hearts go out to the victims and the families of those affected by the devastation.

I have spoken several times to the senior Senator from West Virginia. It is hard to comprehend, in that sparsely populated State, that a storm can take 25 people—men, women, and children—and still there are people unaccounted for.

On behalf of the whole Senate, I express the care and feeling we have for West Virginia. I want to be available to do everything I can to help the people of West Virginia. Senator MANCHIN is a great advocate, and we will listen closely to follow his direction and guidance.

We also thank the many brave police officers, firefighters, EMTs, and members of the National Guard who worked hard to prevent further loss of life. Many more people came close to dying. We have seen it all on television. We have read the stories. It is very frightening that something like that could happen.

I was told by Senator MANCHIN this is a 1,000-year storm—not a 100-year storm but a 1,000-year storm. Nothing like this has ever happened before—9 inches of rain in just a matter of hours. It is devastating for the people of West Virginia but also for our country.

Will the Chair please 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 until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from West Virginia.

FLOODING IN WEST VIRGINIA AND MINERS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, first, I thank Senator REID and all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the compassion and the outpouring of love they have given to our State. They have expressed that to me. I also thank Senator REID and my Democratic colleagues for their commitment to the Miners Protection Act. I also thank Senator CAPITO, my colleague and counterpart in the Senate. She is committed to working on that.

There is a promise that was made, and basically the miners kept their promise. By their hard work, they have kept the country supplied with energy that has been needed. These are mostly

the widows who are depending on these pensions—they are modest pensions—but basically it is their health care. They will get a 90-day notice July 15 if we do nothing, and we cannot do that. We cannot do that to any part of this great country and especially those who have worked so hard and given so much.

I thank him for that commitment. I hope my colleagues, all of my colleagues, my Republican and Democratic colleagues, will help me keep this commitment and this promise to our miners.

Madam President, I wish to tell you a little bit about what is going on in my State of West Virginia. I came back last night.

I was driving home Thursday night, and I got caught in Virginia driving on I-81. This deluge of water started. Rains I have never seen before started while I was on I-81. After getting into Lexington, VA, I cross over to I-64 to come in. Then from I-64 I go through Clifton Forge and Covington. I have traveled quite a bit that way, and I have never seen water like this.

The river started coming across the road. We were able to get through that. I was asked what my first impression was coming into West Virginia. I was driving, and we came into West Virginia on the Greenbrier County side and White Sulfur Springs. The beautiful Greenbrier is there as soon as you come into our State.

The exit where you get off where you go to the Greenbrier and go into White Sulfur Springs, I looked down, and it was totally under water—all those stores where I used to stop, see people, and the little filling stations, but the eeriest thing I ever saw in my life was all these cars were under water and their lights were on. So you know if their lights were on, someone was driving. For the water to come up that quickly that you couldn't even turn your car off, you just jumped out or tried to swim out or tried to get out the best you could, that totally gives you an idea of how fast this river rose. No one has ever seen anything like it. Then I saw a trailer, a person's home, floating down the road, the middle of the road. I am thinking, "What happened?"

Then I drove and got into Charleston, and as Senator REID said, 9 inches. We had up to 10 inches of rain in some parts, 9 inches to 10 inches in this area of southeastern West Virginia that really got hit. All of the counties got hit pretty good, but a few of them really got inundated.

If you can imagine 9 inches to 10 inches of rain happening within a 2-hour to 6-hour period, that would be almost like turning on all the hoses you have in your house, put them in the house, turn them on full force, and let them run for that period of time and see what happens. It is just unbelievable.

Of the things we saw, first, people didn't have insurance because they

didn't think they were in the flood plain. Next, people who were in the flood plain couldn't afford the insurance. Next, most of our State—the hills and the beautiful mountains we have, over the years most of the people—the last 100 years or 200 years—have built in the valleys because that is where the river had meandered and kind of cut out the flat, level places. They are asking: Why would they build? I mean, this is where they have always been.

Over the years, they have either dredged the rivers, they have done different things, they built floodwalls. We build dams to hold back the water in certain areas, which has helped tremendously. Now we have to rethink how we do this. We need the Army Corps of Engineers. We need the Federal Government.

I thank President Obama and his Chief of Staff, Denis McDonough. I called Denis, and I said: Denis, if we have ever needed help, we need it now.

He said: Senator, I can assure you the President is ready to help as quickly as you put your declaration in.

Never have we had a declaration signed and turned around. I thank the President, I thank Denis, and the entire White House staff for the compassion they have had for my State and all the people of our State—as hard as it has been hit.

We have three counties with a declaration: Nicholas, Kanawha, and Greenbrier—which was really hit hard, which is where the Greenbrier Resort is. Those counties are getting immediate relief. We have 500—going to 700—National Guardsmen coming in.

I flew over the area. I visited all the areas by car on Friday. I flew over on Saturday. I have never seen an entire town, an entire city, inundated with water, the entire town. In Rainhill, WV, there wasn't a dry spot in the town so everybody got caught.

Somebody asked about the warning. We did give warning. There is never—if you have lived all your life, your parents and grandparents before you, and you heard stories about water coming this fast and this quick—let me give you one example, and you can imagine. I went to White Sulfur Springs yesterday in the little town—you have seen the pictures on television, the house that was floating and on fire. I was there, right where it happened.

Before I got to that house, I was walking down, and there was a lady standing there. There were foundations of a few homes, but there was no sign of a home anywhere. She had flowers and a cross. And that was where her husband, who was a grandfather, and her—but her husband, her daughter, and two grandchildren were in the house. They got clear to the attic, and the house left. One of the kids was safe, but one little child, the mother of the children—their daughter—and the grandfather were lost in the flood. She was standing there and looking.

What do you say? There are no words to replace that. You see these types of tragedies.

Then I walked across the bridge. This gentleman came and got me he said: Come on, JOE. I want you to come over and see. I walked up across the bridge where another—not large—stream comes out of the mountains, but it had become a raging river. That is where the forks basically join. When what happens, sometimes the hydrology will back up, and it creates a dam. The water creates a dam of itself.

I walked in there, and it looked like a bomb had gone off. There were three or four homes completely burning that had exploded. He lived in one of them. He said, when this all hit, the water, he ran as quickly as he could with his wife. He hid up in a cave on the hillside. They thought everybody had gotten out. A lady did get out, and she came back into the home.

Well, when the houses shifted, it broke the gas line. When the gaslines broke, they filled the homes with natural gas. When the houses shifted, then the power lines broke loose. The sparks from the power line hit the gas and blew up the homes, like explosions going off. The woman in the house got caught. She couldn't get back out—she went back in to get something. She went up into the attic and was burned over 70 percent of her body. Then she jumped into a tree and hung in a tree for 3 hours to 4 hours until they rescued her. I understand she passed away yesterday.

We have 23 confirmed dead. We thought there were 25 because two people were swept away and reported missing. They found them alive so we are at 23, but we still have 5, 6, or 7 unaccounted for.

The tragedy continues. Love is outpouring from people. First, I thank FEMA. FEMA is there doing an unbelievable job and the National Guard. We are going to depend on the Corps of Engineers. It is going to take everything we have to put our State back together where the people can have some infrastructure. Maybe we can change some streams to the point where they will move differently or water will flow a little differently, hopefully, but this is where you need your Federal Government. The State—no State, the Presiding Officer's beautiful State of Iowa—couldn't do it by itself. We cannot do it by ourselves. I thank FEMA, first responders, and Red Cross. We have everybody in.

If people want to know how they can help, there are people who say: I don't have any money, but I want to come to your State. We need you. We need volunteers who want to work. We need people who have resources who want to help with their money and donations. If they want to send goods, we need that too. We need everything. People have lost everything.

To give you an example, Jim Justice, the owner of the Greenbrier Resort—the Greenbrier is closed indefinitely right now. The big golf tournament that was planned, the Greenbrier Classic, has been cancelled. And the golf

course is pretty much running to a certain extent, but they will come back. So Jim, basically, has opened up the Greenbrier to anybody who is homeless right now—anyone who has lost their home. He said: We will give you a place to stay for free; come to the Greenbrier. We don't have hot water—because of their boiler systems—but we have water. So that is what they are able to do, and he has been so gracious to do that.

I tell people, if they can get on my Web site, manchin.senate.gov—at the front of our Web site, you can see everything you can do. It will take you to the site where you can get in contact with the right people to help our State.

Again, I know of the love and compassion people have, and I have watched people come together. Our little State has always taken care of itself. When you ask people “Do you have a place to stay?” they will say “Well, I am staying with my neighbor up here” or they are doing this or that. So that has been fantastic. But the outpouring of love and compassion from around the country has been unbelievable.

We have a lot of famous West Virginians. Brad Paisley has called, and he wants to do a benefit for the State, and that is going to be tremendous. John Kruk and just so many people—so many people have stepped up to the plate.

From the bottom of my heart, I want to say thank you to everybody for reaching out. It is not over. I just called home, and it is raining again. We have flash flood warnings out for the same areas again. But I talked to the weather channel, and we are not supposed to get anywhere near what we got before, so we will be able to handle this, I hope. But it basically just stops the cleanup, and it is devastating to see what has happened.

So I say thank you to all my colleagues and everyone who has sent their heartfelt, sincere condolences for our State and for the people who have lost their lives. That is the first and foremost thing. We can replace everything else, but we can't replace those dear little kids, parents, and grandparents who were lost.

With that, Madam President, I say thank you from the great State of West Virginia, and on behalf of my colleague Senator CAPITO, I thank you very much. We have both been on the trail working together and trying to get all the relief we can, and just keep us in your prayers.

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

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

PUERTO RICO

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, this week the Senate is going to consider legislation dealing with the crisis in Puerto Rico. The legislation before us, the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management, and Economic Stability Act, has already passed the House by a vote of 297 to 127. We are taking it up this week because Puerto Rico needs help. They have needed help for quite a while, but now we are running out of time to help that island territory of the United States, with 3.5 million American citizens living there.

Last week, I spoke to the Governor of Puerto Rico, Governor Alejandro Garcia Padilla. He explained just how dire the situation is in Puerto Rico.

On July 1, a \$2 billion debt payment is due. That is just a few days from now. There is no way Puerto Rico can make that payment; they don't have the cash. When they don't make that payment, there will be a race to the courthouse to see which hedge fund will sue Puerto Rico first and squeeze out whatever money is left on the island, even if it comes at the expense of the 3.5 million American citizens living there today. Hedge funds have already filed for injunctive relief in the Southern District of New York. In their court documents, they state that they should be paid first in times of scarcity, even ahead of what the government needs for essential services—essential services such as schools, hospitals, law enforcement. In our conversation, the Governor told me that if the hedge funds are granted injunctive relief, then he is not going to be able to pay the salaries of law enforcement and other first responders.

This isn't abstract; this is real. Hospitals have already closed. The Secretary of the Treasury, Jacob Lew, earlier cited in a letter that hospitals can only order dialysis treatments for premature newborns in intensive care. How? Only if they pay cash on demand daily. Let me repeat that. They are so strapped that hospitals can only order the dialysis that is essential for life for premature newborns who are in intensive care—they can only order it if they are paid in cash for that dialysis on a daily basis.

This legislation the House has crafted is certainly not the bill I would have crafted, but it is the only bill we have before us that could get by the tea party element in the House of Representatives. It is not ideal, particularly with regard to the labor provisions in the bill and the way the oversight board is organized.

We will hear bipartisan attacks against the bill in the Senate, well meaning and well felt, but this legislation is needed to get Puerto Rico out of this immediate crisis. Several of us would like to see more in the bill to address the health care disparities in Puerto Rico and the lack of economic growth on the island, but, as Governor Padilla has said, if someone is holding you up at gunpoint and says "Your

wallet or your life," you are going to hand him your wallet because the alternative is worse.

That is where we are. We have to compromise. That is the nature of Congress. That is how the Framers set it up. That is how we get things done. We don't get the perfect, the ideal; we have too many other opinions to consider when we put legislation together.

If we pass this legislation, once we get out of this immediate crisis, then all of us must work as hard as we can to push for solutions for some of the other long-term problems Puerto Rico has. This isn't the end; it is just the beginning. At the same time, we should not look past the achievements in this bill. At the end of the day, this is why this Senator comes down on the side of supporting this legislation. It provides for an orderly process for Puerto Rico to adjust all of its debts, including its general obligation bonds. Those are the bonds held by the hedge funds that are asking for injunctive relief, that they be the ones to get the money first, looking to squeeze the life out of the territory. They are the ones that ran all those ads saying this bill was a bailout. Have you seen those ads? Isn't it interesting that they are the only ones who have the money to run ads saying it is a bailout. Who is paying for the ads? The hedge funds that hold the bonds because they want their money first, to the exclusion of essential services on the island. Well, this is not a bailout. It doesn't spend any taxpayer money. But it has the hedge funds on Wall Street running scared because they know that if this passes, they won't be able to get special treatment and they won't be able to starve Puerto Rico of its vital resources.

Just consider the suffering going on in Puerto Rico. Nearly 200 schools have closed. Public transportation services have been cut. Payments to gasoline suppliers have been delayed, causing vendors to stop supplying gasoline to emergency vehicles like ambulances and fire trucks. Schools have had to cut services to special needs kids. Eighty percent of the businesses in San Juan's main business district have closed.

This isn't something we can continue to debate ad infinitum. Real people are suffering now. Every day we go without providing some sort of relief, more harm is done to the people of Puerto Rico. We are out of time. We need to act. And this bill is the only bill moving. I ask my colleagues to support the bill and send it to the President as soon as possible because, as the Governor said, the alternative is worse.

Might I also add that since this Senator comes from a part of the country—Florida, Central Florida, the Orlando area—where there is such a concentration of citizens who have moved from the island—there is one of the highest concentrations of Puerto Ricans in the United States right in the Orlando area. What is happening is that as the island deteriorates as far as

all of its essential services—doctors can't get paid, the people do not have the essential services for life, the health, welfare, and happiness of people—what is happening is that the professional people are picking up roots and moving to the mainland United States. A good number of them are coming to my State. We are glad to have them, but look what is happening: The very people who will help Puerto Rico come out of this financial and health care crisis—by the way, with Zika piled on top of it, with huge percentages of the population already infected with the Zika virus, that is all the more compounding the problems of the people of the island. This is why we have to act.

I have a letter from the Department of the Treasury to our majority leader—from the Secretary of the Treasury—that outlines some of the island's medical woes, talking about the island's doctors in the neonatal intensive care unit. In order to get the drugs for dialysis, they have to get cash every day in order to deliver those services.

I also have Governor Alejandro Garcia Padilla's letter to me, stating why he supports the legislation. I might also say that another Member of the Government—the delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, whom we call Congressman PEDRO PIERLUISI and is of a different party than the Governor—likewise strongly supports this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD those two letters.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, DC, June 27, 2016.

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

DEAR MR. LEADER: Puerto Rico is in crisis, and its only hope for recovery and growth is legislation that authorizes the tools necessary for better fiscal management and a sustainable level of debt. Early in June, the House passed a compromise bill, with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, that will give Puerto Rico the tools to recover without any federal spending. The Senate should take up the matter immediately. Delay will only jeopardize the ability of Congress to conclude its work before July 1, a critical deadline Puerto Rico's leadership has publicly highlighted for months.

On July 1—only four days from now—the crisis in Puerto Rico will ratchet up to an even higher level. Puerto Rico has \$2 billion in debt payments coming due that day, including payments on constitutionally prioritized debt on which Puerto Rico has not previously defaulted. In the event of default, and if creditor lawsuits are successful, a judge could immediately order Puerto Rico to pay creditors over essential services such as health, education, and public safety. This could force Puerto Rico to lay off police officers, shut down public transit, or close a hospital. Even a retroactive stay on litigation passed by Congress a few days later would not reverse such a court order. This is one of many reasons Congress must act before July 1. Creditors are hoping to gain the protection of legal judgments as quickly as possible,

and this could impair Puerto Rico's chances of getting on a path to stability and eventual growth.

The people of Puerto Rico are already suffering, as I saw firsthand on my most recent visit there. About 80 percent of businesses have closed in the Plaza de Diego, once the heart of San Juan's business district. Doctors at the island's only neonatal intensive care unit described how they can order dialysis treatment for premature newborns only if they pay cash-on-demand daily for lifesaving drugs. While we do not know the full ramifications if Congress fails to act before the end of the month, we know for certain that it is the 3.5 million American citizens who live in Puerto Rico who will be further harmed.

Congress must do more in the future to address long-term economic growth and Medicaid inequalities in Puerto Rico, but doing nothing now to end the debt crisis will result in a chaotic, disorderly unwinding with widespread consequences. Some well-funded creditors are working hard to delay legislative action this week, even if it comes at the expense of the Puerto Rican people. I urge Republicans and Democrats to come together in the Senate as you have before to help our fellow citizens, and get a bipartisan bill to the President's desk before July 1.

Sincerely,

JACOB J. LEW.

ESTADO LIBRE ASOCIADO DE
PUERTO RICO GOBERNADOR,
San Juan, PR, June 22, 2016.

Hon. BILL NELSON,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: I write to request that you vote in favor of the Puerto Rico Oversight, Management and Economic Stability Act (PROMESA) before the end of the month. On July 1, 2016, more than \$1 billion in general obligations and Commonwealth guaranteed bonds are due. We do not have the cash to make those payments. A default of that magnitude, without the automatic stay granted by PROMESA, will affect our ability to pay our public workers, including police, nurses and therapists for special needs children.

For more than a year we have been requesting Congress to provide us the tools we need to restructure all the debt. The House of Representatives passed PROMESA, which provides Puerto Rico a solution to its decade-long economic crisis. Although imperfect and intrusive to Puerto Rico's autonomy, it is the only alternative available to reach a sustainable level of debt. PROMESA also protects us from all creditor litigation. The fiscal crisis we inherited does not leave us any options.

The 3.5 million United States citizens on the island are threatened by a debt crisis that can disrupt essential public services such as health, security and education. As Governor, I am responsible for protecting the safety and well-being of the people of Puerto Rico. PROMESA is just the first step in what will be Puerto Rico's long road to recovery. I urge you to approve PROMESA before July 1st, 2016.

Sincerely,

ALEJANDRO J. GARCIA-PADILLA,
The Governor of the Commonwealth of
Puerto Rico.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I will close by saying that we can't let these people dangle there anymore. We have to come to the aid of our fellow American citizens. Let's remember that when it comes to time of war, Puerto Rico provides some of the bravest military people we have. Let's re-

member they serve this Nation honorably. Now let's try to help them.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, we will soon vote on a bill that would provide funding for a coordinated response to the Zika virus—a virus that has already ravaged many parts of Latin America and places like Puerto Rico. Over the past few weeks, our Democratic friends have repeatedly stressed the urgency of this matter. And the summer months coming are likely to bring us more mosquitoes, which, of course, are the primary vector that carries this virus. Thankfully, in the United States, no one who has contracted the Zika virus has done so through a mosquito; it has been from people traveling to Central and South America, who have been bitten there—at least that is according to most current statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. We know they are coming, and we need to act with dispatch.

I know many of our friends across the aisle were very eager to get this done because they came down and made unanimous consent requests for \$1.9 billion. As you will recall, the Senate passed an appropriation for \$1.1 billion, and the only difference between the House and Senate was whether this would be deficit spending or whether it would actually be offset or paid for, which was the House's position. I think the House had the better argument. If we could pay for it, that would be ideal, but I think everybody agrees we need to get moving quickly to protect our communities.

Of course, the people most vulnerable to the Zika virus are women of childbearing age. If a mosquito carrying Zika were to bite you, you might not even notice it or you might feel as though you have had a little flu symptom for a day and then it would go away. We simply don't know enough about how long the virus is retained in the body, so even if a woman isn't pregnant when she is bitten, the fact that she was bitten and is of childbearing age and what that might mean is an unknown. It is frightening, particularly if you are a woman of childbearing age.

I hope we will act with dispatch. I know it is not fast enough for some of our colleagues who wanted us to do this without the usual conference committee with the House to try to reconcile differences, but we need to get this done. It is surprising now to hear some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they actually plan to filibuster this legislation, and the President apparently is indicating he might veto it. I am really interested to hear how they arrived from point A to point B, having taken the position several weeks ago that we ought do it im-

mediately, and now, once it has come to fruition, saying we can simply blow it up, that it is not good enough, and not complete our work here.

It really is unfortunate. I hope cooler heads prevail. This country is on the verge of a public health crisis, and talking to Governor Abbott in Texas and also the public health officials there, I know they are very concerned about what this means. And I am sure, like the preceding speaker from Florida—Florida, Louisiana, and Texas are some very temperate, warm weather regions and are particularly vulnerable to this particular type of mosquito and this virus, but it could spread to other parts of the country, too, unless we act with dispatch tomorrow to approve this conference report and to get this bill to the President's desk and to get the money to the researchers and the people trying to develop a vaccine, which ultimately may be the ultimate tool in the toolbox so the people can be vaccinated so that, for example, women who are of childbearing age don't have to worry about the possibility of acquiring this disease or what it might mean to their unborn child.

We need to make sure the doctors and the researchers and other public health officials on the front lines get the resources they need. The good news is that—taking some advice from the Senate and the House, Republicans, in particular—the President decided to reprogram \$589 million left over in the Ebola account. They did that a few weeks ago. As of earlier this month, only \$40 million of that \$589 million has been obligated. There is a cushion there, but I think we should be careful about acting complacently when it comes to dealing with this particular crisis, or impending crisis.

For the President and some of our colleagues who have been insistent that we act on this now to say “We are going to filibuster it” or “The President will actually veto it” is really pretty hard to get your head around, unless you conclude it is completely disingenuous and irresponsible. I would like to give our colleagues a little more credit than that. I am anxious to hear how they have changed their position so dramatically from just a few weeks ago.

We will vote on this proposal tomorrow, and I hope that cooler heads will prevail and our colleagues will vote to support it, so we can quickly get the urgent resources needed to those public health services that are studying the virus, working on prevention—including mosquito eradication, which is an important part of this—as well as creating a vaccine.

The minority leader, in particular, spent a considerable amount of time on the floor stressing how dire the need is to fund Zika prevention efforts. He and the rest of his caucus will have a clear choice. They can either play politics at the expense of the mothers and the children across the country, or they can simply decide to do the right thing and support the bipartisan Zika bill.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, on another matter, the Senate has been discussing the need to respond to terrorist threats within our own borders. To recap, this isn't about people traveling from the United States to the Middle East and returning or people coming from the Middle East to the United States. It is about that, but primarily what we are worried about in Orlando is the radicalization of an American citizen by propaganda, poisonous propaganda being issued by the Islamic State, and that falls in a fertile field with particularly susceptible individuals like the shooter in Orlando.

That is one reason it is so important we complete our work on the Commerce-Justice-Science appropriations bill. It keeps many of our counterterrorism efforts going by funding those who are on the frontlines, such as the FBI and other law enforcement. I hope we can get that legislation completed, too, and in so doing underscore our commitment to those public servants who defend the homeland.

We can't lose sight of the heart of the problem: a lack of any coherent plan to defeat ISIS and a foreign policy missing direction and leadership from the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

Over the past few days, it has become even clearer that not even those in the Obama administration are onboard with his short-sighted and reckless policies. First, more than 50 diplomats sent an internal protest memo to harshly criticize the President's Syria policy. You can find that draft version of the memo online. It is four frank pages, decrying Obama's failed wait-and-see-approach to Syria, from some of those who have been most involved with the policy.

The New York Times was forced to admit the number of signatures on it, 51, was "extremely large, if not unprecedented." I wish I had time to read the full memo aloud here, but let me quote from a few paragraphs—actually, from the final paragraph. It says:

The status quo in Syria will continue to present increasingly dire, if not disastrous, humanitarian, diplomatic, and terrorism-related challenges. For five years, the scale of these consequences has overwhelmed our efforts to deal with this conflict; the United States cannot contain the conflict with current policy. . . . [W]e firmly believe it is time the United States, guided by our strategic interests and moral convictions, lead a global effort to put an end to this conflict.

What an indictment of the leadership of the White House by people who are part of the Obama administration. I am grateful that these diplomats opted to stand up and be counted and tell the truth for our own security as well as those in the Middle East who are suffering so much. The administration's policies—really, their inaction—have languished for 5 years with all signs pointing to a much needed course correction. Still, even after the redlines were crossed by Syria's murderous dic-

tator and as the supposed JV team of terrorists are exporting deadly violence into our own country, the White House views its policies in a positive light. It is not just these diplomats working in the State Department of President Obama who are raising red flags.

Recently the CIA Director agreed with them while testifying before the Senate Intelligence Committee. He admitted we are further away from a diplomatic solution in Syria than a year ago, largely because of Russia's involvement in propping up the regime of Bashar al-Assad. He confirmed that ISIS, the Islamic State, is preparing to conduct further attacks, in part by training and encouraging its followers to carry out attacks in their home countries, such as the United States of America.

Contrary to the narrative the White House is selling, Director Brennan called ISIS a "formidable adversary" that is building a global terror network. He stressed that Libya, in particular, is a growing hotbed of Islamic extremism.

Recently I traveled to Tunisia with members of the House Homeland Security Committee, and we met with the Libyan country team—the U.S. Ambassador to Libya and the other members of that country team who had not even been able to go to Libya because it was so dangerous. They were actually working in exile in Tunisia next door.

Director Brennan called the ISIS offshoot in Libya the most developed and most dangerous branch of the terrorist group. How did we get here? President Obama and Secretary of State Hillary Clinton failed in their efforts to stabilize the country after toppling Qadhafi. Didn't we learn anything in Iraq? Apparently, the Obama administration did not. They had no plan for what to do once Qadhafi was gone. Evidently, President Obama opted to lead from behind during the military campaign and then not lead at all after Qadhafi fell.

Unfortunately, recent testimony from the President's nominee to head the U.S. forces in Africa, or AFRICOM, suggested the administration hadn't learned any lessons after this disaster. When asked whether there was a strategy in place for dealing with all the threats emanating from Libya, the nominee, the Marine Corps general who was testifying, said he wasn't aware of any strategy, even though he agreed that ISIS has a significant presence in Libya and constitutes an imminent threat to our country here at home.

Just a few days ago, an article in the Washington Post highlighted the difference between what our military leaders believe is necessary to accomplish the mission and what the White House begrudgingly agreed to give them, which is less than what they need. According to the article, U.S. commanders on the ground in Iraq are readying a request to the White House for more troops so we can help the

Iraqi Army secure Fallujah and eventually take back Mosul.

The article also notes that military leaders have been regularly highlighting the need for more troops in the region—and quickly—but are concerned the administration will be reluctant to commit more. That is because the President has instituted an artificial troop cap for Iraq and Syria—it is about the numbers, it is not about the mission—just like he did in Afghanistan, and he doesn't want to add to that no matter what happens.

Apparently, the foolish campaign promises the President made when he was running are more important to him now than actually defeating ISIS abroad. As it stands, his legacy will be leaving Iraq more unstable and more dangerous for U.S. interests than it was when he came into office.

This should be a no-brainer. We don't succeed on the battlefield when we ignore the counsel of the experts, our uniformed military leaders, and we can't succeed on the ground in Iraq when the President will not provide the resources necessary to carry out the operations he has asked them to perform. We don't need a bandaid. We don't need more calls for diplomacy and other hollow talking points in Libya. What we and the world need is American leadership and a commitment from the White House to root out and annihilate ISIS where it lives and breathes.

I doubt the Orlando shooter would have pledged allegiance to the leader of the Islamic State if we had done what our military leadership believes we should have already done, which was to crush ISIS and defeat it. I doubt the Orlando shooter would have pledged allegiance to a leader whose movement had been crushed and destroyed, but he did it because he felt they were winning.

When the watching world sees we lack the will to defeat ISIS, ISIS sympathizers around the world sense weakness, and they are emboldened in their plan to carry out attacks, including on U.S. soil. There is a direct relationship between the battlefield in Iraq and Syria and our neighborhoods and communities here in America. What happens there matters here.

When the request from our military leadership arrives at the President's desk asking for more resources, he should remember Orlando, and he should grant the request. If he refuses or dithers, any resulting failure in Iraq and Syria or further attacks on the homeland will be part of his lasting legacy. From our diplomatic corps to our intelligence community, to the leaders of our military, all have directly or indirectly challenged the President's foreign policy in just the last few days.

If you think about it, it is remarkable. It takes courage and real strength of conviction to buck the leader of your political party or of the administration. I hope the President listens to

them because they are trying to help him make the right decision, and they are the real experts here.

If the President will not act decisively against our adversaries abroad, Congress must do all it can do to guard against the enemy here at home. Passing appropriations bills that provide the resources for Federal, State, and local law enforcement is part of our responsibility. We need to make sure our first responders and law enforcement community have the resources they need, and I hope we get that done soon.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VIEQUES TRAINING RANGE

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, on Wednesday we are going to be voting on something significant, which has been a source of discussion recently, and I wanted to put a little different perspective on the problems that are in Puerto Rico right now. Puerto Rico has \$90 billion worth of debt right now. They say they can't repay it in full. I think a bunch of guys have done a good job in establishing a solution for that. Puerto Rico is scheduled—and is going to be missing—to have another debt payment, which is going to put that amount over \$90 billion.

This week, the Senate will consider legislation that will impose an oversight board that will set up the bankruptcy court restructuring process. It is important citizens of Puerto Rico and the residents of Vieques realize they still have an opportunity to play a significant role in the nation's defense—a role that could bring an economic investment of hundreds of millions of dollars to Puerto Rico.

In April of 1999, following an accident on the Vieques training range—Vieques is a little island off of Puerto Rico—that resulted in the death of a Navy civilian employee, all training activities on that range were suspended. They had been training on that range for 60 years, and they suspended it. Despite the efforts of Congress and the Department of Defense leadership to include approving additional funding to hold a referendum on Vieques, as well as increased funding per year if Vieques remained open, the Navy was forced to end all training operations in 2003. After 60 years of that arrangement, they had to suspend it. When that happened, we had to close Roosevelt Roads.

I remember when they were considering whether they were going to close Roosevelt Roads, I made the comment that they would be closing it. You guys need to quit rejoicing that you had the

benefit of that because Roosevelt Roads was only there to support the Vieques training range. When the Navy left Vieques and closed Roosevelt Roads, they took with them over 2,500 uniformed military personnel, over 2,000 family members, and impacted more than 2,500 civilian employees. The total economic impact from the Navy was estimated to be over \$300 million a year in 2003 when the Navy ended its operations. I recall when that happened. I was there, and I made the statement that you are going to have financial ruin on the island, and it all started when we were told we were not allowed to continue what we had been doing in Vieques.

Today, as in 1999, our military is facing a readiness crisis and needs ranges like Vieques to train in full-spectrum joint operations.

On September 2, 1999, as chairman of the subcommittee—at that time, I was the chairman of a subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee called the Readiness Subcommittee—I held a hearing on the military requirement for Vieques and the assessment of alternative sites that could replace Vieques. During the hearing, ADM William Fallon, who was the commander of the Navy's Second Fleet at that time, and Gen. Peter Pace, who was the commander of the Marine Corps at that time, testified before the committee I chaired that Vieques was a unique facility. It was the only one located in the Atlantic where realistic combat training could be conducted in a combined and coordinated manner. The only Navy live-fire land, complete with day-and-night capabilities, amphibious landing beach and maneuver areas, and the range had areas of low-traffic airspace and deepwater sea space, with underwater and electronic warfare ranges. That was the only one in the world.

The Navy-Marine Corps study examined 18 alternative sites, evaluating the availability of the air-to-ground live ordnance range, with realistic targets and airspace for high-altitude deliveries, and for a naval surface fire support firing range, which permits the training of ships, forward spotters, and fire coordination teams, the ability for combat arms amphibious training, and nearby naval and air support facilities. We looked everywhere for that. We looked at 18 alternative sites. The study concluded that no single site evaluated was able to accomplish all of the training that was conducted at Vieques. The study also considered apportioning the training to various alternative locations but included the piecemeal approach—and this is using their language now—it “significantly degrades training to support the effective integration and coordination of all combined arms.” We are talking about the Marine Corps and the Navy. The Marine Corps is going in and bombing and the Navy has their planes up there and it is all taking place at one time.

To fully understand the capabilities of Vieques and the potential to conduct

Vieques training at other training sites, I visited Vieques and all 18 alternative sites around the world, as well as additional training sites that were used by the Department of Defense that are actually here in the United States. The sites I visited included Cape Wrath in northern Scotland; Capa Tulado in Sardinia; Mona and Dog Islands in the Caribbean; Kennedy County in Texas; Pinecastle, Avon Park, Pensacola, Eglin, and Tyndall in Florida; Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune in North Carolina; Townsend in Georgia; and San Clemente in California. That is a lot of sites, and I went to all of them. None of the locations had the capability to meet the training requirements of the Navy and Marine Corps and would have placed additional restrictions due to lack of training availability for training days, sea and airspace restrictions, proximity to large populated areas, live-fire restrictions, weather, and an inability to conduct combined operations, such as air, land, and sea operations simultaneously—no place.

I also visited the John F. Kennedy Battle Group and the *Wasp*, and learned that live-fire training is essential for our Nation's ability to safely and effectively conduct combat operations, but by not allowing our forces to train using live ordnance in a realistic combined operation at sea, we are putting our military personnel at risk during actual combat operations.

Numerous DOD officials have testified before our committee and reported that the loss of training at the Vieques range has resulted in the loss of critical combat training essential to the Nation's Navy and Marine forces and would increase the risk to our sailors and marines. In fact, it did. These very brilliant people, the top military officials, talked about how many of our troops and how many of our Americans had to die as a result of the loss of that training area.

RADM Kevin Moran, the Navy commander who oversaw operations throughout the Caribbean, compared combined live training to practice for a football team. He explained that coaches could routinely do basic training for quarterbacks separate from the linemen and separate from the defense. They could train everybody individually, but—this is his quote—“at some point you have to bring them together before the big game. It's [Vieques] the only place we can do that.”

Secretary Richard Danzig, who was then the Secretary of the Navy, said: “Only by providing in preparation can we fairly ask our servicemembers to put their lives at risk.”

Admiral Johnson, then-Chief of Naval Operations, and General Jones, who was the Commandant of the Marine Corps, said that Vieques provides integrated live-fire training “critical to our readiness,” and the failure to provide for adequate live-fire training for our naval forces before deployment will place those forces at an unacceptably high risk during the deployment.

CAPT James Stark, Jr., who was at that time commanding officer of the Roosevelt Roads Naval Station, said:

When you steam off to battle you're either ready or you're not. If you're not, that means casualties and that means more POWs. That means less precision and longer campaigns. You pay a price for all this in war, and that price is blood.

Admiral Murphy, then commander of the Sixth Fleet in the Navy, said the loss of training on Vieques would "cost American lives."

On March 12, 2001, five people died in Kuwait when a U.S. aviator dropped three 500-pound bombs off target. They missed their target, and some comments in the report of the incident point to the lack of live-fire training. The commander and deputy commander state that they actively sought opportunities for that training, but the limiting factor was range availability. In other words, they took away the live-fire capability at Vieques and we have five dead soldiers.

What we were talking about then is true today. We put American lives at risk unnecessarily if they are not fully trained prior to combat operations. The success or failure of our military when sent into combat is a direct function of the degree of realistic training they receive before combat. Their ability to conduct live, joint operations is critical to battlefield success, and preservation of the ranges at which our military trains ensures that success.

We have to ensure that our military is prepared for the next fight against a near-peer competitor. We have more near-peer competitors now than we have ever had in the history of this country. That will demand a full strength of our joint force.

There is still no range like Vieques. This happened 15 years ago. It is still the only range with land and sea and airspace that could accommodate naval surface, aviation, and live artillery ordnance delivery with amphibious landings supported by naval fires, all conducted in a joint training environment.

I understand firsthand both the importance and the significance of having a range in your home State.

On May 3, there was a program—I keep forgetting the name of it, but it is Crossfire—where they had two different people, a liberal and a conservative. I have been on that program several times, but this was way back in 2000.

I was debating a guy who was a Congressman from New York who was wanting to close the Vieques training site. As we went down to the end of that, he said: Well, look, Senator, how would you like to have a live fire training area in your State of Oklahoma?

I said: Let me tell you about Fort Sill. At Fort Sill, we have 320 days out of the year—24 hours a day—that we have a live range going. It is within a town of about 100,000 people, and nobody complains about it. In fact, they talk about the explosions, the ordnance that are going off all the time, and they say: "It is the sound of freedom."

I will tell you something kind of interesting. It wasn't long ago that down in Lawton they built—that is the city right next to the live range at Fort Sill—they built what is declared to be the best elementary school in America. When you walk through it, you can't believe there could be a school like that. Well, anyway, there is, and they named it "Freedom Elementary School" after the sound of freedom. There are places where people in this country really want to do things that carry their end of it, and that was so significant.

Anyway, Fort Sill has a live range that operates 320 days a year and nobody complains about it.

So I think we have an opportunity to help Puerto Rico. We can do that—help them as a nation—and a program they put together for Wednesday is pretty decent. It is something that can be done. But at the same time—and I talked to the individuals who put that plan together. I said: As soon as we vote on that, let's go back and tell—since Puerto Rico has had a shock treatment with the economic problems they have had—tell them: If you guys really want to make a contribution, you can do it. You can make a contribution of something that will save American lives.

We have had people testify that when we went into Bosnia and Kosovo, that in both Bosnia and Kosovo, we lost American lives because we didn't have the training only the Vieques can give us. As I mentioned, all around the world—I will always remember when Governor Rossello came in and was complaining about all the environmental concerns and said: We are going to close Vieques as a range. And he said to me, because I was pushing it so hard—he made the statement: Don't ever come into Puerto Rico because you won't come out of there alive. And I went there the next day and I am alive.

So, anyway, that is a serious thing, and I really do think we can support the bill on Wednesday and then after that talk to them in a very reasonable way to let them know what kind of a contribution they can make to the training of their people, as well as our people, to offset what we lost way back 15 years ago. I believe that is something we are now primed to talk to them about. They ought to be ready after all of this. So that is something to come, and I would like to have anyone thinking about the vote that takes place, which I will support on Wednesday, that now you have an opportunity to actually provide a service that is going to save American lives.

With that, 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.

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

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

NOMINATION OF ROBERT ROSSITER

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to speak in strong support of Bob Rossiter, who has been nominated to fill the vacancy on Nebraska's Federal district court.

The Judiciary Committee approved the nomination of Bob Rossiter without objection last October, and I am extremely pleased that the Senate will be voting on his nomination this evening.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska has a tradition of fairness and of justice. This court owes its reputation to the well-respected judges who have served on it.

With only three judgeships, Nebraska's Federal district bench is relatively small. Nebraska's Federal bench is an example of efficiency, as well as integrity. It also has one of the busiest dockets in the country.

For example, during the 12-month period ending March 31, 2016, Nebraska had the most per-judgeship weighted filings among the eight States that have only three authorized judgeships in a single Federal district.

With a small bench and a full docket, it is important that Nebraska's Federal district court operate at full capacity. As soon as Judge Bataillon announced that he would be taking senior status, I began working with Senator Mike Johanns to select a highly qualified candidate for this important position. Through an open process, we considered many applicants with excellent credentials. Approximately 20 individuals asked to be considered for this position, and we had each of them fill out the Judiciary Committee's lengthy questionnaire.

The questionnaires and the reams of supplementary materials were then carefully reviewed. Having reviewed the qualifications and materials of these applicants, I can tell you that Nebraska has no shortage of principled and sharp legal minds. Narrowing the list was challenging. After weeks of thorough consideration, we agreed to recommend Bob Rossiter to President Obama for this judgeship in August 2014. Although Senator Johanns retired from the Senate before the President nominated Mr. Rossiter in June of 2015, I know he was pleased with this nomination.

I thank the President for listening to my advocacy for Mr. Rossiter and for his support for him, for even among the many fine candidates we interviewed, Bob's accomplishments stood out.

Bob has an impressive list of professional achievements. After graduating cum laude from Creighton University School of Law, Bob clerked for U.S. district court judge C. Arlen Beam on Nebraska's Federal district court. Currently, he is a partner at the law firm of Fraser Stryker in Nebraska. Whether Bob is working on Federal and State

employment litigation or administrative agency investigations, he always demonstrates an admirable commitment to integrity and to the rule of law. Over the years, he has gained the respect of his clients by handling a variety of important issues with excellence. He is listed in "The Best Lawyers in America" and in "Chambers USA, America's Leading Business Lawyers." Perhaps the strongest testament to Bob's aptitude and integrity, as well as the admiration of his colleagues, is the fact that he was previously selected to serve as president of the Nebraska Bar Association. Though Bob never assumed the bar presidency due to this nomination, this honor, which is not bestowed lightly, is a reflection of the trust placed in Bob by those who know and work with him.

For these reasons I am confident that we have found a truly remarkable and qualified person to fill the vacancy on Nebraska's Federal district court. I urge my colleagues to support Bob Rossiter's nomination so that he can put his outstanding intellect, skill, and judgment to work for the American people.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL JASON CHESTER AND SERGEANT TREY DUPUY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would like to recognize Corporal Jason Chester and Sergeant Trey Dupuy of the Jonesboro Police Department as this week's Arkansans of the Week for heroically saving the life of a 13 year-old boy trapped in a storm drain.

Last month, 13-year-old Jacob Hunter was swept away during a flash flood in Jonesboro. Jacob was washed through the city's drainage system underneath a parking lot, where he held on for hours. Initial search efforts by police, fire, EMS, and other volunteers to find Jacob were unsuccessful, but Corporal Chester and Sergeant Dupuy wouldn't give up hope. They returned to the area where Jacob was first swept away and searched it again. Sergeant Dupuy leaned toward a storm drain and heard a faint cry for help. That is when the two officers jumped into action. They removed a heavy manhole cover and were able to pull Jacob to safety.

The entire State of Arkansas is grateful to Corporal Chester and Sergeant Dupuy and to all the first responders for their heroic efforts.

We don't hear news stories with happy endings enough these days, espe-

cially when the circumstances seem so grim, but because of the persistence and quick thinking of these two officers, Jacob Hunter is alive and well today.

I am honored to recognize Corporal Jason Chester and Sergeant Trey Dupuy for their efforts. Their determination and commitment to finding Jacob is a reflection of the true spirit of Arkansas. They remind us we owe a debt of gratitude to all first responders and emergency personnel across the country for the work they do to keep us safe.

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

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

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 Robert F. Rossiter, Jr., of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 30 minutes for debate only on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Alaska.

CULTURE OF WHALING IN ALASKA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, one of the great things about being able to come to the floor and preside—as is the Presiding Officer, and it is something I have had the opportunity to do a lot—is that when you are in the Chair, you get to hear a lot about the home States of other Members of the Senate. A lot of Senators like to come to the floor, as they should, to talk about their constituents and talk about so many things that are happening throughout our country.

We just heard the Senator from Arkansas talk about some local heroes in his State. He came to the floor to talk about them. Presiding, I have had the opportunity to hear many great stories: Vietnam veterans in North Dakota, great basketball from the Presiding Officer's State of Indiana, proud members of our military who live in Texas, and tight-knit communities in

responding to disasters in States across our Nation. These are great stories and in many ways they are what make our Nation great; it is what makes our Nation strong. Hearing about all the wonderful communities we have, I certainly have learned a lot from listening to these speeches, and I encourage my colleagues to come and talk about their States and do a little bragging. That is what I am going to do for the next couple of minutes.

My State, the great State of Alaska, has certainly captured the country's imagination in a lot of ways. It is hard to turn on cable TV without seeing a new show on Alaska, and for good reason. There is so much about the great State of Alaska that is awe-inspiring and captures the imagination of the American people. Our mountain ranges, hundreds of them, literally seem to go on for miles and miles—forever, like waves in the ocean. The color of our glaciers is unlike anything you have ever seen before. Our rivers and streams, particularly this time of year, are choked with salmon—millions and millions of salmon. We have moose, bear, wolves, caribou, and muskox. But one of the very best things about Alaska, one of the things that makes us unique, is our mix of cultures and the extraordinary lengths people in Alaska go to keep these cultures alive.

Today I wish to speak specifically about the culture of whaling and to honor our Alaska Eskimo whaling captains—heroes in our communities—and the communities that support these brave Americans.

In Alaska, 11 communities in northern Alaska, which we call the North Slope, participate in two whaling seasons. Nuiqsut, Kivalina, Barrow, Kaktovik, Wainwright, Gambell, Little Diomed, Wales, Point Lay, Savoonga, and Point Hope—these are the whaling communities of my State.

There is a spring whaling season and a fall whaling season. Both correspond to the migration patterns of the great bowhead whale.

The spring has ended now, and it is time for celebration. Nalukataq season is upon us. This is when with the communities get together to celebrate the harvest. It is like a summer picnic on the top of the world, but without hot dogs. Families eat whale and muktuk.

Let me spend a few minutes talking about what it takes to harpoon a whale. I have never done it, but a lot of my constituents have. Amazingly, today's whaling captains and crews still hunt using handheld harpoons, as their ancestors had done for thousands of years. During the spring harvest, many of the villages—also as their ancestors had done—go into the icy waters of the Arctic in hand-sewn boats that are built using wooden frames and hand-sewn walrus or bearded seal skin.

When a bowhead whale is landed, to spread the good news the people exclaim "Yay, hey, hey" across the North Slope.

The VHF radios that sit on kitchen counters and dining room tables all

across this part of Alaska begin to buzz. When a whale is brought to shore, the entire community comes out to help pull in the giant leviathan. It is such an exciting time for these communities. It is exciting because every time it happens, a piece of this important culture is reenacted and honored. The whales are honored, and every part of the animal is used.

These are subsistence communities, meaning they use this whale—all of it. Whale meat is necessary to feed these communities. On average, a whale can produce between 6 tons to 25 tons of food.

I should point out that we have no road system in northern Alaska, so these communities are accessible only by air or seasonal barge transport. Some can be reached this way only at certain times of the year. In other words, these communities need their food; they need these whales.

The annual bowhead whale migration provides the largest subsistence resource available in these remote areas of our great State. Even so, when a whale is taken, the sharing does not stop simply with the residents of the community. The food is shared with other subsistence communities and family members throughout our State. This is yet another amazing example of the resourcefulness that has enabled humans to survive in the Arctic for a millennia and that shapes the character of Alaska to this date.

Yet, throughout the years, it has sometimes been a struggle for the first peoples of Alaska to get their quota of whales. In 1977, the International Whaling Commission tried to shut down the subsistence harvest for Alaska's native people. It was relying on incorrect population estimates provided by Western scientists, and they were ignoring what we in Alaska call traditional knowledge. The Alaska Eskimo whaling captains organized and started the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission, which is alive, well, and thriving today.

Here is a great story. In 1977, when the IWC, the International Whaling Commission, attempted to shut down the harvest in Alaska for Alaska Natives, our whalers told the Western scientists: You don't know how to count the whales because you're looking for them from the air during the spring migration, and they're swimming under the spring ice. You have to listen for them under the ice.

When one of the scientists argued that the whales wouldn't swim under the ice because it is too dangerous, Harry Brower, Sr., the father of some of the prominent whalers today, took the scientist to the ice, put an oar in the water, and told the scientist to put his ear to the oar. What the scientist heard was an entire world of marine life invisible to the eye.

From that, a research program using both traditional knowledge—Alaska Native knowledge—and Western science was born and is used today, still today, to monitor the size of the western Arctic bowhead population.

This research program, still combining Western science and traditional knowledge, is considered the gold standard, the most accurate and sophisticated way in which marine biologists measure whaling populations.

The bowhead whale population is healthy and growing. Currently, it is estimated that there are about 20,000 bowhead whales, up from about 10,000 in 2001. Our communities in Alaska do an enormously important part in terms of making sure there is conservation of the bowhead whale.

The current catch limit for Alaska natives is no more than 67 whales a year, a fraction of a percentage of the total population. That limit was set in 2013 and will last until 2018, when the IWC meets to establish new catch limits.

Every time a new catch limit—a new quota—comes up, there is a fight between the Alaska Eskimo Whaling Commission and the countries that don't respect that tradition and want to stop all subsistence whaling, including my constituents.

What I am hoping for these kinds of talks is that they will make all the Members of the Senate understand how important this tradition is for Americans, for Alaska Natives, and they can learn more about this important tradition.

I will do everything in my power to work with my colleagues here in the Senate to ensure that when the quota comes up in 2018, they have their fair share. This is a vital tradition. It is vital for subsistence, and it is vital to keep a culture alive and to respect a group of great Americans who bring uniqueness and strength not only to Alaska but to our country.

Here is how one of our Alaska Eskimo whaling captains puts it:

To our people, the bowhead is more than food. It keeps our families together. It keeps our children in school. It allows our elders to pass generational knowledge to our youth. It teaches us patience and perseverance. It teaches us generosity. It strengthens our community. It provides wisdom and insight. It gives us hope. It is our way of life. The spirit of the whale lives within each of us.

Let me repeat that last line. "The spirit of the whale lives within each of us."

These are some of the people of my State. These are my constituents. As I have said before, Alaska has bragging rights right now. Our whalers and their culture and their traditions are certainly worth bragging about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS, ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING, AND JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this morning the Supreme Court reaffirmed in *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* that women—women, not politicians—should make their own health care choices. This was an important decision for women's health and women's constitutional rights. But the

fight to protect women's health continues. It is going to continue tomorrow here in the Senate when we have the first vote on the conference report to provide emergency funding to combat the Zika virus.

We are voting on emergency funding. Whether it is flooding in the South, wildfires in the West, ice storms in the winters, or hurricanes in the summers, Congress has always responded to crises with emergency funds. No offsets were required. Now, despite the overwhelming need for funding to fight Zika, when the threat of Zika is real and here, when the threat is of great risk to pregnant women, when the World Health Organization is urging women in Zika-impacted areas to delay pregnancy, House and Senate Republicans want to cut other programs to offset emergency funding for Zika. House and Senate Republicans decided on a conference report that continues their attacks on women's health. The report restricts Zika emergency funding for family planning services—limitations that will prevent some women from seeking health services from their own doctors or from primary care clinics that help serve women in rural areas, including in Puerto Rico, where there are already thousands of Zika cases.

Just after the Supreme Court reaffirmed a woman's right to make her own health care decisions, Republicans in the Senate and the House want to take that away. So it should come as no surprise to anyone tomorrow when I vote against this needlessly limiting response to what is a public health crisis.

Republicans should stop taking crises and using them to make attacks on women. Let's be honest about what we do here in the Senate. We have seen this kind of misguided leadership. We saw the Republicans' misguided leadership extend to the vacancy on the Supreme Court. The high cost of that obstruction was on full display last week when the Court's eight Justices deadlocked twice in one day. Since February, the Court—diminished by Republican inaction in this body—has been unable to issue a final decision on the merits in a total of seven cases. I cannot remember a time in my lifetime where that has happened in that short period of time.

The Supreme Court's inability to serve its highest function under the Constitution has left millions of families across the country waiting for justice, and they are uncertain of what the law is. This is the devastating reality for vulnerable immigrant families who are wondering whether they are going to be torn apart, whether the parents will be taken out and deported, sometimes leaving innocent children behind—after the Court deadlocked last week in a case concerning enforcement of the President's executive action on immigration.

The immigration case demonstrates the real harm of this Republican obstruction. Three years ago today, after

an extensive process in the Judiciary Committee where hundreds of amendments were debated, the Democratic-led Senate, backed by a number of Republicans, passed a comprehensive immigration reform bill on a vote of 68 to 32. Even though a majority of the House of Representatives would have passed that bill into law, the Republican Speaker of the House blocked the bill from even receiving a vote. Apparently, it would violate what they considered the revered Dennis Hastert rule. There were some Republicans who opposed it, even though it passed overwhelmingly. They had to show their reverence to the Dennis Hastert rule, so we did not get an immigration bill.

Because the Speaker refused to act and because they would not allow it to come to a vote, the President—who would not have had an Executive action if it had been voted on—was forced to use Executive action. His Executive action deferred the deportation of parents and children to prioritize the deportation of dangerous criminals. Before that Executive action could be implemented, however, a Republican-appointed district court judge in Texas issued a nationwide injunction—not just for Texas but for the whole Nation—blocking the order.

It was the inaction of Republicans in Congress that led the President to take sensible action to improve our broken immigration system. After blocking immigration reform, Republican obstruction continued in the Senate with the unprecedented refusal to consider the nomination of Chief Judge Merrick Garland to the Supreme Court. This left a hobbled Court of eight to consider this crucial immigration case.

So from legislation, to Executive action, to the hobbled Court, Republicans are responsible for creating these crises points. Why can't we go back to the days with responsible Republican leaders, like one of the greatest I served with, Howard Baker, or Bob Dole, or others, who would say we should at least do our job?

Now that the Supreme Court has finished its term, we can see the full scope of the damage caused by Republican obstruction. In addition to the nondecision in the immigration case, there have been six other cases where the Court could not reach a final decision on the merits. We still do not know whether lenders can discriminate against married women; whether consumers can sue companies for misuse of private information; whether employers can deny women employees access to contraception coverage; whether public-sector unions can recover fair-share costs for collective bargaining; whether a person can sue another State; or whether tribal courts can hold nontribal wrongdoers on tribal lands civilly liable. These are important questions, and the American people should have definitive answers. Our Constitution ensures equal justice for all; not a patchwork of different rights in different parts of the country. This

is the result of Senate Republicans' refusal to do their job and provide a hearing and a vote for Chief Judge Garland.

Chief Judge Garland is an outstanding nominee for the Supreme Court, and Americans overwhelmingly want him to receive a public hearing. The American Bar Association formally weighed in last week announcing that it had reviewed Chief Judge Garland's nomination and unanimously awarded him its highest rating of "Well-Qualified." To reach that rating, lawyers from across the country assessed his integrity, professional competence, and temperament. One said, "Garland is the best that there is. He is the finest judge I have ever met." Another said, "He is a judge's judge, with a very high standard and legal craftsmanship, a fine sense of fairness to all parties, a measured and dignified judicial temperament, and the highest respect for law and reasoned argument." One even said that Chief Judge Garland "may be the perfect human being."

Instead of scheduling a hearing for this impeccably qualified nominee, Republicans are holding Chief Judge Garland's nomination hostage in the hope that the Republican Party will nominate Donald Trump and they can then have Donald Trump make a different nomination. Of course, their nominee is the same candidate who has accused a sitting Federal judge of bias simply because his parents were Mexican-born. Come on.

It is unfathomable to me that Senate Republicans would prefer to diminish the Supreme Court for two terms rather than give Chief Judge Garland a fair and public hearing, but that is exactly what they are doing. No leadership in this Senate—Republican leadership or Democratic leadership—has ever done this. In fact, the last time we had a vacancy in the last year of a President's term, it was President Reagan, and the Democrats controlled the Senate. We voted unanimously to confirm President Reagan's Republican nominee to the Senate. The Democrats moved that nomination.

Senate Republicans are also failing to fulfill their constitutional responsibility to our district and circuit courts. In the 18 months that Senate Republicans have had a majority, they have allowed just 20 votes on judicial nominations—to disastrous results on our Federal courts as judicial vacancies have skyrocketed. Contrast this record to the last 2 years of George W. Bush's administration, when Democrats were in control. During that time, Democrats confirmed 68 of President Bush's judicial nominees and reduced the number of judicial vacancies to 34. Today, however, Senate Republicans' obstruction has caused judicial vacancies to nearly double from 43 to 83. Of these, 30 have been designated as judicial emergencies where caseloads are unmanageably high and the administration of justice is strained. When you look at the facts, Senate Republicans' claim that they have treated the Presi-

dent's judicial nominees fairly is not supported by the evidence. But more importantly, their persistent and unprecedented obstruction is harmful to the American people who are finding justice delayed in our Federal courts.

The nominee the Senate will finally vote on today, Robert Rossiter, is just one example of Republican obstruction. He was nominated over a year ago to fill a judicial emergency vacancy on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska. Despite his nomination being voice voted out by the Judiciary Committee last October, Mr. Rossiter has been awaiting a floor vote for almost 250 days. Robert Rossiter has been in private practice in Nebraska for over 30 years. He has tried more than 70 cases to verdict. I will vote to support his nomination.

Even after today's vote, there will be 25 judicial nominations languishing on the Senate floor. Two of them were reported at the same time as Robert Rossiter and have also been awaiting a vote for 8 months. While there is an agreement to vote on the nomination of Judge Brian Martinotti to fill a vacancy in New Jersey, that vote will not happen until next month. And we do not have an agreement to vote on the nomination of Edward Stanton to the Western District of Tennessee. In 2010, the Senate voted unanimously to confirm Mr. Stanton as the U.S. attorney for that district, and his current nomination is supported by his two Republican home State Senators, as well as by every Republican on the Judiciary Committee. Only because of the efforts of Senator FISCHER is Mr. Rossiter's nomination receiving a vote today. I hope the Republican Senators of Tennessee will be able to persuade the majority leader to schedule a vote for Mr. Stanton's nomination before we leave for the July recess.

Instead of voting on these nominees and instead of holding a hearing on Chief Judge Garland's nomination, Senate Republicans are already talking about shutting down the confirmation process for judicial nominees next month. This is wrong. Hard-working Americans put in long hours to get their jobs done, and they deserve a Senate that does the same. But Senate Republicans have ignored their constitutional responsibilities and continued, as their party's standard bearer has said, to "delay, delay, delay."

It is the Senate's duty to ensure that an independent judiciary can function. But based on the deadlocks and delays we have seen, it is clear that, unlike when Democrats controlled this body and we made it possible for President Reagan to move his nominees, today's Senate Republicans will not act responsibly.

I would say these Senate Republicans should act on Chief Judge Garland's nomination, as well as the 25 judicial nominations that have been passed out by voice vote from the Judiciary Committee. They are languishing on the Senate floor day after day after day.

These are men and women who are prepared to do their job if we will give them a vote. They can't understand and the American public can't understand why the Senate Republican leadership won't let us do our job. After all, we are paid to do it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. 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. COTTON. I ask unanimous consent that all time be yielded back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rossiter nomination?

Mr. COTTON. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Daines	Leahy
Ayotte	Donnelly	Lee
Baldwin	Durbin	Manchin
Barrasso	Enzi	Markey
Bennet	Ernst	McCain
Blumenthal	Feinstein	McCaskill
Booker	Fischer	McConnell
Boozman	Flake	Merkley
Brown	Franken	Mikulski
Burr	Gardner	Moran
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Murphy
Cardin	Graham	Murray
Carper	Grassley	Nelson
Casey	Hatch	Paul
Cassidy	Heinrich	Perdue
Coats	Heitkamp	Peters
Cochran	Heller	Portman
Collins	Hirono	Reed
Coons	Hoeven	Reid
Corker	Inhofe	Risch
Cornyn	Kaine	Roberts
Cotton	King	Rounds
Crapo	Klobuchar	Rubio
Cruz	Lankford	Sasse

Schatz	Stabenow	Udall
Schumer	Sullivan	Warner
Scott	Tester	Warren
Sessions	Thune	Whitehouse
Shaheen	Tillis	Wicker
Shelby	Toomey	Wyden

NOT VOTING—10

Blunt	Johnson	Sanders
Boxer	Kirk	Vitter
Capito	Menendez	
Isakson	Murkowski	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and 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 majority leader.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the body the message to accompany S. 2328.

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

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2328) entitled "An Act to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 2328.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2328.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2328, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Thad Cochran, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Jeff Flake, James M. Inhofe, Deb Fischer, Orrin G. Hatch, Johnny Isakson, Bob Corker, Lindsey Graham, John Boozman, Bill Cassidy, Mark Kirk, Daniel Coats.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4865

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 2328 with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2328 with an amendment numbered 4865.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4866 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4865

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 4866 to amendment No. 4865.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 4867

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer the House message on S. 2328 to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 4867.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on S. 2328 to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 4867.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4868

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 4868 to the instructions of the motion to refer S. 2328.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “2 days” and insert “3 days”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4869 TO AMENDMENT NO. 4868

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 4869 to amendment No. 4868.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following conference report, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany H.R. 2577, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to 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.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BOYD R. BUSER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate a distinguished Kentuckian and exceptional physician who brings great honor to the Bluegrass State. Dr. Boyd R. Buser, doctor of osteopathic medicine, is the vice president for health affairs and dean for the University of Pikeville's Kentucky College of Osteopathic Medicine, or UP-KYCOM. He is also the president-elect for the American Osteopathic Association, AOA, and will be installed as that organization's president next month at its next annual meeting in Chicago.

Dr. Buser earned his osteopathic medical degree in 1981 and has served

as a physician for 35 years. Originally from Iowa, he completed an osteopathic internship in Rhode Island before proudly calling Kentucky his home. He is board certified in family practice, as well as osteopathic manipulative medicine.

He has taught extensively around the world for the past 15 years and has represented the American osteopathic profession in the World Health Organization. He is an officer of the board of directors of the Osteopathic International Alliance. He has been a member of the AOA's board of trustees since 2004 and has served the AOA in a number of other capacities as well before assuming the mantle of president.

Dr. Buser has been recognized by the medical community with many awards for his achievements. In 1994, the AOA, along with the American Osteopathic Foundation, named him the osteopathic profession's “Educator of the Year.” The Maine Osteopathic Association presented him with the Roswell Bates Award in 1994 and the Distinguished Service Award in 1996 and 2007. He is also a current member of the Kentucky Institute of Medicine and the Kentucky Board of Medical Licensure.

A fellow of the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians, Dr. Buser is past president of the American Academy of Osteopathy, AAO. He is also a past chair of the National Board of Osteopathic Medical Examiners, NBOME, and was a founding member of the board of directors of the Osteopathic International Alliance.

Dr. Buser was the recipient of the A.T. Still Medallion of Honor from the AAO in 2010. He also received the Riland Medal for Public Service from the New York Institute of Technology College of Osteopathic Medicine in 2013, as well as the Santucci Award for outstanding contributions to the mission of NBOME. In 2015, he received the Pioneer of Osteopathic Medicine Award from the University of New England College of Osteopathic Medicine.

Kentucky is very proud that Dr. Buser is the second dean from UP-KYCOM to serve as AOA's president; the first was Dr. John Strosnider, the founding dean of UP-KYCOM, in 2006. UP-KYCOM was founded in 1997, and since then, more than 1,000 physicians have graduated from that institution. Nearly 70 percent of them serve in primary care, frequently in rural areas. UP-KYCOM is supplying doctors to the regions of Kentucky and the Nation who need them the most.

I want to praise Dr. Buser for his many awards and accomplishments and thank him for bringing his talents and his expertise to Kentucky. The Bluegrass State is pleased to reap the benefits from his efforts to heal and comfort the sick. It is truly an honor for him to ascend to the presidency of the American Osteopathic Association, and we are glad to see him in that position. I know his colleagues at UP-KYCOM are equally pleased for him, and I wish him great success in his new role.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF KHOBAR TOWERS BOMBING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, June 25 marked 20 years since the devastating bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. This horrifying and evil act killed 19 U.S. airmen and wounded nearly 500 others, 372 of whom were American.

The Khobar Towers were part of a housing complex where American, British, and French troops lived. The complex housed nearly 2,000 military members. The night of the attack, U.S. Air Force SSGT Alfred Guerrero was on patrol and witnessed a gasoline truck drive up to the complex perimeter fence. The driver parked the gasoline truck and then immediately sprinted to the waiting vehicle where he met two other assailants who were acting as lookouts. The car then sped off. Sergeant Guerrero only had a few moments to respond, but tried bravely to begin an evacuation of the building. Tragically, there was not enough time before the truck bomb exploded.

A member of my U.S. Capitol Police security detail, Special Agent Steve Sterling, was in an adjacent building when the attack took place. Steve, an airman first class at the time, was in the lobby of his building, making a call to the United States, when the blast erupted. He was thrown from his seat, but protected from further damage by the plywood boards surrounding the phone booth. Every other person in the lobby of his building was cut and bleeding from the debris and broken shards of glass. Later, Steve learned that four of his coworkers, whom he had just left only moments prior, were severely injured.

After waiting a few seconds to get their bearings, Steve and the other servicemembers who suffered only minor injuries rushed to the blast site. They were shocked to see the entire face of building No. 131 completely ripped off. Immediately, Steve and others started pulling people from the fallen rubble and setting up a triage. They worked through the night and into the early morning. They continued to sift through piles of debris for several days after.

If it were not for the brave efforts of the servicemembers like Steve Sterling, perhaps other lives would have been lost. Today, as we honor those who were lost and injured in the attack, I honor all of the military personnel who responded. I thank them for their selflessness and courage.

The explosion caused by the truck bomb was so great, it was heard from more than 20 miles away and left a hole in the ground nearly 35 feet deep. It was discovered later that this bombing had been planned for 3 years. We also learned it was carried out by a militant group that sought solely to target members of our military. This disgusting act was one of the most brazen attacks on American military personnel. Sadly, it was not the last.

It is important that we do not forget the victims whose lives were lost as a

result because their bravery and service deserves our recognition. That is why I was pleased to support the resolution honoring these gallant men and women, ensuring they are never forgotten. There will never be a way to predict and prevent all such acts of violence, but we can take comfort in knowing that we have the best and most valiant individuals standing on the frontline.

THE "MERCİ TRAIN" IN VERMONT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermonters needn't look far to see evidence of the deep French roots running through our State. From towns such as Montpelier and Isle La Motte, to the apt naming of Vert Mont, the Green Mountain State, generations of Vermonters were raised in homes where the native language was not English, but French. Deep ties to our neighbors to the north in Canada continue this rich culture in Vermont communities today.

It is no wonder then that I have such strong memories of stories about the "Merci Train" in Vermont. In the aftermath of World War II, Vermonters, like people across the country, rallied together to provide supplies for war-torn communities throughout France and Italy. Vermonters sent food and other gifts, through Burlington and Rutland, down to Boston, where they became part of "the Friendship Train," a convoy of rail cars that traveled through France as part of one of the more remarkable humanitarian efforts after World War II.

I well remember my mother and father bringing my older brother and my youngest sister and me to see it. As children, we may not have fully understood what it meant, but for years thereafter, I would go past it, being more and more aware. As a Montpelier native, I join with everybody else with in having pride having that the Merci Train was there.

The Merci Train was France's response, a year later, thanking Americans for their support. Filled with trinkets from French citizens, crafts made by school aged children, and other items, cars from the Merci Train traveled to each State. One arrived in Vermont on February 10, 1949. Its arrival was heralded by the playing of our national anthem, as well as the French revolutionary hymn "La Marseillaise" by the Montpelier High School Band. Its contents, sincere expressions of appreciation from French families, were unpacked and distributed to Vermonters.

While the Merci Train's freight represented the gratitude of a nation, the railroad car itself held the history of two World Wars. Displayed behind the Vermont Supreme Court in Montpelier for a number of years, the car originally served as a railroad boxcar to haul military cargo. Often referred to as "40 and 8s," in reference to their 40-

man or 8-horse capacities, the cars regularly transported American soldiers throughout Europe. Upon the car's arrival in Vermont, it was displayed temporarily behind Vermont's Supreme Court building, where it remained until the 1950s. Removed to the Vermont State Police headquarters, it faced deterioration. A movement in the 1980s—with the support of veterans, private companies, the Vermont National Guard, and "40 and 8" enthusiasts—led to the car's restoration. Today it remains preserved and on display at the Vermont National Guard Library and Museum, a fitting tribute to the strong ties between Vermont and France and another window into the fascinating history on which our great State is built.

I ask unanimous consent that the May 30 article from the Times Argus, "The Merci Train in Vermont," by Paul Heller, be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times Argus, May 30, 2016]

THE MERCİ TRAIN IN VERMONT

(By Paul Heller)

Local radio celebrity Bob Bannon was master of ceremonies as 500 Vermonters gathered at the railroad station in Montpelier to receive a remarkable gift from the people of France.

The present was an antique boxcar filled with gifts from ordinary French citizens—a way of saying "thank you" or "Merci" for American assistance during and after World War II.

A similar gift had been presented to each of the 48 states with an additional one for Washington, D.C. The convoy had been dubbed the "Merci Train," and the old railroad cars known as "40 and 8s" were carried to their destinations by rail.

The one that arrived in Montpelier on February 10, 1949, had been delivered on an American railroad flatcar and was opened in a ceremony that had started with a "Vermont Welcomes France" breakfast. Later, at the train station, the Montpelier High School band played "The Star Spangled Banner" and "La Marseillaise." The Montpelier V.F.W. post provided a color guard carrying the flags of the U.S., France, and Canada.

Officially known as "Le Train de la Reconnaissance de Française," the "Merci Train" was a response to the U.S. railroad convoy a year earlier that had made a similar trip the other way.

That 1947 version was called "The Friendship Train" and had made stops at various large U.S. cities where the cars were filled with food and other gifts from ordinary Americans to offer relief to war-ravaged France and Italy. The Friendship Train was the inspiration of nationally syndicated columnist Drew Pearson, who led the humanitarian effort that put individual Americans in a direct charitable relationship with their counterparts in France.

It is estimated that relief supplies valued at \$40,000,000 were sent to France and Italy in this fashion. Although the Friendship Train did not come to Vermont for donations, the Burlington Free Press was careful to assert that the Green Mountain State was worthy of this gift from France.

Many Vermonters may feel that the Merci Train, bearing gifts from the French people for the people of Vermont, is entirely a one-

way transaction. They remember that the Friendship Train, which went from coast to coast picking up food gifts for the hungry people of Italy and France, did not come to Vermont.

Thus it might appear that Vermont is being thanked for something it didn't do. But while the train did not come here, some Vermonters made their contributions just the same. Food gifts from different parts of the state were sent through Burlington and Rutland down to Boston, where they made up part of the Friendship Train.

Of course, many Vermonters served in the armed forces to help secure an Allied victory in Europe. France, recognizing the sacrifices of all Americans to save their republic, gave a similar gift to each state in the union.

The Vermont car was unpacked and gifts distributed by Earl Newton, director of the Vermont Historical Society, who was sensitive to the need for equity. Vermont legislators took token gifts back to their towns and many items, when appropriate, were given to high school French classes.

The gifts were sincere expressions of appreciation such as small knickknacks that a French family might own. There were many pieces made by French schoolchildren who also included toys and dolls in the shipment.

Vermont Governor Gibson, reported the Burlington Free Press, accepted the car for Vermont and said "the gifts it contained were great in spiritual value and that the people of Vermont would accept them in that sense." He added, "the gifts would be accepted in a spirit of humility and friendship and that the people of Vermont would continue to march shoulder to shoulder with the people of France so that liberty, peace, and freedom might continue for all time."

Many of the gifts included letters and drawings from French schoolchildren, and they were clearly intended for children in the United States. The letters were often addressed, "Chers petits amies d'Amerique..." (Dear little friends of America). These gifts received in Montpelier were mostly sent to museums and schools throughout the state.

While the gifts were mostly sentimental tokens of friendship, it was the railroad car itself that was to prove to be the most unique and lasting legacy of the "Merci Train." The old railroad car, small by modern standards, was informally referred to as a "40 and 8."

Manuel Conley's history of the specialized cars noted, "During two wars they served France as dual purpose railroad boxcars hauling the military cargoes stenciled on their sides 'HOMMES 40 CHEVAUX 8'". A more precise colloquialism might have been "40 or 8" as the designation referred to the cars' capacity to carry 40 men or eight horses in an era when the horse-cavalry was an essential part of a military force.

During the First World War American doughboys were carried to the front in just such cars and veterans of the Great War had vivid memories of that unique mode of transport. According to Conley, Americans were alternately enchanted and disgusted, intrigued and infuriated by the little dual-purpose cars. Sometimes they were just confused.

In "The Doughboys: The story of the AEF," Laurence Stallings tells of one sergeant who reported to his leader: "I got all my 40 artillerymen in the boxcar, lieutenant. But if you try to pull eight of our horses in, somebody's gonna be trampled to death!"

Conley notes that the cars had been updated for their new purpose in the "Merci Train." "All had been repaired, freshly painted, and decorated with plaques bearing the coats of arms of the 40 provinces of France. Across their sides, upon tricolored

bands, was printed the name of the enterprise for which they stood: on one side "Train de la Reconnaissance Francaise" and on the other "Gratitude Train."

The French citizens embraced the idea of thanking America for its sacrifice and generosity and they scoured the countryside for 40 and 8s that could be reconditioned as gifts to each state in America.

"By the end of 1948 the boxcars were filled to capacity. The train carrying over two hundred and fifty tons of gratitude was pulled to the port of Le Havre for shipment to America." The cars were loaded on a freighter bound for Weehawken, New Jersey. Upon arrival, the cars, with a wheel base eight inches wider than standard U.S. tracks, were loaded on flatcars for delivery to their final destinations.

Vermont's Merci car first arrived in Vermont at Brattleboro on February 9, 1949 at 11 in the morning. It was received in Montpelier the following day at 8 a.m. with an official ceremony at 10 "with Gov. Gibson and other officials participating."

When Earl Newton unpacked the cargo, he compiled a detailed inventory on a legal pad. His original notes, in a file at the Vermont Historical Society, are still quite legible. A casual perusal of the list of gifts Mr. Newton distributed include 39 dolls, various decorated cloth wallets, stockings, thank-you cards, pencil drawings, watercolors, ornamental fans, toy cars, guns, pencil boxes, puppets, doilies, photographs, and painted ceramic souvenirs.

Antique French currency in the form of bank notes was included as well as a sampling of Confederate Bank notes from the U.S. Civil War. A representative sampling of some of the gifts may be seen at the Vermont Historical Society.

The most interesting item from the Merci Train is the old railroad car itself that was displayed on temporary rails behind the Supreme Court building at 111 State St. in Montpelier. It remained there until 1953, according to Vermont legislator John Finn, when it was transported to Redstone, then the headquarters of the Vermont State Police, to be used for storage.

With no shelter or maintenance, the car began to deteriorate, and the once brightly painted Provincial crests began to disappear in the harsh weather. When asked, a stingy Vermont Legislature would not appropriate \$10,000 for a shelter, and by 1968 the car had been moved to Steamtown, a Vermont railroad museum in Bellows Falls. Funds promised for restoration never materialized, and Finn noted it again was used for "a storage bin, rotting where it stood."

But then, Melvin Hilliker of St. Albans came across the old car at the train museum. Hilliker, a member of the American Legion, was also a member of a group of Legionnaires who were dedicated to the history of the "40 and 8s." He enlisted his cohorts to save Vermont's Merci Car by taking it to St. Albans for restoration. St. Albans, a famous old railroad town, seemed to be the perfect destination for the neglected relic.

Finn and company lobbied members of the Vermont Legislature for permission to take the car to St. Albans. For Finn, it was a relatively convenient task, as he had just been elected to represent St. Albans in the Vermont House.

After much cajoling, Steamtown released the historic boxcar. At first, moving it seemed an insurmountable problem, but the Miller Construction Company of Windsor generously moved it to the St. Albans CVRR roundhouse in June of 1983.

The "40 and 8" enthusiasts of St. Albans raised funds to restore the car, and with the assistance of the Vermont National Guard, it was moved to St. Albans' Switchyard Shopping Center for a rededication and display.

The history buffs who witnessed the dedication on June 7, 1984, undoubtedly believed the antique railroad car would rest at the Switchyard permanently. However, that was not to be. In just over 10 years time the members of the St. Albans American Legion realized they did not have the means to preserve the antique rail car and, in 1995, with the help of the Vermont Office of Historic Preservation, the old 40 and 8 was moved to the Military History Museum at Camp Johnson in Colchester. Under the aegis of the Vermont National Guard, the museum features the Merci Train car as the centerpiece of its World War One exhibit.

Lovingly restored and displayed, the old car may be boarded by visitors who can imagine what it must have been like to be an American doughboy carried to the front with 39 companions, and then what it looked like in 1949 when it pulled into Montpelier, laden with gifts from a thankful France.

While Vermonters have the good fortune of being able to visit their car from the Merci Train, residents of some of the other New England states are not as lucky.

A 1984 report indicated that the Connecticut car was destroyed by fire in the 1950s, the whereabouts of the Massachusetts car was unknown, and Maine's was in disrepair with most of the painted decorations removed. In 1999 the Rhode Island car was discovered in a junkyard, but now resides in The Museum of Work and Culture in Woonsocket.

In northern New England, New Hampshire (in Manchester) and Vermont have provided shelter for their 40 and 8s and preserved their legacy of sacrifice and gratitude. One may view the car at the Vermont National Guard Library and Museum, which is open Tuesday through Friday from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. There is no charge for admission.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits, while sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. The Senate will soon consider the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017. This conference report provides

funding to combat the Zika virus. For these efforts, the bill provides \$991 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2016 and \$39 million and \$382 million in outlays for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017, respectively. These figures include rescissions of emergency funds that provide a partial offset. This legislation includes language that would designate these provisions as emergency funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Deficit Control Act of 1985. The inclusion of these designations makes this spending eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act.

The conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 also includes funding for military construction outside of the United States that is designated as overseas contingency operations funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii). These provisions provide \$172 million in budget authority and \$1 million in outlays for fiscal year 2017. The inclusion of the overseas contingency operations designations with these provisions makes this spending eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act.

On May 26, 2016, I made adjustments to the budgetary aggregates and the Committee on Appropriation's allocations for fiscal years 2016 and 2017 to accommodate emergency spending found in S. amendment No. 3900 to combat the Zika virus that qualified for a cap adjustment under BBEDCA. The adjustments I make today take these prior adjustments into consideration and reflect the appropriate level for overall adjustments for considering this legislation.

As a result, I am decreasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2016 by \$107 million in budget authority and \$108 million in outlays. I am increasing the budgetary aggregate for fiscal year 2017 by \$172 million in budget authority and decreasing outlays by \$125 million. Further, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by reducing revised nonsecurity budget authority by \$107 million and outlays by \$108 million in fiscal year 2016. Finally, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised security budget authority by \$172 million and reducing outlays by \$125 million in fiscal year 2017.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

	\$s in millions	2016
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,070,927
Outlays		3,091,393

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES—Continued

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016)

	\$s in millions	2016
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		— 107
Outlays		— 108
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,070,820
Outlays		3,091,285

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2016
Current Allocation *:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		548,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		528,955
General Purpose Outlays		1,173,214
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		— 107
General Purpose Outlays		— 108
Revised Allocation *:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		548,091
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		528,848
General Purpose Outlays		1,173,106

* Excludes amounts designated for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to Section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Memorandum: Above Adjustments by Designation	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	— 107	— 107
General Purpose Outlays	0	0	— 108	— 108

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES

(Pursuant to Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and Section 102 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015)

	\$s in millions	2017
Current Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,212,350
Outlays		3,219,700
Adjustments:		
Budget Authority		172
Outlays		— 125
Revised Spending Aggregates:		
Budget Authority		3,212,522
Outlays		3,219,575

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2017

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

	\$s in millions	2017
Current Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		551,068
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		518,531
General Purpose Outlays		1,182,309
Adjustments:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		172
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		0
General Purpose Outlays		— 125
Revised Allocation:		
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority		551,240
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority		518,531
General Purpose Outlays		1,182,184

Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	OCO	Program Integrity	Disaster Relief	Emergency	Total
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	172	0	0	0	172
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0	0	0	0	0
General Purpose Outlays	1	0	0	— 126	— 125

COMMERCE-JUSTICE-SCIENCE
APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I want to highlight several important provisions I am pleased are included in the fiscal year 2017 spending bill for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies.

Several of these provisions are transparency measures that I developed after months of oversight work, to ensure greater accountability in the use of Federal funds. The bill also includes funding for several key programs that benefit at-risk children, as well as survivors of sexual or domestic violence.

First, I am pleased the fugitive apprehension activities that are author-

ized under the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act are supported in this bill. The Adam Walsh Act, which is so named to honor the memory of a 9-year-old boy who was murdered in 1981, authorizes the U.S. Marshals Service to apprehend convicted sex offenders who fail to register as fugitives. The Adam Walsh Act also calls for U.S. Marshals to help jurisdictions track down those who fail to register as sex offenders or who later go missing from the registration system.

I have introduced legislation, known as the Adam Walsh Reauthorization Act of 2016, to extend the authorization for these same fugitive apprehension activities in each of the next 2 years.

Earlier this year, I led the Senate Judiciary Committee in approving this reauthorization measure, and it passed the full Senate, 89-0, a few weeks ago.

Providing \$61.3 million in funding for these Adam Walsh Act activities in fiscal year 2017, as our reauthorization bill proposes, will help ensure the safety of America's children. It is vital that the other chamber quickly take up and pass our reauthorization bill before the 35th anniversary of Adam Walsh's disappearance on July 27th.

Second, I appreciate the committee's efforts to ensure adequate resources for Federal juvenile justice and delinquency prevention programs. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have filed a bill to

update and extend the authorization for these very same programs. Our bill, entitled the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act, would ensure there is greater accountability, on the part of the Justice Department, in the use of the juvenile justice dollars. Our Judiciary Committee cleared this bill by voice vote, and our legislation has the support of hundreds of law enforcement officials and nonprofit organizations around the country. Its prompt enactment is vital to avert mismanagement, waste, and abuse in juvenile justice programs.

Third, many of us have stressed the importance of funding programs that benefit survivors of domestic and sexual violence across the Nation. These include the STOP Grants, transitional housing assistance, civil legal assistance, and sexual assault services programs. The bill before us adequately supports these programs.

Finally, I would like to highlight additional key provisions of this year's appropriations bill that I championed. One provision, which is based on my oversight work and another bill that I introduced last February, would bar the use of funds to deny or impede an inspector general's timely access to any records, documents, or other materials needed to carry out its oversight work. There is just one exception to this requirement in this bill, and it arises only if Congress passes legislation expressly limiting the inspector general's right of access to these materials.

It is also vital that Congress is aware of any effort by DOJ or other Federal departments or agencies to impede the inspector general's work. That is why Senate appropriators incorporated language in this year's spending bill requiring an inspector general to notify both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees within 5 days of any agency's failure to comply with the CJS bill's transparency requirement.

Until the minority leader stops obstructing passage of the bipartisan Inspector General Empowerment Act, this spending restriction is the next best thing we can do to prevent the Justice Department from acting as if the law requiring inspector general access to "all records" does not really mean "all records."

The other provision I championed would increase transparency of the Marshals Service's use of the Assets Forfeiture Fund. I have been reviewing the Marshals Service's expenditures from this fund for more than a year. Although the inspector general recently informed the Judiciary Committee that he couldn't find any laws or regulations that have been broken, he did not speak to the numerous allegations I have received from whistleblowers about the waste of monies in the fund. I continue to have concerns about extensive and cavalier spending of that fund on unnecessary facilities and frivolous furniture, as well as on salaries and activities that aren't di-

rectly related to asset forfeiture activities.

In closing, I wanted to make sure my colleagues are aware of these important provisions of the CJS spending bill.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGREGATION B'NAI ISRAEL SESQUICENTENNIAL

• Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Congregation B'nai Israel of Sylva, OH, as it celebrates its 150th anniversary. It was founded in 1866 by 17 families and grew to 140 members by 1908. Its first permanent synagogue was constructed in 1913 and is now listed on the National Register of Historical Places. Today the congregation serves over 425 members at the Jewish Community Center of Sylva. These members are drawn from across northwest Ohio and southeast Michigan.

Congregation B'nai Israel's mission is to make the practice of Judaism an integral part of its members' daily lives while working in cooperation with the Jewish community. It does this by creating an accessible synagogue that encourages all of its members to study, worship, engage in acts of loving kindness, and build K'lal Yisrael. In addition, they have long promoted the equal participation of men and women in Jewish religious life, a significant goal in the Judaism Conservative movement. It has a long history of community outreach, ranging from the development of war relief programs and welcoming Holocaust survivors throughout the 1940s, to volunteering at nearby community centers and nursing homes, to mission trips in South Africa.

I am here today to honor Congregation B'nai Israel. I congratulate all who were involved in making its first 150 years a success.●

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3100. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Years 2016 and 2017" (Rept. No. 114-286).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 505. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding compliance en-

forcement of Russian violations of the Open Skies Treaty.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 506. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Warsaw, Poland from July 8-9, 2016, and in support of committing NATO to a security posture capable of deterring threats to the Alliance.

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. TOOMEY:

S. 3100. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; read the first time.

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

S. 3101. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 1013

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1013, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage and payment for complex rehabilitation technology items under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2031, a bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes.

S. 2196

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2196, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the non-application of Medicare competitive acquisition rates to complex rehabilitative wheelchairs and accessories.

S. 2216

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2216, a bill to provide immunity from suit for certain individuals who disclose potential examples of financial exploitation of senior citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 2219

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2219, a bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to conduct an assessment and analysis of the outdoor recreation economy of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) 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. 2659

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2659, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency cannot regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to reauthorize the Emmett Till Unsolved Civil Rights Crime Act of 2007.

S. 2895

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2895, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S. 2946

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2946, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 3039

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROB-

ERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3039, a bill to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control.

S. 3059

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3059, a bill to reauthorize and amend the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue and Response Grant Program and for other purposes.

S. 3060

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3060, a bill to provide an exception from certain group health plan requirements for qualified small employer health reimbursement arrangements.

S. 3089

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3089, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal anti-discrimination claims.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to "Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act".

S. RES. 482

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 482, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization and to increase pressure on the organization and its members to the fullest extent possible.

S. RES. 505

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 505, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding compliance enforcement of Russian violations of the Open Skies Treaty.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 506, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the NATO summit to be held in Warsaw, Poland from July 8–9, 2016, and in support of committing NATO to a security posture capable of deterring threats to the Alliance.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 508, a resolution expressing support for the expeditious consideration and finalization of a new, robust, and long-term Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance to Israel between the United States Government and the Government of Israel.

S. RES. 511

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 511, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 26, 2016, as "LGBT Equality Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 4762

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 4762 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2578, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 3100. A bill to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terrorists who are illegally present in the United States; read the first time.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, by Friday a lot of American families are going to be packing up the car and the kids and going somewhere to celebrate the holiday or gathering in the backyard to fire up a barbecue to celebrate the Fourth that way. But one father will be marking the day quite differently. For Jim Steinle, Friday marks the 1-year anniversary of the murder of his daughter. On July 1, 2015, as Jim Steinle was walking on a pier in San Francisco with his daughter Kate, the gunman opened fire, shot Kate, and she bled to death in her father's arms. Her last words were "Help me, dad."

As outrageous as this is, one of the aspects that is particularly maddening about this is that the shooter never should have been on the pier that day. The shooter was an illegal immigrant. He had been convicted of seven felonies and had been deported five times. But what is truly maddening is that 3 months prior to his murdering Kate Steinle, he was held in the custody of the San Francisco Police Department. They had him, and when Federal immigration officials learned that the San Francisco police had this guy, they asked them to hold him until they could get someone there because they knew he was here illegally. They knew his background, they knew how dangerous he was, and they wanted to deport him.

What did the San Francisco police do? They refused. They did not cooperate with the Federal immigration officials, and instead they released him onto the streets of San Francisco.

Why would the San Francisco Police Department do a thing like that? Why in the world would they do a thing like that with a seven-time convicted felon, five-time deported person whom Federal immigration officials were asking them to detain? They did it because San Francisco is a sanctuary city. That means it is the legal policy of the city of San Francisco to forbid their own police department from cooperating—from even cooperating—with Federal immigration officials. Even when the police would like to, they can't. It is against the law in San Francisco. So think about that.

Even when President Obama's administration and the local police are in complete agreement that this person is dangerous and they want to work together, they want to remove this person and the threat he poses to their community in a sanctuary city, the local politicians override that and they decide it would be illegal for the local police to cooperate. So the San Francisco police had no choice. They were forced by their own city government to release the man who would go on to kill Kate Steinle. If Federal officials had called about almost any other crime—if it had been about bank robbery, a trademark violation, car theft—it would have been perfectly legal for the San Francisco Police Department to cooperate with the Federal authorities. But because this involved an illegal immigrant, the San Francisco Police Department's hands were tied. They were forced to release Kate Steinle's eventual killer.

As the father of three young kids, I can't even imagine what Jim Steinle and his wife have endured and what they are going to go through this Friday. Sadly, the Steinles are not alone. According to an internal Department of Homeland Security memo, during an 8-month period in 2014, sanctuary jurisdictions—cities and counties and towns that have chosen to be sanctuaries—have released 8,000 immigrants during this period in 2014, and 1,800 of those released were later arrested for new criminal acts, including two cities that released individuals who had been arrested for sexual abuse of children. Not surprisingly, these individuals were arrested yet again for sexually molesting additional children because that is what these monsters do.

Let's be clear. This is not about immigration. This is really not about immigration. The vast majority of immigrants in this country would never commit a heinous crime against anybody, but any large group of individuals is going to have some bad actors. With roughly 11 million people here illegally, among them there are absolutely violent criminals. It is completely unavoidable. It makes absolutely no sense to insulate those violent criminals from capture by law enforcement.

I should point out that the dangers posed by these sanctuary city laws are not limited to domestic crimes, as ap-

palling as they are. Obviously, the sexual abuse of children and murder are more than sufficient reason to make sure we are not conferring a special benefit on these people. But the fact is, sanctuary cities are impeding our ability to prosecute the war against terrorists.

I will give a case in point. Last month, President Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Johnson, took a trip to Philadelphia with a modest request, because Philadelphia has a very extreme and radical sanctuary city policy. So President Obama's Homeland Security Secretary went to Philadelphia and asked Mayor Kenney of Philadelphia to make very narrow exceptions to the sanctuary city policy of Philadelphia. Specifically, he was asking that the Philadelphia Police Department be permitted to cooperate—just sharing information is what they were asking for—with the DHS if they were dealing with a suspected terrorist or someone who had been convicted of a violent felony or someone who had been convicted of a gang-related offense. Just those cases. Just those. Mayor Kenney refused. The city refused and made no change whatsoever to their sanctuary city status.

So as we gather this evening, the Philadelphia Police Department is absolutely forbidden from cooperating with Federal officials unless the Federal officials can prove that the person in question has already been convicted of a violent felony and they have a warrant for the arrest, which, of course, since the police are not allowed to even communicate with the Federal officials, how would they know to seek an arrest warrant?

The fact is, none of this makes any sense. Imagine the Department of Homeland Security calling the Philadelphia Police Department and complaining that they discovered that the city has in custody an illegal immigrant who the FBI suspects is plotting a terrorist attack. So the Department of Homeland Security asks the Philadelphia police for information about this guy—when did they pick him up, did he have other people with him, who were they, what were they doing, when are they going to release him. There is a lot of information they might like to have. And they might say: Hold this guy until we get there in the morning so we can interrogate him and begin deportation proceedings. That would be a reasonable request from the Department of Homeland Security, but under the current sanctuary city policy of Philadelphia, the Philadelphia police have no choice—their response has to be and is “Come back after the crime has been committed. Come back after he has committed his terrorist offense, and then come back with a warrant, and then we can cooperate with you.”

Sometimes I wonder if we have learned anything after 9/11, after the Boston Marathon bombing, after the San Bernardino murders, and after this horrendous massacre in Orlando. When

are we going to start taking this threat seriously? It is here. We see it. We are living through this.

Well, in my view, we have lived through too much—way too much. So today I am continuing my ongoing fight to end these sanctuary cities that endanger all of our communities. I am introducing the Stop Dangerous Sanctuary Cities Act, S. 3100, and it tackles two problems.

Part of the reason some communities have chosen to be sanctuary cities is in response to court decisions. There are two court decisions that we need to address—one is by the Third Circuit Court of Appeals and the other by a Federal district court in Oregon. These court decisions hold that if the Department of Homeland Security makes a mistake in issuing a detainer in a request to hold someone, if it turns out that the Department of Homeland Security made a mistake—maybe they got the wrong guy—and if the local law enforcement cooperates, as we think common sense has suggested we would like to see, according to these court decisions, the local law enforcement and the local government would bear the liability. They can be sued. That is a problem for communities. In fact, it has driven over a dozen Pennsylvania communities, counties, and municipalities to say: We can't take that legal risk, so we will, quite reluctantly, become sanctuary cities.

There is a simple solution to this. In my bill, the first action my bill takes says that when a local officer is complying with a legitimate, bona fide immigration detainer duly issued by the Department of Homeland Security, then the local officer has the same authority as the DHS official.

A way to think about it is that the local police would be considered agents of the Department of Homeland Security for this purpose. If an individual's rights are violated somehow, the individual would still have every right to sue, but they would not sue the local police department, which was just acting in good faith in cooperation with the Department of Homeland Security; the person would sue the Department of Homeland Security. There would be no diminution of the person's legal rights or their ability to redress anything that went wrong; it is just that the liability ought to attach to DHS, not the local police department.

With this change in the law, there would no longer be any pretext or any justification whatsoever for these sanctuary cities and denying the cooperation with Federal officials which we need.

The second part of my bill says that once that is in place, once we fix that legal liability problem, if a community nevertheless decides they still want to be a sanctuary city, they still want to refuse to cooperate with Federal law enforcement, then they would lose some Federal funds. They would lose some of the CDBG money, the community block grant money, and I know

every Senator is very familiar with how much every city and every municipality gets because the local politicians get to decide how to spend it.

In my view, if you are going to impose the kinds of costs on all of us that sanctuary cities impose, the additional cost for Federal law enforcement, the additional cost to the American people in living in an area where they are at greater risk—it is unbelievable and impossible to quantify the cost to people like Jim Steinle, who lost his daughter—if you are going to impose those costs, then it is reasonable for the Federal Government to choose not to subsidize that.

That is my goal. It is pretty simple. Frankly, I don't think it should even be controversial. Leaders across the political spectrum have criticized sanctuary city policies. Former Pennsylvania Governor, lifelong Democrat, and former Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Ed Rendell, has criticized the sanctuary city policies of Philadelphia. The Secretary of Homeland Security has clearly gone out of his way to try to get Philadelphia to change its misguided policy.

Pennsylvania law enforcement officers from across the entire political spectrum, across the entire Commonwealth, all agree we got this right. Last October the Senate considered a similar measure, and it got bipartisan support, but it didn't have enough to overcome a filibuster. I hope now we are finally going to fix this.

This bill is a simple, commonsense bill. I had this conversation with my constituents, and everyone is shocked that we haven't already fixed this problem. The bill stands for the simple proposition that the safety of the American people matters, that the life of Kate Steinle matters, and that protecting our homeland from violent criminals, including terrorists, matters.

As the Steinles observe the tragic anniversary of their daughter's death this Friday, I think they deserve to know that the Senate cares about that loss, too, and that we are going to do what we can to prevent another senseless and avoidable death from happening again.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4865. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

SA 4866. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4865 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4867. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4868. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

SA 4869. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4868 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4865. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.

SA 4866. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4865 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

SA 4867. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.

SA 4868. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days".

SA 4869. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 4868 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 4867 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2328, to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Taylor Harding, an intern in my office, be given floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Natalie Kirilichin and Elizabeth Wagner, fellows with the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee be granted floor privileges through the end of next month, July 2016.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3100

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3100) to ensure that State and local law enforcement may cooperate with Federal officials to protect our communities from violent criminals and suspected terror-

ists who are illegally present in the United States.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

BROWNFIELDS UTILIZATION, INVESTMENT, AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 518, S. 1479.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1479) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to modify provisions relating to grants, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1479) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1479

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 "Brownfields Utilization, Investment, and Local Development Act of 2015" or the "BUILD Act".

SEC. 2. EXPANDED ELIGIBILITY FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.

Section 104(k)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking "or" after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(I) an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code;

"(J) a limited liability corporation in which all managing members are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I);

"(K) a limited partnership in which all general partners are organizations described in subparagraph (I) or limited liability corporations whose sole members are organizations described in subparagraph (I); or

"(L) a qualified community development entity (as defined in section 45D(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986)."

SEC. 3. MULTIPURPOSE BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (9) and (10) through (12) as paragraphs (5) through (10) and (13) through (15), respectively;

(2) in paragraph (3)(A), by striking “subject to paragraphs (4) and (5)” and inserting “subject to paragraphs (5) and (6)”;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) **MULTIPURPOSE BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.**—“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (D) and paragraphs (5) and (6), the Administrator shall establish a program to provide multipurpose grants to an eligible entity based on the considerations under paragraph (3)(C), to carry out inventory, characterization, assessment, planning, or remediation activities at 1 or more brownfield sites in a proposed area.

“(B) **GRANT AMOUNTS.**—

“(i) **INDIVIDUAL GRANT AMOUNTS.**—Each grant awarded under this paragraph shall not exceed \$950,000.

“(ii) **CUMULATIVE GRANT AMOUNTS.**—The total amount of grants awarded for each fiscal year under this paragraph shall not exceed 15 percent of the funds made available for the fiscal year to carry out this subsection.

“(C) **CRITERIA.**—In awarding a grant under this paragraph, the Administrator shall consider the extent to which an eligible entity is able—

“(i) to provide an overall plan for revitalization of the 1 or more brownfield sites in the proposed area in which the multipurpose grant will be used;

“(ii) to demonstrate a capacity to conduct the range of eligible activities that will be funded by the multipurpose grant; and

“(iii) to demonstrate that a multipurpose grant will meet the needs of the 1 or more brownfield sites in the proposed area.

“(D) **CONDITION.**—As a condition of receiving a grant under this paragraph, each eligible entity shall expend the full amount of the grant not later than the date that is 3 years after the date on which the grant is awarded to the eligible entity unless the Administrator, in the discretion of the Administrator, provides an extension.”.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN PUBLICLY OWNED BROWNFIELD SITES.

Section 104(k)(2) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN PUBLICLY OWNED BROWNFIELD SITES.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an eligible entity that is a governmental entity may receive a grant under this paragraph for property acquired by that governmental entity prior to January 11, 2002, even if the governmental entity does not qualify as a bona fide prospective purchaser (as that term is defined in section 101(40)), so long as the eligible entity has not caused or contributed to a release or threatened release of a hazardous substance at the property.”.

SEC. 5. INCREASED FUNDING FOR REMEDIATION GRANTS.

Section 104(k)(3)(A)(ii) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)(3)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking “\$200,000 for each site to be remediated” and inserting “\$500,000 for each site to be remediated, which limit may be waived by the Administrator, but not to exceed a total of \$650,000 for each site, based on the anticipated level of contamination, size, or ownership status of the site”.

SEC. 6. ALLOWING ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS FOR GRANT RECIPIENTS.

Paragraph (5) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Com-

pensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 3(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) in clause (i)—

(i) by striking subclause (III); and

(ii) by redesignating subclauses (IV) and (V) as subclauses (III) and (IV), respectively;

(B) by striking clause (ii);

(C) by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (ii); and

(D) in clause (ii) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)), by striking “Notwithstanding clause (i)(IV)” and inserting “Notwithstanding clause (i)(III)”;

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—An eligible entity may use up to 8 percent of the amounts made available under a grant or loan under this subsection for administrative costs.

“(ii) **RESTRICTION.**—For purposes of clause (i), the term ‘administrative costs’ does not include—

“(I) investigation and identification of the extent of contamination;

“(II) design and performance of a response action; or

“(III) monitoring of a natural resource.”.

SEC. 7. SMALL COMMUNITY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS.

Paragraph (7)(A) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 3(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking “The Administrator may provide,” and inserting the following:

“(i) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subparagraph:

“(I) **DISADVANTAGED AREA.**—The term ‘disadvantaged area’ means an area with an annual median household income that is less than 80 percent of the State-wide annual median household income, as determined by the latest available decennial census.

“(II) **SMALL COMMUNITY.**—The term ‘small community’ means a community with a population of not more than 15,000 individuals, as determined by the latest available decennial census.

“(iii) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants that provide,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) **SMALL OR DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY RECIPIENTS.**—

“(I) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subclause (II), in carrying out the program under clause (ii), the Administrator shall use not more than \$600,000 of the amounts made available to carry out this paragraph to provide grants to States that receive amounts under section 128(a) to assist small communities, Indian tribes, rural areas, or disadvantaged areas in achieving the purposes described in clause (ii).

“(II) **LIMITATION.**—Each grant awarded under subclause (I) shall be not more than \$7,500.”.

SEC. 8. WATERFRONT BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) is amended by inserting after paragraph (10) (as redesignated by section 3(1)) the following:

“(11) **WATERFRONT BROWNFIELD SITES.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION OF WATERFRONT BROWNFIELD SITE.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘waterfront brownfield site’ means a brownfield site that is adjacent to a body of water or a federally designated floodplain.

“(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In providing grants under this subsection, the Administrator shall—

“(i) take into consideration whether the brownfield site to be served by the grant is a waterfront brownfield site; and

“(ii) give consideration to waterfront brownfield sites.”.

SEC. 9. CLEAN ENERGY BROWNFIELDS GRANTS.

Section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as amended by section 8) is amended by inserting after paragraph (11) the following:

“(12) **CLEAN ENERGY PROJECTS AT BROWNFIELD SITES.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION OF CLEAN ENERGY PROJECT.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘clean energy project’ means—

“(i) a facility that generates renewable electricity from wind, solar, or geothermal energy; and

“(ii) any energy efficiency improvement project at a facility, including combined heat and power and district energy.

“(B) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator shall establish a program to provide grants—

“(i) to eligible entities to carry out inventory, characterization, assessment, planning, feasibility analysis, design, or remediation activities to locate a clean energy project at 1 or more brownfield sites; and

“(ii) to capitalize a revolving loan fund for the purposes described in clause (i).

“(C) **MAXIMUM AMOUNT.**—A grant under this paragraph shall not exceed \$500,000.”.

SEC. 10. TARGETED FUNDING FOR STATES.

Paragraph (15) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 3(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **TARGETED FUNDING.**—Of the amounts made available under subparagraph (A) for a fiscal year, the Administrator may use not more than \$2,000,000 to provide grants to States for purposes authorized under section 128(a), subject to the condition that each State that receives a grant under this subparagraph shall have used at least 50 percent of the amounts made available to that State in the previous fiscal year to carry out assessment and remediation activities under section 128(a).”.

SEC. 11. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **BROWNFIELDS REVITALIZATION FUNDING.**—Paragraph (15)(A) of section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(k)) (as redesignated by section 3(1)) is amended by striking “2006” and inserting “2018”.

(b) **STATE RESPONSE PROGRAMS.**—Section 128(a)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9628(a)(3)) is amended by striking “2006” and inserting “2018”.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, June 28; 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 resume consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577, with the time until the cloture vote equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators TOOMEY, WYDEN, and BROWN.

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

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. TOOMEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 3100 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. TOOMEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes tonight to discuss the Intelligence authorization bill for fiscal year 2017. The Senate has been asked to provide unanimous consent to move forward on this legislation, and I have objected to doing that and want to take just a few minutes to outline why I feel very strongly about this.

The reality is, this legislation contains a number of valuable provisions, but once again it is being driven by the same issues the Senate looked at last week, and that was the McCain amendment, which involved a major change with respect to national security letters. My colleague is a valuable member of the Intelligence Committee and knows what I am talking about.

But to set the backdrop is again, I want it understood how important it is to make clear that it is a very dangerous time. Those of us who sit on the Intelligence Committee are acutely aware of that. A couple of times a week we go into that special room and come away with a very clear recognition that there are people out there who do not wish our country well. So that is not in question. This is a dangerous time. Given these dangers, it is especially important—critically important—that law enforcement and intelligence authorities have the tools they need to protect the American people.

Tonight, I wish to start with where we really left off with the amendment from the Senator from Arizona, the McCain amendment involving national security letters, because that amendment deals with the very same concern that has led me to object to the Intelligence authorization bill tonight.

I don't take a back seat to anybody—not anybody—in terms of making sure our intelligence and law enforcement officials have the tools they need to protect our country at a dangerous time. That is why in 2013, I began working for it then, and we got it into the USA FREEDOM Act. I wrote the provision that became section 102 of the USA FREEDOM Act. It said that

when our government—the FBI or our intelligence and law enforcement community—believed it has to move quickly and it has to move immediately, our government could do that. It could go get the information that has been in question—the email materials, the text message logs, the chat records, and all of these digital communications. Under section 102, the government could move immediately to get this information and then come back after the fact and settle up with the court. Never once has the court denied the government.

I recall that during the debate over the McCain amendment, the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee said that he was concerned that the FBI might have to wait around for a month—no way, absolutely no way, out of the question. Under section 102, there is not going to be any dawdling. There is not going to be waiting around. The government can move and move immediately to protect the American people.

Given that the government has those tools for the FBI and intelligence officials—making sure that we have the tools needed to protect the security and well-being of the American people—that is a reason for being very careful about thinking through big changes in these national security letters and what the changes would be, specifically. This was in the McCain amendment. It is in the Intelligence authorization bill. An FBI field office could issue a national security letter, in effect, administratively. It is an administrative subpoena without any court oversight. For example, the national security letters could be used to collect what are called electronic communication transaction records. This would be email, chat records, and text message logs.

I have had Senators come up to me to ask me about whether this could be true. When I was responding to questions at home about that this weekend, folks or people asked: Does this really mean that the government can get the Internet browsing history of an individual without a warrant, even when the government has the emergency authority if it is really necessary?

The answer to that question is: Yes, the government can. The government can get access to Web browsing history under the Intelligence authorization legislation, under the McCain amendment, and they can do it without getting a warrant—even when the government can go get it without a warrant when there is an emergency circumstance.

The reality is Web browsing history can reveal an awful lot of information about Americans. I know of little information that could be more intimate than that Web browsing history. If you know that a person is visiting the Web site of a mental health professional or a substance abuse support group or a particular political organization or a particular dating site, you know a tremendous amount of private, personal,

and intimate information about that individual. That is what you get when you can get access to their Web browsing history without a warrant, even, as I have said, when the government's interest is protected in an emergency.

The reality is that getting access to somebody's Web browsing history is almost like spying on their thoughts. This level of surveillance absolutely ought to come with court oversight. As I have spelled out tonight, that is possible in two separate ways. There is the traditional approach with getting a warrant. Then under section 102, which I wrote as part of the USA FREEDOM Act, the government can get information when there is an emergency and come back later after the fact and settle.

The reality is the President's surveillance review group has said that they believe court oversight should be required for this kind of information.

In effect, now we have some law enforcement and intelligence officials saying that we ought to go in exactly the opposite direction. By the way, George W. Bush agreed that we ought to be careful about gathering this information. He didn't want this particular power.

Maybe somebody could argue that, well, intelligence and law enforcement officials ought to be able to do this because it is more convenient for them. To tell you the truth, if we were talking about convenience or protecting the American people in an emergency, I would be pretty sympathetic to the government's argument. But that is not the choice. As to the government's interest, given the safety of the American people being on the line, the government goes to get that information immediately—the Web browsing history, the chat records, and the email. The government gets it immediately under the specific language of section 102.

What this really comes down to is that we have had this horrible tragedy in Orlando. So we are all very concerned about the safety and the well-being of the American people. When we are home, there is no question—as I am sure it is in the case of the Presiding Officer of the Senate, my colleague from Ohio, and myself—that the American people want policies that protect their security and their liberty. They want policies that do both. Frankly, they don't think they are mutually exclusive. They think the government ought to be doing both.

After a tragedy—and you can almost set your clock by it—increasingly, proposals are being brought up that really don't do much of either. They don't do much to advance security. In this case, you protect people's security with that emergency authority when the well-being of our people is on the line and the public wants their liberties protected. They are certainly going to be very concerned about someone being able to see their Web browsing history with an administrative subpoena and no court oversight.

I am going to touch on one other section of the Intelligence authorization bill that concerns me, but I will say that I supported that emergency authority very strongly. I was the first to propose it in 2013. I did so because I said I wanted to make sure—since I am one of the longer serving members of the Intelligence Committee, and I am very pleased to have the Presiding Officer of the Senate on it—and I wanted to be able to say that my focus has been to show that security and liberty are not mutually exclusive. We can do both. I think, with what we have outlined this afternoon, we can, in fact, do both. That is why section 102 of the USA Freedom Act is so important. It spells out how and when the well-being and safety of the American people is on the line. There isn't anybody going to be dawdling around. What the distinguished chairman of the Intelligence Committee said about people waiting for a month to get a national security letter is not going to happen—not if you use section 102. We are making it clear how important security is. But we are also saying that we are not going to needlessly erode these sacred and vital constitutional protections of the American people, which is what you would be doing if a field office of the FBI, administratively and without court oversight, could go out and scoop up scores of browsing records.

That is why I have objected to giving unanimous consent to the intelligence authorization bill. We always do it publicly. That is why I am on the floor tonight.

I will tell my colleagues that this bill, on the key issue of national security letters, is essentially a redo of the vote that took place last week on the McCain legislation.

I close by saying that while the Intelligence authorization bill does contain other provisions that I think are quite constructive, I am troubled that the bill also would erode the jurisdiction of the independent privacy board for the second year in a row. Here, in particular, is where we all want to concentrate on U.S. persons. That is what is so important—focusing on U.S. persons. At a time when telecommunications systems around the world are beginning to merge—and this will increasingly be the case in the digital domain—the individual's U.S. or non-U.S. status is not always readily apparent. So I am concerned about some of the restrictions that are in the authorization, as well that I think they really ignore the way in which telecommunications systems have changed around the world and the difficulty in recognizing quickly an individual's U.S. or non-U.S. status.

With that, I note our friend and colleague is on the floor to give his remarks.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the always good insight from the

senior Senator from Oregon, my colleague on the Finance Committee. I say thank you to Senator WYDEN.

WHOLE WOMAN'S HEALTH V. HELLERSTEDT SUPREME COURT DECISION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, the Supreme Court, despite lacking an important ninth Justice—my Republican colleagues refuse to do their jobs. That is the first time that anybody can remember, maybe in history—certainly in recent history—where a Supreme Court nominee has been sent to the Senate by a President, and the Senate has refused to do either hearings or certainly refuse to bring that Justice up for a vote. If this continues, if Senator MCCONNELL and his Republican colleagues continue their course, this will be the first time in 150 years where a Supreme Court vacancy has stayed open for an entire year. Why 150 years? Because we were in the middle of the Civil War, and there were all kinds of things going on as southerners, who had seceded, left the Supreme Court with lots of vacancies, and the Senate didn't do its job then. But that was the Civil War; this is a political war waged by one side in a refusal to do its job.

Today the Supreme Court, despite not having nine members, reaffirmed that women, not politicians, should be the ones making their own health care decisions. In a 5-to-3 decision, the Supreme Court ruled on *Whole Woman's Health v. Hellerstedt* that the Texas law at issue places an undue burden on a woman's ability to access safe and legal health care.

The law's arbitrary, medically unnecessary—medically unnecessary—restrictions caused dozen of clinics to close across the State of Texas. The same thing has happened in other States with similar laws, including my State of Ohio with 11 million people. These clinics are often the only places that women, and also many men, have to turn to for basic health services. Today's decision is a victory for health care in Texas and, ultimately, for State after State across the country.

Millions of women rely on Planned Parenthood and other clinics like it for lifesaving screenings, testing, preventive care, and treatment. In Ohio, Planned Parenthood centers provide health care services to almost 100,000 men and women each year. A hundred thousand men and women depend on Planned Parenthood for things like screenings, testing, preventive care, and treatment. Many of these men and women have nowhere else to turn. They either can't afford care anywhere else or they live too far away from another health center to have real access to basic health care—screenings, testing, preventive care, counseling, treatment, and all those things.

Today's decision sets an important precedent that no politician should come between a woman and the health care she needs. We know that laws like

this are part of a sustained, coordinated attack on a women's right to make personal, private health care decisions for themselves. We have seen it in Ohio, and we have seen it in so many other States across the country.

Politicians claim these harmful restrictions are all about protecting women's health. Nothing could be further from the truth. These talking points are a sham, and today's majority decision by a generally conservative Supreme Court shows the Court saw right through those arguments.

Ohio and other States with so-called TRAP laws should repeal them immediately. If they wait, they will only be struck down by the Court, just like the Texas law—again, a Court where most of those Justices, or at least half of those Justices were appointed by conservative Presidents. We need to work to get these laws off the books quickly and to fight the attacks women continue to face on their right to make their own health care decisions.

Earlier this year, Ohio passed a new law to strip Federal funding not only from Planned Parenthood but any health care facility that could be perceived as “promoting” safe and legal abortions. This includes health clinics that simply work with other providers to refer women to other facilities so women can make decisions that should be between them and their doctors.

This is far, far more sweeping than just defunding Planned Parenthood, which is a political talking point for Republicans across this country now. Health officials in Ohio are scared that the new law could take funding away from local health departments—as if we don't have enough problems in our State.

Let's be clear. This isn't about defunding abortion. The Federal government does not provide funding for abortion, period. It hasn't provided funding for abortion for decades. This Ohio law explicitly targets critical health and health education services for women, including HIV testing and cancer prevention services.

Today's 5-to-3 decision by the Supreme Court is a victory for all of us who want to improve the lives and health of women around the country, but it will do nothing to stop laws like this in Ohio. That is why our work goes on.

These laws that have passed in Texas and Ohio that the Court struck down are not about health or safety. The Supreme Court confirmed that today. They are about politicians thinking they know better than women and their doctors, and it is happening every day in this country. If these laws continue to chip away—or in the case of Ohio's new law, carve away—women's access to care, we will see more undiagnosed cancers, more untreated illnesses, and more unintended pregnancies.

My State, shamefully, is 50th in the Nation in Black infant mortality. We are 47th in the Nation overall in infant

mortality. It is laws like these that legislators passed—laws defunding public health services, laws cutting money for local communities so they can put it into health care and education. It is the behavior of this legislature and some of its predecessor legislatures that have attacked young mothers and young women who may or may not be pregnant. And when you do that, there is simply not the emphasis on well-baby care, there is not the emphasis on preventive care, there is not the emphasis on the health of the mother, and

there is not the emphasis on giving women choices.

It is time for politicians in my State and across the country to follow the guidance of the Supreme Court today and to stay out of decisions that should be confidentially between a woman and her doctor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:57 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, June 28, 2016, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2016:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT F. ROSSITER, JR., OF NEBRASKA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA.