



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 13, 2016

No. 113

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Living God, we bless Your Holy Name. We praise You for the abundance of Your love and for Your peace that transcends understanding. Lord, even in the midst of the cacophonous, You permit us to hear Heaven's harmonies.

Today, inspire our lawmakers to depend on Your grace. As they rely on Your promises, empower them to obey Your precepts, finding in Your wisdom a lamp for their feet and a light for their path. Sustain them with Your sweet presence when they walk on weary roads, and continue to bless them with the constancy of Your love. Send Your Spirit to bring quiet and serenity into their souls.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

UNITED KINGDOM'S NEXT PRIME MINISTER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Queen of England will ask Theresa May to form a government and

become the United Kingdom's next Prime Minister.

Our allies, the British, have stood with us through the toughest of times and remain a valued ally and partner. This was true under Theresa May's predecessor as Conservative Party leader and Prime Minister—that is David Cameron, to whom we also send warm regards today—and it was true under the preceding Labour governments of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown as well. We have every expectation it will be true under her leadership as well.

From what I hear, May is tough, savvy, and she has promised to seek unity and “a strong . . . positive vision for the future” of her country.

So on behalf of the Senate, allow me to wish her the best in the days to come.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today the Republican-led Senate will have two opportunities to make a difference for the American people by passing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report and the bipartisan, bicameral aviation agreement. Both bills are the result of months of hard work from colleagues on both sides. With continued cooperation, we can move these measures across the finish line now.

The CARA conference report is a comprehensive legislative response to the prescription opioid and heroin epidemic which is devastating our Nation. By increasing prevention, treatment, recovery, and law enforcement tools, CARA can help prevent more people from struggling with addiction to begin with and it can help foster long-term healing for those already struggling with addiction.

It is no wonder it has earned the backing of nearly 250 groups, from local hospitals like the Kent County

Memorial Hospital in Rhode Island to law enforcement groups like the Fraternal Order of Police and antidrug groups like Voices of Hope in my own State of Kentucky.

At a time when drug overdoses claim 129 American lives every single day, it is painfully clear we need to do more, and we need to do it now. That is why this Senate majority has provided more than double the funding the previous majority provided for opioid-related issues. That is why this Senate majority has made passing this comprehensive response a priority.

I particularly want to thank those who made this moment possible, Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, Senator GRASSLEY, and Senator ALEXANDER. I also appreciate those on the Democratic side who worked very hard on this bill, such as Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator KLOBUCHAR. I know they are all proud to support it today.

We can also pass the bipartisan, bicameral aviation bill, which is an important step to ensuring safety and security for American travelers. Recent terror attacks, such as those at airports in Brussels and in Istanbul, underline the significance of this bill, which represents the most significant airport security reform in a decade.

By shoring up security for international flights coming into the United States, by enhancing vetting for aviation employees, and by improving security in prescreening zones that are often vulnerable, the airport security bill before us will take more steps to protect airline passengers.

The bill will also take steps to keep Americans safe from active shooter threats by authorizing more so-called VIPR teams. It will also make sure airports are better equipped to respond and disarm threats that come their way by bolstering resources and training for security personnel.

In addition to these smart security enhancements, the bill also includes a number of key items to improve safety

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5019

in our skies, such as ensuring that unmanned aerial vehicles don't interfere with emergency response and improving mental health screening for pilots. It includes a number of consumer protection provisions, too, such as refunds for lost or delayed baggage and improvements to travel for disabled passengers and parents with small children.

I especially thank Senator THUNE for guiding this critical bill through the legislative process and for his work to include even more security provisions to keep Americans safe.

Every Senator should support this bill today so we can send it to the President's desk immediately. With cooperation now, we can finish our work on these critical bills. With continued cooperation in the coming days, we will be able to finish our work on other important legislation as well.

For instance, yesterday we voted to go to conference on the Energy Policy Modernization Act, which represents the first broad energy legislation to pass the Senate since the Bush administration. By updating and reforming our energy policies and infrastructure, this bill can help Americans save more energy, produce more energy, and pay less for energy.

This much needed legislation wouldn't have been possible without the resilient efforts of the Energy Committee chair, Senator MURKOWSKI, and the ranking member, Senator CANTWELL, to move it forward. I am pleased the Senate took the next step to advance this bill, and I hope we can arrive at a final agreement in the near future.

Unfortunately, there are areas where our colleagues have blocked critical progress on issues such as Zika control funding and support for our veterans. Here was the headline in a newspaper this week: "Reid: Senate Dems will block Zika funding again." "[W]hich means," the article explained, "there will be no further avenues to pass a funding bill to combat Zika for the rest of the summer."

Democrats used to say Zika was an imminent threat. Now they are threatening to extend the filibuster of the funding we need to fight Zika and protect women's health. Why? It seems clear enough. They think dysfunction works well for them politically, so they are trying to manufacture some regardless of who gets hurt in the process. They have tried to muddy the issue with extraneous arguments and half-truths, but they just don't stand up to serious scrutiny.

Let us examine a few of the things they have said about this compromise conference report. Our Democratic friends pretend it would underfund Zika. Actually, it contains the exact \$1.1 billion funding they just voted for last month.

Democrats pretend it contains partisan offsets. Actually, the offsets have bipartisan buy-in. Two of the three offsets have explicit bipartisan support.

The third takes unspent money that was set aside for health care in the territories but cannot be used and actually uses those funds for—get this—health care in the territories.

Democrats pretend the compromise conference report would weaken clean water protections. Actually, it temporarily—just temporarily—waives a duplicative paperwork provision that Democrats themselves call "unnecessary for the protection of our environment" and a "waste of taxpayer dollars." This temporary provision would only apply to pesticides already approved—already approved—by the EPA, and it represents the only real way to commence with the kind of anti-mosquito efforts we need—efforts the EPA Administrator herself assures us are not only safe but "perhaps the most important tool we can use right now"—as the vaccine takes a period of time to develop.

Democrats also pretend the compromise conference report would prohibit funding or deny access for birth control. Actually, it provides more resources for health care, including preventive care, than the Zika bill Democrats voted for just last month. This compromise bill directs those health care dollars to the very places you would expect, such as hospitals, public health departments, community health centers, and Medicaid.

Democrats are now upset because a political supporter doesn't get a special carve-out, so they are demanding an earmark for this partisan group as the cost of ending their attack on women's health and their blockade of anti-Zika funding. Of course, Democrats would like us all to ignore the fact that the very same partisan campaign organization would not have been able to access these Medicaid funds in the President's Zika request either.

So it is hard to decide which of these excuses is the most disingenuous. Maybe it is the false claim this bill cuts funding for veterans. It actually increases veterans funding to record levels, by the way. Just as Democrats are pushing a partisan proposal to provide political cover on Zika, it actually would leave veterans funding behind.

So, look, I think we get this. Democrats have a partisan interest in blocking critical anti-Zika funding. That is what is going on here, but Americans are asking them to please just put politics aside for once and think of the national interest. Does anyone—anyone—seriously believe pregnant mothers care about manufactured squabbles over offsets and earmarks and duplicative paperwork? They want Washington to kill mosquitoes and they want them to do it now. They want to see a vaccine developed—and quickly. They want to see their unborn babies protected from a devastating virus that can have lifetime consequences. What they do not want to see, what they are not interested in observing, is one more manufactured partisan excuse from our colleagues over here on the other side.

To quote the top Democrat on the Committee on Appropriations, "Mosquitoes don't care about the budget process." She is right.

The time for games is over. This is our chance to pass anti-Zika funding, and there is only one way to do it. Vote yes on the compromise Zika control and veterans conference report before us and send it on down to the President.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

LEGISLATION BEFORE THE SENATE AND JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Republican leader celebrates the opioid legislation and the FAA bill, but both are missed opportunities. There is no funding in the opioid bill. There were editorials all over the country yesterday about that. I read here on the Senate floor, it is in the RECORD, about The New York Times saying it was really wrong to try to claim credit for doing something on opioids when there is no money to do it.

The FAA bill—I will talk about that in a little more detail in a little bit—is another missed opportunity to do what is right to help, to help the Republican leader keep his word.

CARA, the opioid legislation, has no real funding to solve the real problem.

Over the last week, Democrats have exhausted every avenue to try and work with Republicans on a Zika funding measure. Democrats had the audacity to expect the Republican leader to live up to his promise in April of bipartisan work on Zika. This is what the Republican leader said in April:

We all are very much aware that this is a serious crisis. We'll be working with the administration, with Democrats.

But his actions, especially over the last couple of weeks, clearly illustrate that he was never really interested in a bipartisan solution. For example, the President offered a meeting with Senator McCONNELL, Speaker RYAN, Secretary Burwell, and Director of OMB Shaun Donovan, to work on the Zika crisis. The Speaker and the Republican leader refused that meeting. We offered to reintroduce the Senate's bipartisan Zika compromise from what we sent to the House. We would do it again as a freestanding bill. That bill had 89 votes. Eighty-nine Senators voted for it.

We have offered Republicans legitimate compromises in the hopes they would join us at the negotiating table, but it is clear that they don't want to stay in DC. They want to rush to Cleveland and wave the flag for Donald Trump. That is why they are imposing imaginary deadlines on Zika legislation.

The Wall Street Journal reported yesterday that “Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL today rejected that offer, saying the time for such negotiations had passed”—talking about our offer, our latest offer. The Republican leader is saying there is no time to work on Zika. Well, I would suggest that I disagree with that.

Starting this Friday—right here, July 15—we are going to begin the longest recess in the Senate in 60 years. Sixty years ago, there was not much going on in this country, relatively speaking. We had far fewer people, 100 million fewer people. We had a less complicated government in many ways, so there was an opportunity at that time to take the time off, but 60 years later, there is no time to do that.

To say there is no time to work on Zika—give us all a break. There is plenty of time—7 weeks, to be exact. I guess a couple months of paid vacation is more important than protecting pregnant women and their babies from the terrible birth defects caused by Zika. There is no reason we can’t stay here and work on protecting women and their babies, but Republicans are in such a hurry to coronate Trump in Cleveland, they are willing to sacrifice helping their constituents.

The Republican leader announced yesterday that he will be speaking at the Republican convention next week. I guess the Republican leader is rushing for the exit without funding Zika so he will have time to prepare his speech and polish it because I am sure it will really help Donald Trump a lot in his election efforts. The Republican leader cares more about his time off and cheering Donald Trump than protecting the women of America and their babies from this horrible virus.

Let’s be clear. It is obvious that Republicans are choosing Trump and some time off over protecting American women from the Zika virus. This is a really bad, revolting set of priorities, and every Republican in this building and the office buildings surrounding this Capitol should be ashamed. They shouldn’t fool themselves—every Republican in Congress should know that if they walk away without funding Zika, the repercussions are going to be severe.

I can’t recall ever, having been around here a long time—even before I came to Congress, I worked here—watching a party so willingly move to its own destruction. That is what Republicans seem to be intent on doing. Maybe they don’t like being in the majority. It is hard to be in the majority. We are trying to save the Republicans from themselves, but they won’t let us. We have pursued every avenue possible to find a bipartisan Zika bill path forward that can pass both Houses and be signed by the President. It shouldn’t be hard. Women and babies across America are counting on Republicans to come to their senses and pass a bill before we leave here on a 2-month vacation, but if Republicans refuse, if they

can’t see the writing on the wall, we can’t make them read the writing on the wall. It is up to them to open their eyes and read the writing on the wall.

Look at the time we have to do something on Zika. Look at the time—July 15, August. See all these big black lines? We are not here. We come back on September 6. July is gone, August is gone, and part of September is gone. We have a lot of time to be here and do some work.

I say to my Republican colleagues, sit down with us. We have offered compromise after compromise. To hear my friend talk about, oh, I can’t understand why they won’t accept preventing Planned Parenthood from taking care of these women—if there were ever a time in the history of America where women wanted to do something about birth control, how about now?

My Republican friend says: I don’t understand why they are concerned about Planned Parenthood not being able to take care of these women. I don’t understand why they are concerned about changing the environmental laws dealing with the Clean Water Act. I don’t understand that.

Their legislation takes \$500 million from veterans that we were going to use to process claims. For him to come and say we are increasing veterans money is just not true. Everyone knows that the \$543 million they have here is an offset from ObamaCare. I could raise a point of order right now, and it would fall automatically. Everyone knows that. Taking money from Ebola—there is not much left there. Ebola is still a crisis. We know that. We remember that from 2 years ago.

But what is always so interesting is why in the world, if they are so interested in doing something about this, would they stick a provision in their legislation that they reinstate the ability to fly the Confederate flag over military cemeteries? How is that for a compromise?

So this calendar is going to stay here. Let’s look at it for a while and see what time we have left. The Republican Senate is being defined by its unfinished business. It is not just Zika; we could go on for quite some time. I will mention a couple things.

How about giving serious consideration to protecting Americans by funding our military and our national security, addressing gun violence, or providing the necessary resources to attack our Nation’s opioid crisis.

Through their historic inaction, Republicans are refusing to treat the Federal judiciary with the respect it deserves and the Constitution demands. The senior Senator from Iowa has turned the once proud and independent Judiciary Committee—my friend—we have been together for 34 years in the Congress of the United States—the senior Senator from Illinois is a member of that committee. He loves his work on that committee; he has told me numerous times. But that once proud and independent Judiciary Committee has

been turned into a partisan Republican opposition research operation. The Republican Judiciary Committee now has a singular focus: winning the White House for Donald Trump.

The Judiciary chairman has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars trying to embarrass Hillary Clinton during her stalwart term as Secretary of State of this great country. They failed, of course. Senator GRASSLEY wrote countless letters demanding State Department documents. He even once went after a woman who worked at the State Department and was having a baby. He wanted the records to make sure he could document that. He scoured sensitive records belonging to Secretary Clinton’s aides. He was obsessed with digging up political dirt. He found none. But, like the Benghazi Committee in the House, Senator GRASSLEY has wasted millions of taxpayer dollars and produced zero. Now that the FBI has closed the book on Secretary Clinton’s emails, Senator GRASSLEY is resorting to questioning the integrity of career FBI officials, calling their investigation “suspect.”

Senator GRASSLEY’s efforts to elect Donald Trump don’t end with his partisan attacks regarding Secretary Clinton. The senior Senator from Iowa has obstructed qualified, consensus judicial nominees in the hopes that Trump will win in November and remake the judiciary in his image. Think about that. Unlike past Judiciary Committee chairs, Senator GRASSLEY is content to put partisanship above a functioning judiciary.

The number of vacancies under President Obama has skyrocketed. Republicans’ obstruction is putting them in the history books—but for the wrong reason. Last year, Senate Republicans made history by confirming the fewest judges in a long time. This year, they seem determined to shortchange the judiciary even further. We have a myriad of judicial emergencies around the country, meaning the judges can’t get their work done. These courts have more cases than judges can handle, and that has more than doubled.

Justice is being denied for millions of Americans, but under Chairman GRASSLEY, the Judiciary Committee spends its time playing politics, not confirming judges. It seems the only thing deserving the chairman’s attention is electing Donald Trump, ensuring he gets as many judicial appointments as possible. Nowhere is that more apparent than with the current vacancy on the U.S. Supreme Court and GRASSLEY’s obstruction of the highly qualified Chief Judge Merrick Garland. No one can find anything dealing with his education, his qualifications, his judicial temperament, his integrity—he is top of the line, as was indicated some time ago by ORRIN HATCH.

President Obama nominated Garland 100 days ago. He serves as the chief judge of the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He was unanimously rated as

“well qualified” by the American Bar Association—the highest rating possible. By any measure, he is exactly the type of fairminded, consensus nominee the Senate should be considering for the vacancy. But Judge Garland can’t make his case to the American people because Senator GRASSLEY refuses to even hold a hearing on the nomination. Chairman GRASSLEY has come up with a myriad of excuses to block the nomination, none of which hold water. As the Des Moines Register said recently, “Grassley’s excuses are purely political.”

Iowans aren’t being fooled. They know that the chairman’s real goal is holding the Supreme Court open for Donald Trump to do with what he wants. The Judiciary chairman has already said Trump would “appoint the right type of people”—boy, I will tell you, that must be a real stretch—“the right type of people” to the Supreme Court. The senior Senator from Iowa obviously places a high value on Trump’s judgment, which has proven to be so good the last year. Senator GRASSLEY is holding a Supreme Court vacancy for a man who accused an Indiana-born judge of being unable to do his job because of his racial heritage. His parents came from Mexico. Apparently he would like to see that brand of thinking brought to the Nation’s courts.

It is time for Senator GRASSLEY to stop playing politics with his committee and give Judge Garland a fair hearing. It is time for his committee to address the numerous lower court vacancies and damaging judicial emergencies throughout the country. The American people deserve a functioning judicial system led by the Judiciary Committee in the Senate. They have had enough with Republican excuses. Iowans and the Nation are waiting. It is time for Senator GRASSLEY and Senate Republicans to do their job.

Mr. President, I would ask the Chair to announce what the Senate is going to do the rest of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

Conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11

a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois. Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, pending before the Senate is an important bill. It is a bill that relates to the opioid epidemic in America—an epidemic which is linked directly to the heroin epidemic in America and the sad reality of the deaths that are occasioned by heroin overdoses.

The prescription opioid and heroin epidemic claimed 28,647 American lives in 2014—1,652 in my State of Illinois. That is a 30-percent increase in just 4 years.

I have seen this devastation firsthand. I have sat with parents who have lost their kids. I have met with young teenagers who were addicted. Thank goodness that some of them have been able—with treatment, counseling, and strength—to fight off that addiction.

The reality is obvious. This narcotics epidemic is not an inner city problem. It is an American problem. It is a problem that not only touches the inner cities of America, but it also touches every other community. There is no town too small, no suburb too wealthy to escape the opioid and heroin epidemic.

I have been across my State, from one end to the other, at roundtables with law enforcement, with medical professionals, with those who do addiction treatment and with those who have lived through these addictions. I have seen firsthand what it has done to communities and families and lives. We need a forceful response, and we are going to vote on one in about an hour. It is called the CARA bill. It is a bill that moves us in the right direction when it comes to dealing with this addiction.

The conference report has many important elements to it, and that is why I am going to support it. It includes my proposal to require reforms at the FDA, or the Food and Drug Administration, to ensure better oversight of dangerous and addictive opioid drugs before they are approved for sale in our country. My provisions will ensure the FDA convenes scientific advisory committees before approving new opioid drugs and that the Pediatric Advisory Committee has a voice in the decision.

We require the FDA to consider the public health impacts before allowing more addictive products to come onto the market. We direct Federal health agencies to develop plans for continuing medical education with doctors and other providers who prescribe opioids. We require the FDA to encourage drug companies to make abuse-deterrent formulations of these dangerous drugs.

The CARA conference report also includes a proposal I have worked on to improve State prescription drug monitoring programs. This legislation will make it easier for States to share information about overprescribing and overusing opioids, it gives doctors more information to better perform their prescribing practices.

I am pleased the CARA conference report includes new grant programs to expand access to naloxone—the life-saving anecdote—to promote treatment alternatives instead of arrests for those suffering from addiction and to create flexibility and treatment options for those who need medication-assisted therapy or pregnant women who need specialized care.

Having said all of these positive things about what we are to vote on, let me state the obvious. When only 12 percent of the people in Illinois are able to receive care for their addiction, and there is a 12-week wait at facilities for vulnerable patients to get into drug treatment, authorizing new programs, which this bill does, is good but not good enough. We need to make an investment. We need to put taxpayers’ dollars behind this commitment to end this epidemic, and it is needed now.

That is why Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN of New Hampshire offered an amendment during the Senate floor consideration of this bill. Her amendment would have put \$600 million into actually making the bill work, enforcing it, investing in it. It failed.

During the CARA conference meetings, Senator MURRAY and Congressman PALLONE offered amendments to ensure that Congress would put some money into the promise of this bill. They couldn’t get it passed in a conference dominated by the Republican majority. Why? Why would these efforts be blocked when the Republicans are joining us and saying this is a national problem that deserves our immediate attention? Because Republicans have said they have already proposed to increase funding in appropriation bills to take care of this. Yet many Republicans are supporting a continuing resolution that freezes funding at this year’s level and provides for no increase in opioid epidemic treatment. When they say they are going to put more money in and then call for a continuing resolution, they know and we know that it is a sham.

The Republicans are opposing an increase in funding for this bill by saying they already proposed increased funding in another bill, but at the same time they are advocating a freeze, or flat-funding a continuing resolution. They can’t have it both ways.

It is confusing, but those of us who live in this world know what they are up to. They want to take the credit for passing this bill and the promise of funding it in the future into the election in November but not provide the money that is needed to make it work. That is playing games with people’s lives. America deserves better.

Failing to provide the dollars today is not going to help those who are currently suffering. It is not going to help that mother who was awake all last night worrying about a son or a daughter who is facing an addiction, praying they can get that child they love into treatment in time to break that addiction and save their lives.

You know what else is missing from this CARA conference report? Many of these measures in the bill deal with addiction after it has taken hold. We have to do things to prevent addiction on the front end. The best way is to ensure people don't get addicted in the first place. I have introduced the Addiction Prevention and Responsible Opioid Practices Act, or the A-PROP Act. It is going to help shut off the spigot for fueling this crisis.

Here is something most people don't understand or realize. The Drug Enforcement Administration sounds like the kind of law enforcement agency that polices America to reduce the likelihood that narcotics are going to be found in our homes, in our neighborhoods, in our communities, and in our States. It also has another responsibility. Each year pharma, the major pharmaceutical companies, comes to this agency and asks for the approval to make even more narcotics. These are prescription narcotics like opioids. The DEA has to sign off on this increase in production each year.

If we are going to take a look at the seriousness of this opioid problem and its growth in America, take a look at the growth of production in America that has been approved by this Federal agency. Between 1993 and 2015, the Drug Enforcement Administration-approved quotas for oxycodone increased almost 40 times. In 1993, they were producing about 3½ tons of these opioid pills. Now they are producing 150 tons of these opioid pills.

The DEA has approved pharma to produce enough opioid narcotic pills to provide—listen closely—every adult in America a 1-month prescription each year to opioid narcotics—every adult in America. That goes way beyond any medical need. It is pharma's effort to make more money and to feed the beast of this opioid epidemic, and DEA each year gives the seal of approval. That is wrong.

Once these pills are produced, it takes a doctor or a dentist or some other authorized medical professional to prescribe them. How they are making it through that process onto the streets and into the homes of America is the next question beyond this DEA approval of pharma's overproduction.

We need continuing medical education to be mandated. Incidentally, DEA approves doctors to give them the authority and power to prescribe narcotics. They can monitor this, as well, and see where the abuse is taking place. We need an all-hands-on-deck approach to this epidemic. Each stakeholder needs to play a role.

I am going to vote for this CARA conference report. On its face, it is hard to vote against, but I want to do it with the knowledge of having said in this statement on the floor that it isn't enough. Unless we pass Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN's amendment, unless we follow up on Senator PATTY MURRAY's amendment in conference and fund this effort to stop this epidemic, we are ba-

sically sending a very nice greeting to America that we recognize the problem but we are not paying to solve it. People across America understand this epidemic. It is time for us to take it seriously, not for political posturing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my colleague from Illinois for his remarks on the funding issue. I couldn't agree more.

There is no question that this body should be working to help curb opioid abuse in this country, to improve mental health services, to improve the way we treat addiction and speed up recovery. Everyone in this Chamber knows it. But the bill before us, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, is woefully insufficient for dealing with the opioid and heroin crisis. It makes a whole lot of changes, but it doesn't support a single one with new resources.

It would authorize block grants to States to treat people who are hooked on these dangerously addictive prescription painkillers, but it doesn't provide any actual money to give. It would authorize programs to help law enforcement crack down on this scourge, but it doesn't provide a single plugged nickel to our cops.

Without actual appropriations, this bill is like a Hollywood movie set—something that appears real on the surface but has no substance and no life behind its facade. Let me say that again. Without actual appropriations, this bill is like a Hollywood movie set—something that appears real on the surface but has no substance and no life behind its false facade.

I want to clear one thing up. I have heard many of my Republican colleagues say that we should pass this bill, and we can just fill in the money later. Forgive me for being skeptical that they will actually follow through on that promise, because my friends on the other side of the aisle have been fighting for years to cut, not increase, the exact same programs they are now touting in this bill—what a sham.

With the rise of the tea party, the hard-right conservative factions in the House and Senate brought devastating proposed cuts to the health programs that combat the opioid problem, and my colleagues here who are not members of the tea party went along. Now that there is an opioid crisis, now that some are worried about reelection, oh, they are out there. Where were they last year and the year before? Where are they going to be this year in terms of actually getting some funding?

Last year, Republicans proposed billions of dollars in cuts to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill—the main funding source for substance abuse treatment. Without the bipartisan budget agreement, this would have cut \$9 billion. In fact, the Senate Appropriations Committee proposed cutting the Substance Abuse and Mental

Health Services Administration, or SAMHSA, by \$160 million before Democrats pushed to restore it. We didn't hear much of an outcry from the very same people who are out there saying they are doing things on opioids.

On the other side of the Capitol, the tea party Republicans have gone even further. In 2012, they proposed cutting SAMHSA by \$283 million. The latest PAUL RYAN budgets—the holy grail of Republican fiscal austerity—took a meat cleaver to this agency. He proposed cutting an estimated \$400 million from SAMHSA in 2013 and 2014.

The Republican record on actually funding these programs is, frankly, abysmal. When you hear treatment centers and when you hear law enforcement say that we don't have the resources to do what we need to do to go after the opioid crisis, ask yourself why, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have fought increases in funding.

You can't have an additional counselor. I have held parents in my arms who said: My son or daughter didn't make it as they were waiting in line for treatment. There were not enough counselors, not enough slots. I have talked to law enforcement officials who say they want to do much more, but their hands are tied because they don't have enough cops, enough intelligence, enough follow-through on going after these evil drug dealers who are just despicable.

We want to say to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that what they probably would have done to us is to block this bill so we should have no accomplishments. That is what happened in 2013 and 2014. We are not going to do that. This has a few good things, but it is not close to enough.

The way the appropriations process has proceeded this session, I see no reason to believe how any of this is going to change. So far the majority has been utterly unable to pass bills that contain increases in funding. Why? Why wouldn't good people here who say they want to fight opioids and come home and talk about it do it? I will tell you why. Because the hard right has a stranglehold. They say no increase in funding for anything, except maybe Defense, and even a lot of the hard right people don't want that. Everyone goes along. They are afraid of the Koch brothers, who want to cut, cut, cut. They are afraid of the Heritage Foundation that wants to cut, cut, cut, and so they give speeches and even pass a bill that makes some small improvements, but they don't get the funding. It is not that they are malicious, but they don't have the courage and strength to stand up and do what is needed, and then they are hypocritical when they go back and say they are leading the fight to go after opioid addiction. That is the problem here. After years of opposing funding for mental health and substance abuse programs, no one should believe that Republicans are going to honor their promises

about CARA—yeah, down the road we will find some funding—until we see it.

Shortly the Senate will pass this bill. As soon as that happens, Republican Senators are going to run home to tout its passage as if they have single-handedly solved the opioid crisis in this country, but that will not be true. They will not mention that the bill has no funding and doesn't have the teeth it needs; they will not tell people that it doesn't include a dime for a new treatment bed, a dollar for a drug counselor's salary, or the needed increases in money for law enforcement. What it says is this: that colleagues on the other side of the aisle are more interested in showing voters they are doing something about opioids than actually doing something because they are constricted by a small, narrow, but powerful group of special interests in their party that say you can't vote for any increases in funding for anything, and it is a shame. This is an issue ripe for bipartisan compromise. It is an issue in which we can and must make real progress, but as it stands, this bill doesn't get the job done.

Every day 2,500 teenagers in America abuse prescription drugs for the first time. These are our kids, our neighbors, and our friends. We all know families that have had the anguish—and the joy that some have had as their sons and daughters have recovered. But everyone who knows people who have been fighting addiction—whether it is alcohol or prescription drug abuse or some other substance—knows that every day is a struggle and a fight. You are never sure that they will not go back. And then there are those who have lost kids. Sometimes their kids are just out on the streets, and their family doesn't know where they are, and some of them, of course, are gone. It is nothing we should be playing games with, and a small group of hard-right ideologues shouldn't be blocking change in America. We don't need a bill designed for campaign rhetoric. We need resources.

I strongly urge my Republican colleagues to schedule a vote on legislation that provides robust funding to address the opioid and heroin epidemic as soon as possible. Until we pass the increase in resources for law enforcement and treatment, both of which are so necessary, we cannot say that Congress has done what is necessary to solve and fight the opioid crisis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that any time spent in quorum calls prior to 11 a.m. be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak in support of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This bill represents an important step in tackling the growing crisis of prescription drug and heroin addiction in this country. I thank my colleagues, especially the original sponsors of this bill. Senator WHITEHOUSE, Senator PORTMAN, Senator AYOTTE, and I have worked together on this legislation for a number of years.

Drug overdoses from opioids now claim more lives than car accidents every year. That is a pretty shocking statistic that I don't think most Americans would expect. The crisis is ripping apart families from all different backgrounds, and with deaths increasing nearly sixfold since the year 2000, it is a crisis on the rise. This deadly trend struck at the heart of Minnesota. Last year alone, 336 Minnesotans died after overdosing on opioids.

Since I started working on this bill, I have heard from people in communities across my State. In Montevideo, 12-year-olds were courted by pushers who said: Hey, kids. If you go in and check your parents' medicine cabinets—I'll give you a list—and bring us their prescription drugs, we will give you a can of beer. That happened in Montevideo, MN.

Shelly Elkington shared her tragic story. Her daughter, Casey Jo, was a champion swimmer and hoped to study nursing like her mom, but in 2008 she was diagnosed with Crohn's disease, and that is when she started taking opioids for pain relief. As we know, four out of five heroin users started out by misusing prescription pain killers, and in the end the very pills that were supposed to ease Casey Jo's pain didn't work. She became addicted and eventually turned to heroin and other drugs, and basically this addiction hijacked her life. She is no longer with us.

This is the story for far too many people. In one 7,000-person town in Minnesota, 3 young people died of opioid overdoses in just 6 months in 2013.

Our final bill includes a number of proven strategies to help States and local communities in the fight against addiction, and one of the most important provisions in it for me is looking at solutions for unused prescription drugs. Senator CORNYN and I passed a bill back in 2010 and finally got the rules out after advocating for them from the DEA, I believe for 4 years, and we are finally starting to see some pharmacies, such as Walgreens, voluntarily taking back unused prescription drugs. This bill helps to build on that work.

CARA also increases the availability of naloxone, which we know can be used in overdoses, and, of course, one of the most important things in this bill is a start at prescription drug monitoring. I emphasize that it is a start because I think a lot more needs to be

done with prescription drug monitoring. I would have liked to have done it in this bill, but now we need to move on and get something done.

Today, I will be introducing a bill with Senator KING and Senator MANCHIN to actually do something about prescription drug monitoring, and that is requiring individual States to put in place prescription drug monitoring programs and actually submit the data. I have learned—having Hazelden in my State—that some States have a program, but it just means doctors have to sign up. It doesn't actually mean that they actually record information or that they share it with other doctors. It doesn't even mean they share it between States. Our bill would require States that receive Federal funding to combat opioid abuse to ensure that their prescription drug monitoring complies with certain standards so that we can crack down on this addiction before it starts. It would require prescribers to consult with the PDMPs before they hand out prescriptions, require dispensers to report back within 24 hours of distribution, and would provide for the proactive notification of health care professionals when patterns indicative of opioid abuse are detected. For people who travel across State lines, it would also require States to share information.

Here is an example: There was a patient at Hazelden Betty Ford who had 108 prescriptions for painkillers filled by more than 85 different prescribers. Think about that: 85 different medical professionals had prescribed these drugs.

I met a rehab guy up in Moorhead who had a patient with a similar story, who had filled prescriptions from doctors in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. That is what is going on. If we don't require States to share information with other States, it is as if we don't really have a prescription drug program to begin with.

CARA is an important bill, but there are two things that we need to change in order to improve the work we are doing in Congress. No. 1 is the money for treatment that I know Senator SCHUMER just addressed, which is in Senator SHAHEN's bill, which would appropriate emergency funding and, second, not just say we are doing something about prescription drug monitoring but actually do something about prescription drug monitoring, and that is why I am introducing this bill today.

There is a lot of work ahead, but I want to conclude my remarks by acknowledging the major step we are taking by passing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and sending it to the President's desk to be signed into law.

I thank my colleagues for their support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I continue to be concerned by the determination of a number of people to move through the Senate the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal, the 5,554-page document, which the American people have clearly rejected and do not favor, even though powerful forces continue to push for it. It has been reported that both Presidential candidates oppose it; however, it does appear that Secretary Clinton's opposition is in doubt, and there was a troubling report yesterday.

Her top Asia policy adviser, who served as her Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia, Kurt Campbell, told an Australian news outlet that Clinton's opposition to TPP is not real. He said: "Every trade agreement goes through the deepest, darkest tunnel before it is ultimately passed." Her top adviser is saying to our Australian allies that it is going to pass, and that is contrary to what she has been telling the American people. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the worst-kept secret in Washington is that Hillary Clinton, if elected, intends—in some way and some fashion—to see that the TPP becomes law. She made 45 different statements during her time before this lawless agreement was being negotiated—up to the very end of Congressional debate over fast track—that she supported it. This statement by her top adviser is not only shocking but really confirms the fears that so many people have had—that her opposition to the TPP on the campaign trail is a result of the pressure of the voters and is not a real conversion.

After voicing her support for the 5,554-page agreement 45 times before running for President, and after refusing to take a position on it when asked about it for months during her campaign, she has since made statements to the American people that she opposes the agreement. Her senior policy adviser is overseas touting the benefits of TPP. Just as her email scandal problem proves, Mrs. Clinton tends to say one thing to the American people but another thing to her globalist friends.

The TPP creates a 12-country Pacific union, whereby each country gets a single vote. This will allow the union to legislate and change its own rules. It is described as a living agreement. They can even change their own rules. They can pass laws and regulations that make it very difficult—virtually impossible—for the American people to have control over it. It is going to be very difficult to contain this union where each country gets one vote. The United States gets one vote. The Sultan of Brunei gets one vote. Vietnam gets one vote. This makes no sense. We absolutely should not pass this massive agreement that erodes the economic strength of America, giving our competitors the same votes on important issues as we have.

Even the rosiest Trans-Pacific Partnership projections cited by the Obama

administration estimate that this agreement—their own estimate is it will slow the growth of manufacturing in the United States and cost us 120,000 manufacturing jobs over the next 15 years. But other studies show the United States could lose much more. A Tufts University study said we could lose 400,000 jobs. That is their analysis of it.

Secretary Clinton's adviser, Kurt Campbell, and other expansive trade advocates always believe in these free-trade agreements no matter what is in them. They seem to remain oblivious to the impacts that such a massive trade deal will have on the already-struggling economy and middle America. Mr. Campbell's statements are further confirmation that the Obama administration and Hillary Clinton have not given up on this deal. Indeed, President Obama continues to push for it openly and without apology. They fully intend to do everything they can to sneak the TPP through Congress, with perhaps some cosmetic changes to say they have fixed the problem, after the election—most likely during the lame-duck session of the House or the Senate—when many Members are no longer accountable to the American people, or it could be even in the next Congress.

While talking with the newspaper *The Australian*, the former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Campbell, also found time to denigrate and talk bad about the presumptive nominee of one of our national parties, Donald Trump. *The Australian* reported that the former Australian Foreign Minister has written that Mr. Campbell "will be Secretary of State if Mrs. Clinton becomes the President at the end of the year." Well, that is the first I have heard of that. We learned that maybe from *Australia*.

I believe this is another example of the kind of political duplicity that irritates, frustrates, and angers—legitimately—the American people. They have their leader saying one thing, promising one thing during the election season, all the while they are working to advance a different agenda entirely.

It is the same about fixing illegal immigration. They always promise it during the campaign, but when we get in the Senate and start actually voting on the things that would be necessary to create a lawful system of immigration that protects the national interests, it never seems to happen.

So it is pretty clear Hillary Clinton really supports the TPP. It was only an election-cycle diversion that caused her to back off of it, and she refuses to rule out its passage entirely. The media should demand that she clarify her position. Why will she not rule out passing it? Does her top adviser to Asia, meeting with Asian nations that would participate in this TPP—does he speak for her or not?

As quoted by *PolitiFact*, Mrs. Clinton said: "I waited until it had actu-

ally been negotiated"—she is explaining why she now opposes it when she supported it previously. She said: "I waited until it had actually been negotiated because I did want to give the benefit of the doubt to the (Obama) administration. Once I saw the outcome, I opposed it."

Well, that was not a very satisfactory answer to me at the time. I was very uneasy about that conversion to opposition, and now we have her top adviser to Asia saying something entirely different.

This is what the *Australian* newspaper said about him and this agreement. He says that—he did acknowledge globalization has sometimes been disruptive to politics, disruptive in countries like the United States. He is talking about disruptive for jobs and workers in the United States. I think he is certainly correct about that.

How did *PolitiFact* analyze Mrs. Clinton's statements? Here are some of the things they reported in their analysis. "Once I saw what the outcome was, I opposed it."

That is a pretty clear statement, it appears.

Speaking in *Australia* in 2012, however, she hailed the deal as "setting the gold standard."

She said: "This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open, free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field."

It seems to me to be a total commitment to supporting the trade deal.

Remember, as Secretary of State, she is the chief diplomatic official for the United States. The Trade Representative does most of the negotiations, but the Secretary of State is involved in these negotiations. It involved the economic relationship of the United States with 11 other Pacific nations. So she knows what is going on in these negotiations and should be well aware of them. If she wasn't, she was not doing her job.

Hillary Clinton's support for the TPP goes on as she said that it would create "Better jobs with higher wages and safer working conditions, including for women, migrant workers and others too often in the past excluded from the formal economy will help build Asia's middle class and rebalance the global economy."

Well, I don't have any doubt that if this trade agreement is like the other trade agreements—and I believe it is—it will definitely help Asian trade competitors of ours. The question is, who is representing the American people? That is whom our legal, moral, and political responsibility is to—the American people. Is it going to be a better transaction for them or not? They don't think so, I don't think so, and a growing number of economists are beginning to understand why these trade deals I have so often supported in the past are not working effectively.

PolitiFact reported in October that she also described this trade deal over

time as “exciting, innovative, ambitious, groundbreaking, cutting-edge, high-quality, and high-standard.” That is the way she has described it over the years.

PolitiFact concludes with this: “Nonetheless, her comments at the time were so positive and so definitive, it becomes disingenuous to argue, as she’s doing now, that she didn’t endorse it before it was finalized.”

So that is where we are.

I will yield the floor if someone else arrives. That is the main point I wanted to make.

I would urge our colleagues to understand what is happening. There has been an analysis and a growing understanding within the developed nations of the world that their middle-class working people are being hammered by these trade agreements. Last year, it was reported that 55 percent of the people in Germany supported the transatlantic trade agreement, and this is a follow-on to the TPP, all part of the fast-track authority Congress gave to the Trade Representative of the United States. I opposed it, but Congress voted to approve it. He is negotiating right now with the Europeans on a matching-type treaty that will also be monumental involving the Atlantic trade deal.

Last year, 55 percent of the people in Germany supported this agreement. A recent poll in Germany showed now only 17 percent support it.

In recent weeks, clear messages have also been sent by the people of the United Kingdom, our British allies; they don’t like being placed in these large international trade organizations where the UK only gets one vote. If they get that in the European Union, I don’t know if they have a single vote—and they don’t believe it has been working in their interests. That was a factor in them voting to withdraw from the EU, even though the EU is pushing this trade deal—the TTIP—exceedingly hard.

What has been the impact on our trade deals in the past? In 2011, I supported the South Korea trade deal. It was an important deal, one of our biggest trade agreements, and they are allies. I believe in the South Koreans. They are good people. So we voted for it. Congress passed it. President Obama advocated for it and signed it. At the time, he declared that our exports to South Korea would increase \$10 billion a year and that would help create manufacturing jobs in the United States; that it would be a win-win: Korea would import more to us, but we would export more to Korea too, the trade deficit would not increase, and it would be a job creator in the United States. So Congress voted for it—a big vote for it.

Well, what has happened since 2011? Last year, our exports to Korea were not \$10 billion, not \$1 billion but \$30 million. Their exports to us from South Korea were \$15 billion. So what happened? The data, the projections were

not right. That is very damaging for America. Our trade deficit with South Korea more than doubled.

I would say to my colleagues somebody needs to be asking: What is happening to jobs in America? What is happening to wages in America? The situation is not good. Since 1999, wages in America have declined \$4,186, adjusted for inflation. That is the way to calculate it properly. Median family income is down over \$4,000 since 1999. Make no mistake, bad trade deals are a part of that. Another part of that is, when you bring in more workers than you have jobs for, you create a surplus of labor and wages go down, if there are any free-market people left on Wall Street, they understand that.

So we have had a double whammy, in addition to high regulations and stupid taxes that we impose on the economy. All of these things have created a situation in which we are not healthy economically. Wages are declining. Middle-class Americans are hurting. They have a right to ask: Who in Washington is looking out for my interests? That is the way I see it.

This trade agreement—5,500-some-odd pages—is bad. We do not need to pass it, and we absolutely do not need to go into another European Union-like trade agreement where the United States gets only one vote even though we have by far the dominant economy.

What do all of these countries want first and foremost? It is understandable. It is not evil. They want to sell in our market. They want to bring home American dollars. That is their goal.

When we enter into a trade agreement with somebody who wants to sell here, we should make sure that we do it in a way that protects American workers and makes sure that our trading partners open their markets to us so that we can export as much to them as we allow them to import to us.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I thank my colleagues for the vote we will take in a very short time on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act known as CARA. This legislation holds great promise to help families and communities combat the opioid epidemic that has truly been ravaging our Nation.

The epidemic is a public health crisis, causing death and destruction to families and communities, and this legislation is barely a symbolic step. The rhetoric on the floor today and throughout our consideration of this bill, unfortunately, is unmatched by real dollars. Until we commit resources, our words will be a glass half empty, and we must fill that glass with the resources necessary to truly make a difference, as I have seen from the roundtables I have held around the State of Connecticut where law enforcement, community activists, families whose loved ones have suffered from addiction, and addicts themselves

recovering from this disease—it is a disease, and we must recognize it as a disease that can be treated if we commit the resources.

I thank Senator COATS for joining me in authoring the Expanding Access to Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs Act, which is among the measures included in this bill. This provision would allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants to access State prescription drug monitoring programs and view the patient’s prescription opioid history to determine if a patient has a history of addiction.

Although nurse practitioners and physician assistants write over 30 million opioid prescriptions every year, including in 2013, few States allow them to consult and submit prescribing data to these important State databases. Allowing them to access more information about a patient’s history enables them to help address potential addiction before it becomes a serious problem.

Critically, we must recognize the key role nurse practitioners and physician assistants can play in curbing prescription drug abuse and diversion. That is why this provision allowing those nurse practitioners and physician assistants to access State prescription drug monitoring programs is so important.

I thank my colleague Senator BALDWIN for her tireless effort in advancing the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act to address overprescribing and accountability at the VA. Her leadership on behalf of Jason’s family and their courage and strength, particularly his mother Linda, widow Heather, and daughter Anaya, were impressive and instrumental in incorporating this measure.

The provisions from Senator BALDWIN’s legislation that have been included in CARA will require the VA to expand the use of opioid safety initiatives within all VA facilities—a profoundly important step because it will enable the VA to better facilitate use of State prescription drug monitoring programs and ensure that all VA facilities provide naloxone to at-risk veterans without a copay. That is a profoundly significant step.

I hope monitoring and tracking programs will be further improved so that State boundaries can be more easily overcome in terms of information flow, and the effectiveness can include not only the VA but our civilian programs.

Additionally, improvements to the VA Patient Advocacy Program will truly help the VA better serve our veterans.

These provisions are also included in the Veterans First Act. I am hopeful that this body will move forward on the Veterans First Act.

I appreciate the bipartisan work of my colleagues in addressing the opioid crisis. I am pleased to support this bill but again emphasize that it is a short-term solution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 12 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO JAMES WALLNER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, Capitol Hill is a famously transient place. Every 2 years, the membership of the House of Representatives changes, the membership of the Senate changes, and in the interim, the coming and going of congressional staffers is virtually constant. But when you take a step back and look through the wide lens of history, you can see certain pillars of permanence, certain exceptional individuals who stand out from and rise above the fleeting crowd. These are the institutional giants of Congress, the men and women whose extraordinary talents and devotion to the Constitution have shaped the character and the course of government and whose legacies continue to influence Congress long after the individuals behind them have gone.

For the past 5½ years, I have had the pleasure of working with and learning from one such individual, a true master of the Senate, James Wallner.

Friday will be James's last day as executive director of the Senate steering committee—although the optimist in me hopes that he will be back in the Senate someday. Starting next week, he will join the Heritage Foundation as the group vice president of research, where he will oversee all of the think tank's research papers, projects, and initiatives. For this, James is eminently qualified. James has been studying politics in the classroom and in real life on Capitol Hill throughout his entire adult life. In all his spare time, in between advising Senators and raising his two children, Graham and Quinn, with his wife Kimberly, James has been busy becoming a scholar, earning two master's degrees and a doctoral degree in politics, and an accomplished author, having published one book, with another forthcoming.

Aside from what must be the best time-management skills in the world, coupled with the fact that the man probably never sleeps, this is what you first notice about James: just how freakishly smart he is.

I will never forget the first time I met James, which was back in 2011, not too long after I had been sworn in to office as a Senator. As a brandnew Senator with a brandnew staff, one of my top priorities was to find someone who could help mentor and guide me and my staff—someone outside of my staff. My staff included a lot of people who had never worked in Washington before, so we needed someone on the outside of our staff to help teach us how the Senate really works and how Congress really works.

I asked around for suggestions, and one name kept coming up: James Wallner. If you need someone to give a

crash course or an extended, semester-length course or a course lasting 5½ years on Senate procedure, politics, and policy, James Wallner is the man.

This was some of the best advice I had ever received—to consult James Wallner on these and other issues. The instruction and guidance James provided to me and my staff far exceeded expectations. James's knowledge of the Senate is encyclopedic. Working with him is like having your own personal Parliamentarian by your side, always ready and eager to give comprehensive answers to virtually every question that might come up, even those dealing with the most arcane procedural mechanics within the Senate.

Most people in Washington operate on the premise that connections are what you need to succeed in politics. Some might even assume that they are all you need to succeed in politics. James, although known and esteemed by many, has flipped this conventional wisdom on its head. For him, it is not who he knows but what he knows that has made him an invaluable resource for so many Members in Congress and so many staffers on both sides of the Capital over the years.

While his formidable intellect has set him apart over the 10 years in the Senate, the qualities I always admired most in James are his deep and abiding love for this country, for its history, its people, and its institutions, and his uncompromising commitment to the self-evident truths upon which it was founded and the truths built into our governing document, the U.S. Constitution.

One of my favorite examples of this is exemplified by James's annual tradition of reading, start to finish, the official and complete notes from the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Of course, for James, it is not enough to simply read and re-read this voluminous text every year; he makes sure to do it between May 25 and September 17 so that he can read each day's notes on the very day or the very anniversary of the very day on which they were originally recorded.

James brought the same passion and appreciation for our constitutional heritage to his work as the executive director of the Senate steering committee, a position which he has held since 2012. The purpose and mission of the steering committee is to encourage innovative thinking and bold action within the Senate's Republican conference. This is no easy task, of course. In a town that is not exactly known for innovation or boldness, many may see this as a mission impossible, but James saw it as a moral imperative because he understands that many of our government's and our country's most urgent problems today are caused by an unnatural timidity and sclerosis within the legislative branch.

The job may be difficult, but James carried it out with an admirable combination of tenacity, patience, courage, and grace, and always with an unre-

lenting devotion to recovering America's founding principles and thereby putting the Congress back to work for the American people.

As James knows better than most, placing principle over party and elevating the interests of the American people over the interests of political elites is unlikely to win a popularity contest in Washington, but it will earn you the respect of your colleagues and anyone happening to be watching.

Few on Capitol Hill respect James more than two of his former bosses, Senator PAT TOOMEY and Senator JEFF SESSIONS. This is what each of them had to say about James on the occasion of his departure from the Senate.

Senator TOOMEY said:

James Wallner not only understands a wide range of policy issues, but he is a master of the congressional rules and procedures needed to turn conservative philosophies into action. He is an exceptionally smart strategist and is willing to work hard to advance the ideas needed to restore an American government that is limited in scope, efficient with taxpayers' money, and accountable to the voters.

Senator SESSIONS said:

It has been an honor to work with James in the Senate. I am proud to say that James began his Senate career in my office as a Legislative Assistant and later became my Legislative Director. In these roles, James demonstrated a mastery of congressional procedure and policy. He has supported not only me, but the entire party in developing and working to implement conservative, pro-growth policies that help place our nation on a more sustainable path. The Heritage Foundation is fortunate to have hired a man of such skill and I am confident that he will serve them well. James is without a doubt one of the most talented and dedicated staffers I have ever worked with or known in the Senate.

For 10 years, James Wallner has been an exceptionally articulate, passionate, knowledgeable, and steadfast champion of the very things that make the Senate great and that make the Senate unique—especially open, robust debate and deliberation. The Senate is better because of him.

He will be missed. But with so many challenges looming over the horizon and with so much work yet ahead of us to be completed, something tells me this will not be the last time the Senate hears from James Wallner.

Thank you, Mr. President.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn,

Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, Kelly Ayotte, John McCain, Rob Portman, John Barrasso, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, John Thune, Orrin G. Hatch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the conference report to accompany S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin abuse, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 90, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—90

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

NAYS—2

Lee Sasse

NOT VOTING—8

Cochran	Rounds	Vitter
Inhofe	Sessions	Wicker
Roberts	Shelby	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 90, the nays are 2.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair lays be-

fore the Senate the House message to accompany H.R. 636, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill (H.R. 636) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes," with House amendments to Senate amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendments to the Senate amendments to H.R. 636.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 1:45 p.m. will be equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, before I give my speech, I ask unanimous consent for Senator PORTMAN to have 1 minute.

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

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and, in less than a minute, I want to acknowledge something historic that just happened on this floor—a 90-to-2 vote for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. This is the Senate agreeing with the House to do something important to address this epidemic of heroin and prescription drug abuse, and I congratulate my colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, my coauthor, and encourage all my colleagues to now get this signed as soon as possible so we can get it out to our communities to help.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

REFORMING THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to discuss America's broken budget process and the Senate Budget Committee's continuing effort to provide solutions to place our Nation's budget on a better, sustainable path.

Last year, on May 5, the Senate passed its first balanced 10-year budget since 2001. This was a big deal. It was thoroughly considered and amended to the tune of 71 rollcall votes, and 146 amendments adopted overall, and it provided an enforceable plan to get the Nation's exploding debt under control.

On May 22, just 17 days later, we enacted legislation that violated the budget. Congress didn't even abide by the budget for a whole month. This trend has continued throughout the 114th Congress. Since passing its fiscal year 2016 budget plan, Congress has been unable to achieve any reduction in overspending called for in the balanced budget. Instead, Congress enacted legislation increasing spending by nearly \$150 billion and reducing revenue by \$478 billion over the 10-year window. Much of these violations were enacted as part of the end-of-the-year omnibus spending bill, which was draft-

ed behind closed doors and passed under threat of government shutdown, completely outside of regular order.

The truth is, America's budget process is broken, and it is preventing Congress from tackling the pressing fiscal challenges facing our country. The current budget process is designed only to spend and fails hard-working taxpayers. Each year, nearly \$3 trillion is spent by Washington without any meaningful congressional review or consideration. What America really needs is a budget process built to save.

The last time Congress reformed the budget process was in 1974. Times have changed, and the 40-year-old process has only grown more dysfunctional and antiquated. Until 1998, Congress had never failed to pass a budget, but in the last 15 years, Congress failed to pass a budget resolution more than half the time. Today, budgets from Congress and the President are increasingly tossed aside, leaving the country with no long-term fiscal plan.

Our appropriations process is broken. Spending bills are nearly always late, creating crippling uncertainty for agencies, businesses, and the American people. We have completed all appropriations bills on time in only 4 of the last 45 years. In 15 of those years, we did not pass one appropriations bill on time. Instead of well-considered funding decisions, the government operates on short-term spending bills or continuing resolutions. We have had to use 173 short-term spending bills since 1977, and that is just 3 years after the Budget Act was passed.

That is just the portion of the budget Congress has control over. Today, a growing portion of our budget is devoted to entitlements and other automatic spending. When Congress last reformed the budget process in 1974, this type of spending constituted only one-third of what was spent and two-thirds of the spending provided annually.

This chart points that out: 1966, 33 percent on automatic pilot, 67 percent, annual review. Now, 70 percent automatic spending, 30 percent under annual review. And this is growing automatically. These don't have guaranteed revenue sources. Whenever the revenue source doesn't meet up with what we have already said would automatically be paid, it cuts into this 30 percent that we get for annual review—automatically—and reduces the amount we get to actually make decisions on.

I have talked about what could happen if the interest rates go up—\$19 trillion in debt. So \$20 trillion at a 1-percent interest rate would cost us \$200 billion a year. The norm, 5 percent, would cost us 1,000 billion, or \$1 trillion, and we only get to make decisions—this part of it—on \$1,070 billion. So how would we fund everything the government does on \$70 billion?

This crisis is coming. In 2016, 70 percent of Federal spending is provided automatically, essentially on autopay year after year without congressional review or approval. In 15 years, this

runaway spending and interest will consume all of the taxes and revenues the Federal Government collects crowding out the functions we normally associate with good government.

What would those be? Some really important ones would be national defense and border security, maybe transportation, maybe education.

This mandatory spending operates with no connection between funding decisions and program performance. Given that this spending often continues in perpetuity, the least we can do is ensure that it is spent effectively.

I want to repeat that part. The mandatory spending operates with no connection between funding decisions and program performance. There are a whole bunch of programs out here in the 70 percent that we never have to look at because they are going to get their money anyway. Nobody lobbies us on it because they get their money, anyway. So we don't have any program performance. How many of those do we suppose are not doing what they were originally intended to do? I am willing to bet a lot of them. In fact, I have looked at them and know it is a lot of them.

The good news is there are bipartisan steps Congress can take now to fix America's broken budget process. The Senate Budget Committee has held a series of hearings and meetings to discuss bipartisan solutions that would, No. 1, improve the way Congress considers budget legislation, No. 2, update the antiquated accounting rules that would affect the information Congress uses to make tax and spending decisions, and, No. 3, set the country's finances on a sustainable path by establishing enforceable long-term fiscal targets.

Congress can begin to regain control of the Nation's finances by reforming the procedures it uses to consider budget legislation. Based on conversations with Democratic and Republican members of my committee, I am pursuing the following reforms with the understanding that they will receive bipartisan support:

First, the Senate's rules governing consideration of budget resolutions are overly burdensome and discourage passage of this important planning document. We can fix this by reforming what we call the vote-arama, the disgraceful ritual that has turned into a string of meaningless gotcha votes. The Senate should bring order to this chaotic process by establishing filing deadlines and limits on the number of amendments that can be offered.

Second, the Senate should be required to devote floor time to consideration of annual appropriations measures—the annual spending measures. In Wyoming, the State legislature encourages full consideration of their spending bills by holding a budget session—that is, a session of the regular legislature—and it requires a two-thirds vote to consider any nonbudget legislation. We should have similar rules in the

Senate to make sure we get our work done.

Third, budget points of order should be meaningful. Today, they are routinely ignored or waived by Members of this body. The Senate should tie the waiver vote threshold to the size of the budget violation. De minimis violations—that would be under half a million dollars, probably—should be automatically waived, while large violations should be subject to up to a two-thirds vote threshold. It has to be a little more difficult for us to violate what we set out to do.

Fourth, Congress needs to rethink the way it allocates Federal resources. Our fragmented budget process makes it nearly impossible to know how much of the government's resources are devoted to a particular policy goal. There is a different budget for the Budget Committee, a different one for the spending committees which are the appropriators, and a different one for the White House. I think it is intentional, so that we can't follow what it is. Our fragmented budget process makes it impossible to know how much of the government's resources are devoted to a particular policy goal. We should establish subcommittees within the Budget Committee to review entire portfolios of government spending and tax policy to ensure the programs and funding are actually accomplishing certain policy objectives. This would help identify both effective and ineffective programs, reducing waste, and focusing on results.

We should also consider moving to a 2-year funding cycle. Funding uncertainty creates wasteful spending, disrupts government operations and planning, and reduces productive investment and hiring in the private sector. A biennial process would lock in 2 years of spending in law, providing Federal agencies, businesses, and the American people with certainty and predictability. That is why this commonsense solution has been supported by Presidents, legislators, and good-governance think tanks from both parties for decades.

Once the Senate passes legislation to improve our internal budget procedures, we should move on to the more fundamental problems of the current budget process; that is, the antiquated accounting rules and our growing debt burden. The private sector applies modern advances in economics, accounting, and finance to accurately reflect a business's financial condition and the potential impact of new policies, but the Federal Government's budget rules haven't undergone comprehensive reviews since 1967. That was 50 years ago. This issue may seem dry and boring, but as an accountant, I can tell you that it is extremely important and exciting. Antiquated accounting techniques mislead Congress and the public, and they misstate the true cost of government activities. Updating these budget rules will provide Congress with the honest, accurate information nec-

essary to allocate taxpayer dollars effectively and efficiently.

Finally, Congress should get serious about addressing America's long-term debt crisis, which today totals more than \$19 trillion and is expected to grow over \$29 trillion by 2026—and that is just based on this 70 percent on automatic pilot. We need long-term, enforceable fiscal targets with guideposts along the way that ensure revenues and spending are moving in the right direction.

Fiscal targets alone will not fix the Federal budget. Congress will need to enact substantial policy reforms if it wants to get our Nation's debt under control. Former Budget Chairmen Judd Gregg and Kent Conrad—one Republican, one Democrat—recommended establishing a bipartisan commission to submit a legislative proposal that would achieve long-term revenue, spending, and debt targets. Congress would then be required to consider and vote on the commission's recommendations without amendment. This is a creative, bipartisan approach to addressing politically difficult decisions that must be made to ensure this country's future prosperity.

The Budget Committee has been working diligently on these reforms and stands ready to offer bipartisan legislation should the Senate choose to fix our broken budget process. The time to act is now. We are currently spending over \$230 billion in interest on our debt every year, even with historically low interest rates that I talked about. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that every one percentage point our interest rates rise will increase America's overspending by \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years, or about \$160 billion a year. That is a 1-percent rise in the interest rate—\$230 billion—up another \$160 billion, up another \$160 billion. Interest on the debt will soon put America out of the business of protecting its citizens from foreign threats, educating our youth, and building national infrastructure like highways and roads.

These bipartisan reforms wouldn't solve all of our budget problems, but they are a promising first step toward unsticking the budget gridlock that has gripped Washington in recent years. This would begin to put our Nation on not just another path but a better path.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article, which appears in the Washington Times today, be printed in the RECORD: "Government not close to paying for promises, CBO says." The subtitle is "Tax increases, cuts needed to return to normal debt load," by Stephen Dinan.

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

[From the Washington Times, July 13, 2016]
GOVERNMENT NOT CLOSE TO PAYING FOR PROMISES, CBO SAYS: TAX INCREASES, CUTS NEEDED TO RETURN TO NORMAL DEBT LOAD
 (By Stephen Dinan)

The economy simply cannot grow fast enough to cover the federal government's generous promises to Americans, the Congressional Budget Office said Tuesday, laying out grim options of massive tax increases or withering cuts to spending that loom ahead.

After a few years of post-recession relief, deficits are roaring back, the CBO said, sounding a call to action for a Congress and White House that have instead been arguing over how much to increase spending.

But with health care costs rising, and an aging population already promised very generous Social Security and Medicare benefits, the government cannot come close to paying for its current promises, the CBO said.

"Revenues are projected to increase, but much more slowly than spending, leading to larger budget deficits and rising debt," the analysts said in their long-term budget outlook.

The picture is substantially worse than just a year ago, when the CBO said debt held by the public would reach 107 percent of gross domestic product by 2040. Now, the CBO says, that figure will be 122 percent—a 15-point turn for the worse.

Analysts said Congress keeps cutting taxes and boosting spending, at a time when the budget hole calls for the exact opposite approach.

To get back to normal—which means a debt rate of about 40 percent of the economy—the government would have to cut \$560 billion out of next year's budget, and growing every year thereafter. Even to maintain the current level of already excessive debt, which is 75 percent of the economy, would require cuts of \$330 billion in 2017.

"The longer lawmakers waited to act, the larger the necessary policy changes would become," the CBO said.

Budget watchdog groups demanded Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, the presumptive presidential nominees for Democrats and the GOP, begin to talk about the massive fiscal problems looming ahead.

"The presidential candidates should step up and address our dangerous long-term debt trajectory with constructive solutions and real leadership, not continuing to duck these challenges as they have so far," said Maya MacGuineas, head of Fix the Debt.

Robert L. Bixby, executive director of the Concord Coalition, said the presidential hopefuls need to take the issue to voters so the public gets invested in the debate, and so the elections produce a mandate for the kinds of solutions needed to fix things.

The deficit was a dominant issue in 2010, as President Obama's health law, the Wall Street bailout and the stimulus package were all making a major dent in the government's finances. Deficits soared beyond the \$1 trillion mark for the first time in history.

The deficit has dropped dramatically over the last few years as spending limits, imposed by Congress, have kicked in, and as some of the post-recession tax breaks have expired.

But the CBO said things are about to get worse.

Revenue will remain low—at between 18 and 19 percent of GDP, which is about the average of the last 40 years. But spending will explode, rising from 21 percent today to more than 27 percent by 2040.

That means that 30 years from now, the government will regularly run deficits totaling \$5 trillion a year—more than the size of the entire federal budget right now.

Social Security, which eats up 4.9 percent of GDP today, will average 6.3 percent in 25 years. Medicare, which stands at 3.8 percent today, will balloon to 6.6 percent surpassing Social Security to become the biggest entitlement program.

Meanwhile discretionary spending—the nuts and bolts government operations such as education, defense and homeland security—will drop to just 5.2 percent of GDP.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, there is another article that the Washington Times did called "Budget chairman to propose bipartisan overhaul of congressional budget process." It has bipartisan quotes from members of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Times, July 12, 2016]
BUDGET CHAIRMAN TO PROPOSE BIPARTISAN OVERHAUL OF CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS

(By Tom Howell, Jr.)

Senate Budget Committee Chairman Mike Enzi on Wednesday will propose the first bipartisan overhaul of Congress' budget process in four decades, saying lawmakers should outline two years of spending at a time and then stick to their plans.

The Wyoming Republican hopes to put an end to the last-minute deadline showdowns that have plagued Capitol Hill over the last six years by forcing the Senate to debate spending bills soon after the annual budget is finished.

"Instead of a functioning appropriations process, Congress has resorted to massive omnibus appropriations bills and continuing resolutions that carry over spending from the previous year," he says in a summary of his plan obtained by The Washington Times.

He said it needs to be easier to write the budget and harder to break it once it's finished. And he said Congress should be forced to spend more time working on the spending bills to carry out the budget, as a way of making the document matter.

Under current rules, Congress is supposed to complete a budget by April 15 each year, and the spending committees then use that broad blueprint to write 12 appropriations bills doling out the money by Sept. 30.

In reality, Congress never meets either deadline.

Lawmakers instead regularly pass short-term stopgap bills to keep the government open, limping along until they can agree on massive year-end spending packages that please neither side. Over the last 40 years, Congress approved some 173 stopgap bills.

Other times Congress has failed altogether, sending the government into partial shutdowns.

Mr. Enzi believes changing the process can produce better results, and will formally outline his ideas in a speech early Wednesday on the Senate floor.

In his outline, he says the government is already operating on two-year budgets after massive debt agreements in 2011, 2013 and 2015. But he'd make it even easier to write a budget by limiting the number of amendments that can be considered on the Senate floor.

It's also relatively easy to break the budget caps, with a 60-vote threshold. Mr. Enzi says small breaches should be easy, but the bigger the spending, the tougher it should be.

Really big budget breaches should require a two-thirds vote, he says—the equivalent of overturning a presidential veto.

Also, Mr. Enzi says the Senate should focus on the regular appropriations bills from the moment the budget resolution is adopted until Congress breaks for its August recess.

Any attempt to consider a non-appropriations measure during that period would require a two-thirds vote in the Senate.

Mr. Enzi also wants a new budget commission to update government accounting practices.

For instance, the commission could explore whether "dynamic scoring," in which the economic impact of federal policies is taken into account by congressional scorekeepers, should be used to enforce budget agreements.

Committee aides expect Democrats to support rules that would limit the number of floor amendments allowed to budgets, though other aspects of the plan might be a tougher sell, for instance Democrats have balked at Republican demands to use dynamic scoring to count the economic ripple effect of tax cuts.

Sen. Angus King, Maine independent who caucuses with Democrats, said he's already on board with Mr. Enzi's plan to budget for two years instead of just one.

"It gives you more time for oversight, and it's ridiculous to do a one-year budget on an enterprise this big," he said.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President at 1:45 p.m. today, we are going to vote on the FAA bill. It is coming back, in essence, as a conference report, although it was negotiated directly with the House. So we will take up the House message.

I thank Senator THUNE, the chairman of the committee, because the two of us, of course, get along, and we have worked together to achieve an agreement with our counterparts in the House. So I thank Senator THUNE. There were parts of this bill that he basically said for me to work them out with the Republican chairman in the House, and the work product is the proof in the pudding that we are going to take up today.

This is a little more than a 14-month extension, but don't let that fool you because it is going to put into permanent law bolstering security at our airports in order to help better protect us. Of course, in these times, the safety of our traveling public is a top priority. In fact, it contains some of the most significant aviation security reforms that Congress has ever considered, and we have considered, as the Presiding Officer can remember, a lot since September 11, 2001. It also contains a number of consumer protection and drone safety provisions. So let me just enumerate a couple of those.

To address the insider threat posed by terrorists, we increase the vetting requirements and random physical screenings of airport employees. What we found was, especially with the Atlanta airport situation 2 years ago, that they were not really checking their airport employees. There was a gunrunning scheme over a 3-month period in which an Atlanta airport employee would bring in guns. He wasn't

checked, he wasn't screened, and they didn't know what was in his backpack. Then he would go into the sterile TSA area where passengers are, into the men's room, and he would trade his backpack to a passenger that had already come through TSA screening. For 3 months they carried on this scheme of running guns from Atlanta to New York. Thank goodness, they weren't terrorists. They were criminals. But we can imagine that something like 150 guns were transported over that 3-month period. Well, that is what we addressed in this FAA bill. We have increased the screening required at the airports, even though that is their responsibility. The most effective thing for TSA in screening anybody or baggage is the nose of a dog. We have doubled VIPR dog teams, and that is a substantive change.

What about the international flights? We are always concerned about the point of last departure in an international designation coming into the United States. Have they been sufficiently checked, since we in effect are relying on the host government of that airport for a U.S.-inbound flight? This will authorize TSA to donate unneeded security equipment to foreign airports with service to the United States. We are calling for increased cooperation between us and partner nations on routes flown by Americans. We are now in this bill requiring a new assessment of foreign cargo security programs.

We also are setting up new screening systems and security checkpoint configurations to try to expedite passengers getting through. But at the same time, recognizing what happened in the terrorist attacks in Belgium and Istanbul makes it clear that we have to reduce the vulnerability of all those passengers amassing as a soft target before they ever go through the TSA checkpoint. That is what they did in Istanbul and in Belgium. So we put stuff to address that in this bill.

Now, as to cyber security, we have heard a lot about it. Certainly, the cyber security risk for the FAA is a definite one, and we have done stuff in this bill to reduce the cyber security risk to the national airspace system and civil aviation. That includes reducing the vulnerability of the in-flight entertainment systems. We have all seen that video where someone with a laptop can take over a car through the in-car entertainment systems. We are concerned about that with regard to airlines, airplanes as well. This legislation supports the FAA efforts to develop a threat model to strengthen against that cyber security threat.

What about consumers? This is substantive law that will last far beyond the extension of this bill that extends the FAA authorization through September 30 of next year. Don't you get irritated when you pay a baggage fee? Say you pay 50 bucks for an extra bag or a heavy bag and all of a sudden it is lost or significantly delayed? In this bill, those baggage fees are going to be returned.

We are also going to require the airlines to have policies that are family-friendly. What about the child who desperately needs to sit next to a parent? Save for the goodness of the passengers—and the passengers usually respond because they are good people and realize that a child ought to sit close to a parent. We have enshrined that in this bill, and that will become a permanent law.

For air travel with people with disabilities, we call for a review of the training and practices by airports and airlines and require the Department of Transportation to accelerate the rule-making.

Finally, I want to talk about the potential—and it is an accident waiting to happen—of an unmanned aerial vehicle—in other words, a drone—colliding with an airliner. We had a report a few months ago about an inbound American Airlines flight into Miami. They sighted a drone off the left wing. It is absolutely essential that we keep drones out of the airspace for takeoffs and landings in a busy airfield, so we have set up in the legislation a pilot program to develop and test technologies to intercept that drone or to shut it down when it is near an airport in order that we don't have what we know would be a catastrophic crash. It requires the FAA to work with NASA to test and develop a drone traffic management system.

I thank all of our Senate colleagues. I thank the ranking member and the chairman in the House, as we negotiated these provisions in this bill. That is what we are going to vote on at 1:45 p.m. I commend the FAA bill, and I hope the Senate considers it favorably.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Republican whip.

(The remarks of Mr. CORNYN pertaining to the introduction of S. 3184 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we take up extension of the FAA reauthorization this week, I want to voice my frustration that an extension of the section 48 energy investment tax credit was not included. More importantly, I want to make clear my continued commitment to securing the credit's extension before the end of the year. This is an issue of immediate urgency.

The tax package agreed to at the end of last year extended the section 48 energy investment tax credit for 5 years, beginning on January 1, 2017, phased down to 26 percent in 2020 and 22 percent in 2021. However, through a drafting error, some technologies in section 48 were left out of that long-term extension. As a result, those technologies—including fuel cells, geothermal, hydropower, and biomass, among others—are set to expire at the end of this year.

Picking winners and losers was not our intention. The majority leader

agreed with that sentiment and made a commitment to address the discrepancy early this year. Unfortunately, we have yet to place it on a moving legislative vehicle. The lack of certainty for these technologies is creating market distortions that will drive capital out of these technologies and toward those with longer-term incentives.

I think it is important that we support an all-of-the-above energy strategy and ensuring new clean energy technologies have a seat at the table is a key component. Therefore, although I had hoped to see us put the section 48 fix on the FAA extension, I remain committed to securing this change before the end of the year. This is a non-controversial, already-agreed to modification and it should be processed expeditiously.

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

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to support the FAA Extension, Safety, and Security Act of 2016. The FAA extension provides the aviation community with necessary stability over the next year and sets into motion important reforms to improve safety and security for air travelers. This legislation includes provisions that support the general aviation community, as well as job creators in Oklahoma. First, this bill includes third class medical reform, the foundation to my Pilot's Bill of Rights 2, which will cut burdensome red tape and encourage pilots to disclose and treat medical conditions that could impact their ability to fly. It also includes a provision allowing critical infrastructure operators to use drones to support their needs for meeting existing regulations or in response to natural disasters. This provision will make way for innovative technology to be used with large-scale infrastructure, such as bridges or pipelines, so that businesses can safely and efficiently provide services to their consumers.

I am particularly pleased to note that this bill includes the third class medical reforms from my bipartisan Pilot's Bill of Rights 2, which has passed the Senate three times since last December. This legislation is strongly supported by the entire general aviation community, a number of pilot unions, including the Allied Pilots Association representing the pilots of American Airlines, the Southwest Airlines Pilots' Association, and the NetJets Association of Shared Aircraft Pilots, as well as the National Association of State Aviation Officials. In particular, I want to highlight the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, AOPA, and the Experimental Aircraft Association, EAA, for their leadership and support from the beginning and all their work to educate my colleagues in Congress on issues that affect pilots. I am very grateful for the strong and consistent voice of AOPA and EAA members who have shared why third class medical reform is necessary.

FAA's current medical certification process is bureaucratic, burdensome, and discourages pilots from disclosing and treating medical conditions that could impact their ability to fly. This legislation reforms the medical certification process for general aviation pilots in a way that will increase pilots' knowledge of risk while demanding treatment of identified conditions. The reforms expand the existing exemption for light sport pilots to include more qualified, trained pilots, as long as they complete three requirements. First, pilots must complete an online medical education course; second, pilots must maintain verification that they have been to a doctor at least once every 4 years and certify that they are receiving the care they need as directed by their physician to treat any medical condition that warrants treatment; and third, pilots must complete one comprehensive medical review by the FAA.

The FAA extension legislation also includes a provision that would allow critical infrastructure owners and operators to use unmanned aircraft systems to comply with mandated regulations and to perform emergency response and preparation activities.

This amendment would apply to energy infrastructure, such as oil and gas and renewable electric energy, it would apply to power utilities and telecommunications networks, and it would apply to roads and bridges and water supply system operators. Today critical infrastructure owners and operators are required to comply with significant requirements to monitor facilities and assets, which can stretch thousands of miles, and traverse rural and hard to access areas. Existing Federal safety regulations require periodic patrolling of the rights of way of critical infrastructure such as pipelines or transmission lines to check for encroachment, unauthorized excavation, evidence of leaks, or any other conditions that might jeopardize the safety of the pipeline or transmission line. Currently, Federal regulations allow periodic patrols to be conducted on foot, in vehicles, or with manned aircraft.

This language would ensure that critical infrastructure owners and operators, sponsors or associations who sponsor critical infrastructure, or their agents are able to apply to the Federal Aviation Administration to use unmanned aircraft as well.

This is of particular importance because unmanned aircraft can be quickly deployed to assess dangerous situations as part of a coordinated response to provide immediate feedback and situational awareness and direct resources to locations of highest danger. The use of unmanned aircraft would provide consistent and long-term on-scene information gathering capability in spite of weather or other incident dangers harmful to responding personnel, reduce the threat to response personnel in emergency situations.

This amendment is supported by a wide array of stakeholders including the Small UAV Coalition, the National Rural Electric Cooperatives, the American Public Power Association, Edison Electric Institute, CTIA—the Wireless Association, the American Gas Association, the American Public Gas Association, the Interstate Natural Gas Association of America, the American Petroleum Institute, the Association of Oil Pipelines, the American Fuels and Petrochemical Manufacturers, 3D Robotics, and the American Wind Energy Association. Congress should provide direction to FAA to set up a process for critical infrastructure operators to be able to safely operate unmanned aerial vehicles where there is clear and articulable need, and the provision included in this bill accomplishes that goal.

I strongly support this legislation, and I look forward to ensuring the swift implementation of these provisions by the Federal Aviation Administration in the coming months. ●

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another matter, earlier today this Chamber voted to move the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act conference report forward. This legislation has been the work of bipartisanship from the beginning, and it sailed through the Senate earlier this year.

Now, this bicameral agreement authorizes even more resources to combat the epidemic of heroin and prescription painkiller abuse that is tearing families apart across the country. Over the last few years, we have heard the stories and we have seen a dangerous trend of heroin and prescription drug abuse. In my State alone, it is estimated that these deaths have increased by as much as 80 percent in recent years. There is no doubt this is a serious issue. This is not just a bipartisan issue; this is a nonpartisan issue. Now is our chance to get something done.

I am grateful for the hard work and the leadership of the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, who has shepherded this bill from the beginning to where we are today, along with Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire, Senator BLUNT from Missouri, and Chairman GRASSLEY of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I want to thank all of them for their role in getting this bill across the finish line. Now we need to complete our work and pass it so we can get it to the President's desk.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Of course, there is a lot more we should be doing for the American people this week, but unfortunately, instead of advancing bills that would help prevent birth defects from the Zika virus and divert a public health crisis, our colleagues want to talk about climate change. I understand many of them feel this is a serious matter and a priority, but what they have been basically doing is beating up on a group of nonprofits and private citizens no one outside the beltway has

even heard of, and for what? For having the temerity to exercise their rights under the Constitution, their rights to free speech and free expression. Heaven forbid someone should utter words that somebody across the aisle might disagree with. The answer, as we know, to speech you disagree with is more speech, not less speech. It should not be used to try to squash, intimidate, coerce the people you disagree with. That is not the America I know, and that is not what the Constitution provides for.

I hope our colleagues will get their priorities straight. This is about preventing devastating birth defects in children infected with the Zika virus. We can have a discussion about climate change—hopefully without the attempt to intimidate and attack people who express opinions our colleagues don't agree with—but I suggest that our priorities ought to be a little bit different.

It is not just that this is a conscience effort to ignore the most pressing issues facing our country, such as fighting the Zika virus or funding our troops; they don't even want to have an honest conversation about the policies they are peddling because they are not interested in a debate, they want to stamp out contrary views.

For all their fanfare about climate change, this is not the most urgent thing we need to do this week. They don't talk about how the policies are advocating what actually stifled free speech and hurt the American economy and cut jobs. We have had debates and votes in this body about some of these sweeping proposals to deal with the problem that may or may not actually come to pass. There have been other challenges we faced in this country that have been overcome due to the inventiveness, innovation, and genius of the American people in coming up with solutions.

I hope our colleagues who have latched on to this as a way to divert attention from the imminent threat of the Zika virus and the need to fund our troops will come back into a zone—not a logic-free zone—where we can talk about these issues. And instead of trying to score political points with outside groups who are happy to raise money off of this issue, we need to get back to reality and back to the work at hand.

Quite frankly, it is hard to believe this is where we are, with our Democratic friends arguing against bills that would help prevent birth defects in our children and support our troops. Instead, they want to grandstand on climate change. I hope they get a reality check soon and stop quibbling over bicameral, bipartisan pieces of legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to address two issues which the Senate Finance Committee has spent a considerable amount of time on, and both of

them are examples of how the Senate is leaving important work undone on its way out the door. I am going to begin by discussing the opioid bill.

If ever there were an issue that ought to be unifying the Congress and bringing Democrats and Republicans together to surmount an important challenge, it ought to be opioid addiction in America. This is a crisis indiscriminate of geography and politics. The reality is that opioid addiction is ripping through our communities like wildfire. A recent editorial in one of my home State newspapers captured the extreme urgency of the opioid struggle, the addiction, with this statement: "Opioids are winning."

After months of work, the Senate and House have come up with an opioid bill. I can give my assessment in a sentence: It is a half-measure. The job is far from complete, and certainly nobody ought to be taking victory laps. The reality is that this opioid bill leaves many opportunities to fight and successfully win the battle against opioid addiction on the negotiating table.

A landmark study dealing with opioids came out a few months ago and found that 80 percent of those who were addicted to painkillers or heroin weren't getting treatment.

I want everybody to understand that under this bill, those waiting lines are not going to get much shorter. The thousands of babies born each year with an addiction to narcotics—this bill won't be enough to bring that number down to zero, where everybody knows it should be. And there is a moral imperative to actually get it to zero. That is why there are headlines stating that opioids are winning the war.

The package before the Senate certainly has the kernels of a meaningful game plan, but, in my view, there is just not enough there. There are programs being established that could be a big help to those who are struggling to get their lives back on track, but there aren't the tools to deliver on that promise.

Senators should know that doing only half the job now means that Members are going to be leading with their chins when the appropriations process returns later this year. The reason I say that is there are some programs that are going to be bumping up against the uncertainty of the appropriations process.

There is a program for pregnant women and new mothers suffering from an opioid-use disorder.

There is a program to help States take important strides when it comes to monitoring prescription drugs.

There is better tracking within the VA.

There is a plan to strengthen the network of support in American communities that is best equipped to reach out to those who need support in fighting addiction, which includes physicians, employers, the criminal justice system, and more.

The bill green-lights the National Institutes of Health putting new energy into the development of safe, non-addictive, effective, and affordable drugs and treatments for chronic pain.

The bill establishes a task force and grants for States to construct what I believe could be a fresh approach to pain management and opioids, including education programs, treatment, recovery efforts, prescription monitoring, and strategies to prevent overdose.

Getting those proposals off the ground is a first step, but with the Senate on its way out the door, it seems to me that you also have to do more than just leave the strategy for actually winning against opioid addiction to the uncertainty of the appropriations process in the fall.

There are other questions about this bill. I am very concerned about the provision that gives \$75 million in special kickbacks to the manufacturers of opioids that are considered under the bill "abuse deterrents." I believe it is wrong for the bill, which only does half the job for Americans struggling with addiction, to then turn around and give an unjustified windfall to big drug companies. I offered an amendment to get rid of the windfall, and it was very simple. I said: Let's give that money to pregnant women who are enrolled in Medicaid, women of limited means who are struggling to fight addiction. But the choice was made to give the windfall to the drug companies rather than to help those vulnerable women who are trying to get their lives back on track. We shouldn't be giving funding to programs that really help women and others who are trying to overcome addiction and then turn around and give a \$75 million windfall to drug companies. That, in my view, is an imbalance that does not pass the smell test.

The bottom line on the opioid legislation is that there is an awful lot of heavy lifting to do before anybody ought to think about taking a victory lap. My State—and it pains me to say this—is the fourth worst State in the country when it comes to opioid abuse. I hear from Oregonians who have gone from pills, to heroin, to a tragic ending. I hear accounts that nobody could have ever dreamed of.

I was blessed to go to school on a basketball scholarship. Nobody heard about basketball players who had an injury getting hooked on opioids and having tragic, premature endings and opportunities choked off. We didn't hear those stories then, but we hear them now.

I have heard from doctors and pharmacists about the dangers drugs pose and the difficulty of treating pain safely. I hear from community leaders who are trying fresh approaches to reach out to young people. My sense is that every single Member of the Senate is hearing these kinds of stories.

I want it understood that the opioid addiction crisis is going to keep raging unabated. Lives are going to continue

to be lost and families are going to continue to be torn apart until the Senate finishes the rest of the job, and the rest of the job is still ahead of us.

NOMINATION OF MARY WAKEFIELD

Mr. President, I have unfinished business that needs to be addressed, and that is the yearlong obstruction in front of the Senate Finance Committee on a supremely qualified nominee, Dr. Mary Wakefield, who is the President's choice to be the Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Her nomination has been sitting in purgatory longer than any other such choice in history, and it is for reasons that have absolutely nothing to do with her qualifications.

I am going to talk about what is causing the holdup, but I want to spend a little bit of time talking about Dr. Wakefield and the important role she has been nominated to fill. She is up for the No. 2 spot at Health and Human Services, which would make her the chief operating officer of a Department that is taking on some of our most important health challenges, including opioid addiction. They manage the most important health programs in the country. This Department is on the frontlines in the battle against Zika. They run the Centers for Disease Control, the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institutes of Health, child welfare programs, family support programs, and it goes on and on.

I felt from the outset that she was the right person for this job. She is somebody who has seen the American health care system from all sides. She comes from rural America. She hails from North Dakota and sought out more opportunities to help individuals by working in policy and managing programs. She was a nurse, and she said: I want to do more, and I am going to be able to do it by learning more about these health policies. So she earned a master's degree, a Ph.D., and then she served as a legislative assistant and chief of staff in the Senate. She has proven herself most able as the head of the Health Resources and Services Administration. This is almost a textbook case of somebody qualified to do this job.

When the Finance Committee met in February to discuss her nomination, she was winning plaudits from both sides of the aisle. My friend, Chairman HATCH, said Dr. Wakefield has an "impressive background and a reputation for being a problem solver." Those are not my words. They are the words of Chairman HATCH.

Senator HOEVEN, who introduced Dr. Wakefield at that hearing, said, "She is a dedicated public servant and a hard-working health care advocate."

And Senator HOEVEN, whom we all respect, like Senator HATCH, made the important point that Dr. Wakefield is an advocate especially for rural America. She believes Americans deserve access to high-quality health care, regardless of their ZIP Code, and she has certainly walked the walk as a nurse and as a practitioner.

Senator HOEVEN encouraged the Finance Committee to support Dr. Wakefield's nomination and "send her to the full Senate for confirmation."

Unfortunately, this process of moving this highly qualified nominee has ground to a halt. There have been kind of two stages of this process. First, in February, Senator GRASSLEY indicated he would put a hold on the nomination on the ground that he and other Republican Senators had not received adequate responses to the questions they had raised about Planned Parenthood. Now, these questions had absolutely nothing to do with what Dr. Wakefield had been involved in. Senator GRASSLEY's questions were answered months ago, but as soon as that was accomplished, there was another objection.

In March, the Republican members of the Finance Committee sent a letter to the inspector general raising questions about a complaint against the State of California regarding what is the so-called Weldon amendment. The amendment prohibits recipients of appropriated funds from discriminating against health care providers who do not cover abortion services. We were told the Wakefield nomination could not be considered until those issues with respect to California and the Weldon amendment were resolved.

Once again, we are seeing issues raised that have absolutely nothing to do with Dr. Wakefield, a nurse, someone who hails from rural America, who Republican Senators say is eminently qualified, to be held up for matters that had nothing to do with her nomination. She wasn't the subject of the investigation. She didn't work in California. There has been no allegation she has been involved in any way in the matters being investigated.

Several weeks ago, the Office of Civil Rights concluded their investigation of California and the Weldon amendment. It concluded the Weldon amendment had not been violated, really not even implicated, because none of the parties bringing the complaint were even covered by the amendment. So as a matter of law, there was no violation.

Now, one would normally think that would finally clear the decks; no issues left related to Dr. Wakefield's nomination. Even the issues unrelated to her nomination had been resolved. So one would think we would be ready to go, ready to forward the nomination. That has not been the case. My understanding is, on the other side of the aisle, Republican members of the Finance Committee are still unwilling to favorably report the nomination.

So a highly qualified nominee is being needlessly blocked for reasons that—and I have spent a lot of time digging into this—are completely unrelated to her qualifications and the position she has been nominated to.

It just seems to me the people we represent deserve more when it comes to the consideration of vital nominees—vital nominees like Dr. Wakefield—and legislation that ought to

really shorten those waiting lines for opioid treatment and respond fully to the challenge of opioid addiction. The Congress ought to be doing its job. It ought to be doing more than making political points and passing half measures.

I will close by way of saying that I think as much as any Member of this body, I have made a commitment to working in a bipartisan way. It is what I want to be the hallmark of my time in public service. I will just close by way of saying that I think both fighting opioid addiction and making sure that qualified people who have been recommended by senior Republicans can actually be considered here in both instances. The Congress and the Senate owe more to the American people.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS AND PELL GRANTS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I was interested to hear my good friend talk about the uncertainty of the appropriations process. Frankly, I think we could debate no issue that would change the Congress more totally than the issue of getting back to the certainty of the appropriations process.

For 200 years, the principal work of the Congress—the House and the Senate—was to set our national priorities based on how we spend our national trust of the money given to this government by the people who pay taxes, the revenue of the government. We have gotten out of the habit of doing that. Frankly, one of the reasons we have an authorizing process—and have always had that—and an appropriating process is because that gave the Congress the annual ability to look at those programs, see how they were working, see if they were still working, and gave the Congress the ability to reach out to a program and have that program answer every question because there was an annual review of how we spent the money. If there is an incredible indictment over the last 7 years, it is that the Senate has stopped doing that work.

The Republican-led Appropriations Committees over the last 2 years have had all the bills ready for the first time in a long time—ready to do the work and ready to talk about the priorities of the country and, maybe more importantly, ready for the 30 people who serve on the Appropriations Committee to not be the only people who get to offer amendments, to not be the only people who ask and answer questions, and to not be the only people who get a say in this process. That is why these bills need to be on the floor.

What a tragedy this week and last week that the Defense appropriations bill—the primary responsibility of the Federal Government to defend the country—that bill isn't even allowed to be debated by the minority because they say: We want to see what the final bill will say before we are ready to de-

bate the Senate version. There is no government—bicameral, two legislative body chart in the world—that shows how one group decides what the final bill looks like before the other body of the Congress is allowed to pass a bill. That is just not the way this works. There is a Senate bill, there is a House bill, and those two bills come together.

The country, for good reasons, has forgotten the basic civics of how our democracy works because the Senate particularly has been such an obstacle to that democracy working for 7 years now. For 5 years, we were not able to amend the bills, and that was a reason not to go forward, and by the way it was a good reason not to go forward. Then, for 2 years, we didn't want to debate the bills because apparently we didn't know what they were going to say before they got to the President's desk. That is not how this process is supposed to work.

Last month, for the first time in 7 years, the Senate Appropriations Committee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education passed a bipartisan bill. It came out of the full committee 29 to 1. That is a good vote, but that still means 70 of the Senators haven't gotten to weigh in on what that bill should look like. If that was the case, it could be that other Senators who are concerned about opioid abuse—which I want to talk about in a minute—the Senators who are concerned about whether that is going to be funded would be less concerned if they knew we were back to the constitutional way of running the government.

As chairman of the Labor and Health and Human Services Committee, I was pleased we were able to write that bipartisan bill. Certainly, Senator MURRAY, the leading Democrat, didn't get everything she wanted in this bill, and I didn't get everything I wanted in this bill, but we were willing to set priorities. One of the priorities I want to talk about for a few minutes, before we all go home and have a chance to talk about the good things that could happen in the country if we will just do our job—one of those priorities will be returning to year-round Pell grants.

Pell grants are the grants available to people who, because of their family income or their personal income, qualify for not a student loan but actually a student grant. Until 2008, we had several years where you could go to school, and you could go to school year-round, and still have access to those Pell grant funds.

Recently, I was at Harris-Stowe State University in St. Louis. I was at Mineral Area College, I was at Ozarks Technical College, Missouri State University in Springfield, and I was at Three Rivers Community College in Poplar Bluff talking about what happens if people are able to stay in school once they get in school.

One of the students I talked to at Harris-Stowe is Tierra Wilson, a 21-

year-old senior who was about to graduate. She was going to school pretty much on her own resources, her own part-time job. She needed to get done as soon as she could so she decided to take summer classes, but since she didn't have the opportunity for a year-round Pell—she could only get the Pell grant for two semesters instead of the way it was until 2008—she could only get that money for two semesters so she had to borrow the \$3,000 it took her to finish her degree sooner. The good news is, she is going to finish her degree. The bad news for her is, she has an additional \$3,000 debt that she wouldn't have had.

The newspaper the Joplin Globe recently shared a story about another student who also recently has gone to school on Pell grants, Andy Hamon. He is a senior. His mom and dad run a small business. According to that story, he has always depended on financial aid because his family didn't have the resources to pay tuition. He said it hasn't been easy. He said he had to take classes in the summer, and when he did take classes in the summer, he had to borrow or out-of-pocket come up with the \$800 to \$10,000 the Pell grant will not cover.

When I was at Mineral Area Community College, the president of Mineral Area Community College, Dr. Steve Kurtz, said, when you talk about affordability and accessibility, you are right in the middle of this discussion on what happens if you have access to help year-round as opposed to just two semesters a year.

Jean Merrill-Doss, who serves as the dean of student services at that college, says approximately 60 percent of their student body is dependent on Pell grants to attend school.

As a college student, I went to school as quickly as I could. Nobody in my family had graduated from college before. I went three years, three summers. It took 124 credit hours to graduate with a bachelor's degree. I had 124 credit hours. I didn't have an extra hour. I couldn't pay for an extra hour, in my view, and I needed to get college behind me or I might not be the first person in my family to graduate from college.

In fact, the first teaching job I took at Marshfield High School—my grandfather was the janitor. He had been the janitor, when I was growing up, at the school where I took my first job as a college graduate.

Students like Tierra, students like Andy need to have the opportunity we can give them to go to school and finish school.

Pell grants benefit about 7.5 million students annually. The maximum two-semester Pell grant will be \$5,815 in the school year that begins next fall. The \$5,815 pays for tuition, fees, books at every community college in Missouri, and we have a big community college system. So for people who have the most economic need, we already have free 2 years of college in our State, and

in a couple of our universities you can still get all your tuition, all your books, all the fees paid for with a Pell grant.

What is the advantage of being able to stay in school once you get started in school? The Presiding Officer and I are two of the three university presidents here in the Senate. So we have talked to many students who had to have financial aid and had to have help to go. If you are the first person in your family to graduate from college or you are going back to school—maybe you are taking a break, you didn't go to college, or college didn't work out—and you are an adult and totally responsible for all of your college expenses if you are going to go, staying in school makes a big difference. If you decide you can't go that summer semester because you can't afford the tuition and you get the full-time summer job, it is real easy for the full-time summer job to turn into this: Well, I will do this job one more semester, and I will get into school in January. In January it is easy to think: Well, I will go ahead and finish my job and save a little more money, and I will get back into school at the regular time next fall. Before you know it, life gets in the way, things happen, and you intend to continue to go to school, finish, and get your degree, but it somehow doesn't happen.

Those students who want to continue their class work year-round should have access to the Pell grant help that you would have if you were a little more flexible and had a little more ability to take a part-time job in the summer, live at home with your mom and dad, and do whatever you are doing there and start back in the fall. Year-round Pell is not for everybody, but it is expected that an estimated 1 million students of the 7.7 million students that get Pell would take advantage of year-round Pell, and that includes 20,000 Missouri students who would take advantage of year-round Pell. They would get an average of \$1,650 each to take advantage of that other semester—another semester to catch up, another semester to get ahead, or another semester to just graduate faster. This is something we need to do and should do.

OPPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I want to speak for a couple of minutes about the other topic that was just discussed—opioids. Clearly, this is a problem. About 1,000 Missourians every year die from opioid overdoses. In St. Louis alone, deaths related to opioid abuse have increased three times since 2007. An estimated 5.9 million American adults have an opioid use disorder. This is truly a public health crisis in every corner of the nation, from our major cities to our rural communities. There is some evidence that rural communities even have a bigger problem with opioid abuse than in the city.

I was visiting over the Fourth of July weekend with some St. Louis fire-

fighters who were also in the first responder team, and it is clear that this is something where 10 or 15 times a day, and even more on weekends, they are responding to opioid overdoses. If you are in a fire department in America today that also has a first responder unit, you are three times more likely to go to an overdose than you are to go to a fire.

The good news is there is treatment. Seventy-two percent of the Missourians who went through the State's opioid treatment program, having been tested, were found to be negative afterward with any random test. So there is a solution here. The problem is that only about 10 percent of the people who have the problem get into the program to solve the problem.

That is why yesterday the bill was passed that I co-sponsored that dealt with the idea of opioid abuse. This agreement expands access to evidence-based treatment and recovery services and focuses on proven strategies that strengthen people's ability not to get addicted and, if they are addicted, to figure out how to no longer be addicted.

In this appropriation, we recommended a 93-percent increase in the money available. One of the issues that Senator WYDEN was concerned about was whether there would be enough money. Between last year and this year, we increased the money by 542 percent. It takes an unbelievably effective government agency to deal with a more than 542-percent increase. We are going to continue to watch the bill, to watch the need, to see and do everything possible to see that the money is available.

The House has ideas here. We do too. First responders are not the people who need to be primarily focused on this job. They need to be there when they need to be there, but we have to do something that solves this problem.

People need a place to go. That is why the Excellence in Mental Health Act will have at least 6 States, and as many as 24 States, on January 1, treating mental health like all other health, providing an important access point for mental health issues of all kinds and opioid issues that can only be dealt with in that context of overall health involving mental health.

I hope we will begin to work more openly, more transparently, and more committed to solving problems than we are committed to just complaining about problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS DENTAL INSURANCE RE-AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 3055 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3055) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide a dental insurance plan to veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.

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

Mr. BLUNT. 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. 3055) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3055

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 “Department of Veterans Affairs Dental Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. DENTAL INSURANCE PLAN FOR VETERANS AND SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS OF VETERANS.

(a) DENTAL INSURANCE PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1712B the following new section:

“§ 1712C. Dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and administer a dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans described in subsection (b).

“(b) COVERED VETERANS AND SURVIVORS AND DEPENDENTS.—The veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans described in this subsection are as follows:

“(1) Any veteran who is enrolled in the system of annual patient enrollment under section 1705 of this title.

“(2) Any survivor or dependent of a veteran who is eligible for medical care under section 1781 of this title.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall contract with a dental insurer to administer the dental insurance plan under this section.

“(d) BENEFITS.—The dental insurance plan under this section shall provide such benefits for dental care and treatment as the Secretary considers appropriate for the dental insurance plan, including diagnostic services, preventative services, endodontics and other restorative services, surgical services, and emergency services.

“(e) ENROLLMENT.—(1) Enrollment in the dental insurance plan under this section shall be voluntary.

“(2) Enrollment in the dental insurance plan shall be for such minimum period as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this section.

“(f) PREMIUMS.—(1) Premiums for coverage under the dental insurance plan under this section shall be in such amount or amounts as the Secretary shall prescribe to cover all costs associated with carrying out this section.

“(2) The Secretary shall adjust the premiums payable under this section for coverage under the dental insurance plan on an annual basis. Each individual covered by the dental insurance plan at the time of such an adjustment shall be notified of the amount and effective date of such adjustment.

“(3) Each individual covered by the dental insurance plan shall pay the entire premium for coverage under the dental insurance plan, in addition to the full cost of any copayments.

“(g) VOLUNTARY DISENROLLMENT.—(1) With respect to enrollment in the dental insurance plan under this section, the Secretary shall—

“(A) permit the voluntary disenrollment of an individual in the dental insurance plan if the disenrollment occurs during the 30-day period beginning on the date of the enrollment of the individual in the dental insurance plan; and

“(B) permit the voluntary disenrollment of an individual in the dental insurance plan for such circumstances as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection, but only to the extent such disenrollment does not jeopardize the fiscal integrity of the dental insurance plan.

“(2) The circumstances prescribed under paragraph (1)(B) shall include the following:

“(A) If an individual enrolled in the dental insurance plan relocates to a location outside the jurisdiction of the dental insurance plan that prevents use of the benefits under the dental insurance plan.

“(B) If an individual enrolled in the dental insurance plan is prevented by a serious medical condition from being able to obtain benefits under the dental insurance plan.

“(C) Such other circumstances as the Secretary shall prescribe for purposes of this subsection.

“(3) The Secretary shall establish procedures for determinations on the permissibility of voluntary disenrollments under paragraph (1)(B). Such procedures shall ensure timely determinations on the permissibility of such disenrollments.

“(h) RELATIONSHIP TO DENTAL CARE PROVIDED BY SECRETARY.—Nothing in this section shall affect the responsibility of the Secretary to provide dental care under section 1712 of this title, and the participation of an individual in the dental insurance plan under this section shall not affect the entitlement of the individual to outpatient dental services and treatment, and related dental appliances, under such section 1712.

“(i) REGULATIONS.—The dental insurance plan under this section shall be administered under such regulations as the Secretary shall prescribe.

“(j) TERMINATION.—This section terminates on December 31, 2021.”

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 17 of such title is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1712B the following new item:

“1712C. Dental insurance plan for veterans and survivors and dependents of veterans.”

(b) CONFORMING REPEAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 510 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1712 note) is repealed.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 is amended by striking the item relating to section 510.

FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Vermont.

COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, while the Senator from Missouri is still on the

floor, I noted what my friend said about his being the first member of his family to get a college degree.

The Leahys came to Vermont in 1850. When my grandfather—who was a stone carver—died, my father was a teenager, and he had to go to work. I became the first LEAHY to get a college degree, and my sister was the second one. I have to think what the path might have been otherwise. There is one thing we all have to agree on: We have to make it easier for college to be affordable, with all kinds of plans and ideas. The kids have to be able to go to college. I was able to do that. I was able to go on to graduate school. It is so important to be able to compete today. I was touched by what my friend said, and I appreciate it.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. President, we have kind of a good news/bad news situation today. The good news is that Congress is taking a step forward on how to respond to opioid addiction. By advancing the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, we are leaving behind decades-old misconceptions about how to confront addiction.

For too long, Congress relied on punitive measures that only served to push addicts further underground and away from recovery. This legislation treats opioid addiction as an illness. It combats it as we would any other public health issue, through a commitment to evidence-based treatment and recovery programs. But the bad news is our commitment falls short.

The conference report promises critical programming, but then it does not pay the bill. It does not provide the resources necessary to support the programming. So we should know what we have here. We have a first step—an important first step but barely a first step. If we make a mistake and say: OK, we have done our job, then we have failed the countless communities across the country grappling with addiction. We are doing very little to stem this epidemic.

I am afraid my friends, the Republicans, have repeatedly blocked efforts to fund the programs authorized by CARA. When the legislation was first considered on the Senate floor, Republicans opposed Senator SHAHEEN’s amendment that would have provided \$600 million in new funding of emergency supplemental appropriations, which is actually a modest amount considering what is needed in this country.

Then we have the appropriations process in committee this year. Emergency funds to fight this addiction epidemic were denied. Senate Republicans kept assuring us that there was going to be a time and a place to include real funding. Well, last week’s conference provided such an opportunity. I, along with other Democratic conferees, identified commonsense and bipartisan off-sets that would enable us to dedicate almost \$1 billion in new resources to put the programs in CARA to work. We told our Republican counterparts we

could not sign the conference report unless it included meaningful funding, but the Republicans voted against funding CARA so I did not sign the report. They also made a new promise. At the conference meeting, the Republicans promised to include \$525 million in new funding to combat addiction through the appropriations process. I have to note that I hope Americans demand that Congress keep this promise and provide meaningful funding for CARA—not with poison pill offsets that would kill it but with real promises.

I will soon again join with Senators MURRAY, WYDEN, and SHAHEEN to introduce legislation to provide \$920 million to fund CARA. It could be fully paid for. It could be paid for with offsets that received overwhelming bipartisan support. If we are really serious about combatting the opioid epidemic, there is no sense not to pass this, and there is no sense not to put our money where our mouths are, because, if we fund it, it can make an important difference. We can expand prevention efforts, expand access to treatment and recovery services, and authorize the critical public health programs to create and expand Medication Assisted Treatment, MAT, programs.

If CARA were funded, it could make an important difference in communities across the country. The bill lays the groundwork for expanding prevention efforts and access to treatment and recovery services. It removes arbitrary restrictions on prescribing Medication Assisted Treatment, which will allow nurse practitioners and physician assistants in Vermont to treat addiction just as they treat other illnesses. It authorizes a critical public health program I helped create to expand MAT programs. Some Vermonters tell me they are struggling with addiction and they have had to wait nearly 1 year to receive treatment. At the Chittenden Clinic in South Burlington, VT, several have died while waiting. Because we wouldn't fund it, several died. This story is not unique.

The bill also includes my provision to support our rural communities by increasing access to the overdose reversal drug naloxone. Rural locations have the highest death rates in the country from opioid poisoning, and getting this drug into more hands will save lives.

The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act also recognizes that the overprescription of opioids is largely responsible for this epidemic, and the legislation includes a provision I strongly support to encourage the National Institutes of Health to intensify research on the effectiveness of opioids in treating chronic pain and to encourage the development of opioid-alternatives to manage chronic pain.

Two weeks ago, on a beautiful Vermont evening, a standing-room only crowd filled a conference room at the Green Mountain Technical and Career Center for a community meeting on opioid abuse. The event was orga-

nized by Lamoille County Sheriff Roger Marcoux. He is a former DEA agent who has seen the toll of heroin and opioid abuse and what it has done in the rural regions of my State.

Dr. Betsy Perez, a panelist and long-time practitioner at nearby Copley Hospital, surprised many in the crowd when she addressed the opioid issue from a personal rather than from a medical perspective. This doctor told the heart-wrenching story of her addicted daughter's journey.

Despite many efforts at treatment, her daughter repeatedly relapsed, eventually winding up homeless on the streets of Burlington. Her daughter is now 2 years into recovery and recently became a mother. The cost of her intensive residential treatment was high. It drained the doctor's retirement savings. But she would have it no other way. I wonder how much better off they might have been if we had prevention clinics in place.

I held a hearing in St. Albans, VT—again, standing room only. I remember a noted pediatrician who spoke about being with parents whom he did not identify. He said they were well off. He was telling them about the dangers of opioids and how teenagers can get addicted. They were shocked to hear this.

They said: Thank you for telling us about this. We will watch out for our daughter.

He said: I have been treating your daughter for 2 years. She is an addict.

You could hear a pin drop in that room. But she was getting treatment, and many are not so fortunate. Each day, throughout our country, 129 people die from drug overdoses. I suspect that almost every Vermonter knows someone who has been impacted by addiction. This is not the future we want for our children, our grandchildren, our communities. In Vermont, we know what it takes to get ahead of addiction. While I appreciate the attention Congress has given this issue, CARA will only work for Vermont and States across the country if Congress is willing to provide the funding that is necessary to fight this epidemic.

I was proud to help usher CARA through the Senate. I will support it today. But I am greatly disappointed that Congress has so far refused to treat this public health crisis as seriously as it did the swine flu or Ebola.

I would urge all Senators: Don't go just to formal meetings. Just stand outside your local grocery stores, as my wife, a registered nurse, and I often do. Just talk with people. Walk down the street, and talk with people. You are going to find what Vermonters know all too well: Lives are at stake here, and time is of the essence. It is time for Congress to act like it and fully fund CARA.

I know when Marcelle and I go home, we want to say that we are helping because we know some of these families personally. In a little State of only 600,000 people, you tend to know a lot of people. I have seen some of the finest

families in our State devastated by this. I am sure it is the same in the Presiding Officer's State and every other State in this country. We have to represent the people from our States and help.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. 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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POLICE AND COMMUNITIES OF COLOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, as our Nation confronts what increasingly feels like a weakening of the bond between law enforcement and the communities they serve, I rise to urge all of my colleagues to examine the relationship between police and communities of color. One year ago, I joined the Democratic members of the Senate Judiciary Committee in urging our colleagues to convene hearings on this critical issue.

The Justice Department had recently made public the, frankly, shocking findings on its investigation into the Ferguson Police Department, which found that the city engaged in a pattern and practice of constitutional violations. But the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over matters relating to civil liberties and criminal proceedings, and entire subcommittees devoted exclusively to matters of crime and to the protection of constitutional rights held no hearings on the broader issue. No proposals were debated by the whole committee, no testimony heard.

We had already lost Eric Garner, Michael Brown, Tamir Rice, and Freddie Gray. And rather than honor our obligation to confront this problem head-on, rather than engage in difficult conversations about race and about persistent inequality, we allowed these problems to be met with silence.

It must be said that we owe a debt of gratitude to the brave officers who worked tirelessly to keep us safe from harm. Every day, they put their lives on the line to protect our safety and that of our families. But we are doing a disservice to the noble men and women of that profession and to the communities they serve by turning away from unpleasant facts and by refusing to talk about them.

That silence carries a terrible price. Last week, a 32-year-old man named Philando Castile was pulled over for driving with a broken taillight in Falcon Heights, MN. It was the 53rd time he had been pulled over in just a few short years. His girlfriend Diamond was beside him. Her 4-year-old daughter Dae'Anna was in the back seat. We

don't know precisely what happened as Philando spoke to the officer who approached the car. We don't know what the two men said to each other, but we know how that encounter ended. Philando died after suffering multiple gunshot wounds.

Philando's community—our community—in Minnesota is devastated. That community includes Philando's family, his loved ones, and his friends. It also includes the staff and the children in the elementary school where Philando worked; he knew them all by name. And it includes the parents of those children, many of whom began the morning after his death by explaining to their kids that Phil wouldn't be at school anymore.

The impact of Philando's death has been felt far beyond those who knew him. In Dallas, as people seeking justice for Philando and his family gathered in a peaceful protest, a deeply troubled man murdered five members of a police force shielding demonstrators from gunfire. And over the weekend, protests in St. Paul took a vicious turn as protesters pelted police with rocks and chunks of concrete.

Such violence does not honor the lives of those we have lost. It does not advance the cause of justice. Rather, violence makes it more difficult for our communities to begin the long and difficult healing process.

From the suburbs of St. Paul to downtown Dallas, our communities are in pain, and it is our responsibility as lawmakers to do something about it. We cannot take the steps necessary to confront this challenge if we fear acknowledging that it exists. We cannot solve this problem without coming together as a nation to address and dismantle the systemic racial injustices that lead to far too many of these deaths and to identify solutions. We cannot solve this problem if we run away from it.

But running from it is precisely what this body will do. In just a few short days, the Senate will adjourn for 7 weeks. During that time, our communities will continue to endure anguish, heartache, and pain. I hope every Senator uses this time to meet with people who have been touched by these events and to better understand the challenges that we face and they face. I urge them to join me in working to address them.

When asked about her son's death, Philando's mother said: "All we want is justice." And she deserves nothing less.

ZIKA VIRUS FUNDING

Mr. President, I wish to turn to another important issue: the Zika virus outbreak, its devastating impact on families, and—I hate to say this—the Republican obstructionism that is preventing us from taking meaningful action to address this outbreak.

As you know, the Zika virus is transmitted to people primarily through the bite of an infected mosquito, but it can also be transmitted through sexual

contact, through blood transfusions, or from mother to child. While it typically causes no symptoms or mild illness in adults, we now know that a Zika virus infection during pregnancy can cause microcephaly and other severe birth defects. In fact, the World Health Organization has declared this outbreak a public health emergency of international concern. In some countries, Zika virus transmission is so high that public health officials have asked women to delay their pregnancies.

While other countries are feeling the brunt of this outbreak, Zika is also affecting us here at home. So far, there have been over 1,100 people in the continental United States who have been affected by the Zika virus while traveling to endemic countries. This includes 320 who are currently pregnant. We are already seeing local transmission in U.S. territories, where 2,500 additional people have been infected, and these are just the confirmed cases. The actual number of those infected is likely to be much, much higher.

This is why over 140 days ago President Obama asked Congress for emergency funds to respond to the Zika virus outbreak. His request, drawing on the expertise of public health experts, sought funds for things such as mosquito control, vaccine and drug development, and diagnostics so that more people can get tested and receive their results faster.

After weeks of deliberation, the Senate eventually reached a bipartisan compromise. Although we didn't get all the money we need to fight the virus, we did get \$1.1 billion. Democrats and Republicans in the Senate negotiated in good faith and got a bipartisan package that included important provisions to combat the Zika virus. That is why 68 Members of the U.S. Senate, including 22 Republicans, voted for the Senate bill.

Unfortunately, that bipartisan spirit has not prevailed. As it turned out, Republicans in the House of Representatives delayed and then derailed the funding request. Even though the Senate passed a bipartisan compromise, House Republicans, with support from Republican Senate negotiators, sent back a partisan package packed with ideological poison pill provisions. These included provisions that deliberately block funds from going to family planning clinics, take away money from the continuing fight against Ebola, and even erode provisions in the Clean Water Act.

Let me explain some of these provisions in more detail. The bill the House and Senate Republican negotiators sent back to us limits women's access to contraceptive services. Imagine that. At a time when many women have decided to delay their pregnancies out of fear of the Zika virus, my Republican colleagues are actively working to keep birth control out of reach. Such provisions disproportionately harm low-income women who turn to

safety net clinics such as Planned Parenthood for birth control and for education on family planning.

Two weeks ago, one of my Republican colleagues addressed this issue on the floor of the Senate. Standing next to a photo of a baby girl with microcephaly, he argued that Democratic objections to the bill were "fanciful and imagined." That is what he said—"fanciful and imagined." He dismissed the idea that Planned Parenthood was deliberately targeted in this legislation since it was not mentioned by name in the text. But it is actually that intention that is fanciful.

Because of the way the legislation is crafted, it excludes family planning clinics such as Planned Parenthood from receiving funds. This is particularly harmful in places like Puerto Rico, where infection rates are rising rapidly and high numbers of uninsured women need access to information about the virus, as well as effective birth control.

This kind of tactic is deeply counterproductive. To combat this virus, we must rely on the strength of our entire medical system and not sideline the country's most experienced family planning providers.

Second, Republicans have criticized Democrats for asking for more money, describing our vote against their bipartisan package as "disgraceful." Let me describe what is disgraceful. This Republican bill, unlike any other recent emergency spending bill, actually takes money away from efforts to control Ebola outbreaks—which are still active in Africa—in order to pay for Zika.

I would like to remind my colleagues that a short time ago Ebola ravaged West Africa, infecting more than 28,000 people and killing over 11,000, making it the deadliest Ebola outbreak on record.

While research is under way, we do not yet have a vaccine against this virus. Ebola is still an active threat. In fact, since the 2014 outbreak, there have been several new clusters of Ebola virus due to the virus's persistence in survivors. Public health experts warn that this virus will return; the question is whether we will be ready. At this juncture it would be irresponsible to cut funding from Ebola research, surveillance, and public health infrastructure. The Republican strategy to fight the Zika virus would do just that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 1½ minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you.

Finally—see, I was going to say "finally" anyway.

Finally, the bill even waives permitting requirements when it comes to applying pesticides near bodies of water. This clean water requirement was intended to protect people from toxic

substances, particularly pregnant women, children, and other vulnerable populations. But my colleagues are mischaracterizing our objection to this rider. In fact, one of my colleagues went to the Senate floor recently and accused the Democrats of being “more focused on protecting the mosquito than they are protecting people.” That is just absurd.

To sum up, my Democratic colleagues and I supported the Senate bill to fund the fight against a devastating disease, and Republicans decided to politicize this issue by sending back a conference report that was filled with partisan policy riders.

Every day that we don't act, this virus continues to spread. And, in the meantime, the Republican leader has not given any indications that he plans to change course. In fact, he said he plans to bring up the same exact partisan bill that was defeated last week.

The President has already threatened to veto this bill, so another vote would be useless.

I urge my Republican colleagues: Please, please stop playing partisan politics, and let's pass something meaningful to address this crisis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, at the moment, we are considering the reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration, and I am disappointed by what we are about to do today, although at this point there appears to be no option. This extension fails to accomplish significant and important reforms in the aviation world, and it is something we were able to do, should have been able to do, and almost accomplished. As a result of our failure, I will oppose the reauthorization legislation we will vote on in just a few moments.

Three weeks ago, I came to the Senate floor to express my concern with what was happening, and my plea and request to our House colleagues to act on the FAA reauthorization bill as the Senate sent it to them—the FAA Reauthorization Act of 2016, which in April passed the Senate by the unusual vote of 95 votes in favor—broadly supported.

I serve on the Commerce Committee, and Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON worked hard with all of us on that committee to see that a wide variety of interests, a wide variety of opportunities were explored for us to make improvements in the world of aviation.

The way it works is, we have a piece of legislation that is in effect and will soon expire, and we are up against a deadline for that extension, but we knew that. In fact, we went to work early. The Senate Commerce Committee began hearings a long time ago—months ago. We worked hard to find consensus, and we did. Our product came to the Senate floor not just with a simple reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration but with

items that were so important to this country's economy, to those who utilize general aviation, to communities that care about their local airports, and to those—in my case in Kansas—who care about how many jobs we have and can continue to have and how many more we can create as a result of the manufacturing of aircraft in this country. So we did what we were supposed to do in the Senate. We worked together and found solutions. We found compromises, and we passed legislation overwhelmingly.

Unfortunately, when it went to the House of Representatives, no action was taken in the House. As I said, the clock is ticking and the FAA will no longer continue to have legal authority to exist. Once again, as has happened in years gone by, we are left with a take-it-or-leave-it situation. We either take the House-passed extension or the FAA shuts down. There is no need for us to be in the position we are in today, and the extension we are going to vote on will be missing many important provisions included in the Senate-passed bill.

My perspective on this certainly is as a Kansan, but it matters no matter what State you live in. Kansas is an aviation State. General aviation is our State's largest industry, and our largest city is Wichita, which is appropriately known as the air capital of the world. Kansas aviation workers have supplied three out of every four general aviation aircraft since the Wright brothers' first flight at Kitty Hawk, and today some 42,000 Kansans make a living manufacturing, operating, and servicing the world's highest quality aircraft.

So what does the FAA reauthorization—the extension we are about to vote on—have to do with those jobs in Kansas? What does it have to do with jobs in this country? If we have a goal we ought to be working on together to achieve, it would be to create more opportunities for more Americans to have better jobs. We need—and we all know it—a strong manufacturing sector in this economy. Yet we will fail to take advantage of the opportunity to increase the chances of more manufacturing jobs, more general aviation jobs, more airplane manufacturing jobs in the United States—more jobs for Americans, better jobs for Americans, more secure jobs for Americans—because we aren't able to do today—the House was unwilling to include in the extension those things that increase the chances the aviation industry in our country can better compete with those in a global economy that are our competitors.

What the manufacturing side of aviation needs, what aviation manufacturers in Kansas need is the ability to compete in a global marketplace so the industry remains our country's No. 1 net exporter. This requires significant reforms at the FAA, particularly in their certification process and improvements in the regulatory environment.

These provisions that are so helpful were contained not just in the Senate-passed bill but also in the original House FAA bill that was approved by the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee earlier in the spring. So here we have a situation in which the House Transportation Committee, the Senate Commerce Committee—in fact, the full Senate—approves things that matter greatly to our country and, most importantly, to its workers, and yet today we come to the Senate with a relatively simple extension that ignores those important reforms and improvements.

These provisions that are not included in this extension would streamline aircraft certification, significantly improving efficiency, and better focus the FAA's valuable resources someplace else. These reforms would have had a positive impact upon our economy, on job security, and job creation. Both the House and Senate recognized the importance of this issue and advanced nearly identical certification reform language, but, as I said, for some reason that language no longer appears in this bill.

In addition to certification, there were lots of other issues we agreed upon. Among the members of our committee and among Members of the Senate, overwhelmingly popular bipartisan provisions were included in this bill originally in the Senate but are not included now in this simple extension, including things such as strengthening our Contract Tower Program, which is so important, particularly to rural communities.

Again, while I come from a State where we manufacture planes, I also represent a State in which general aviation, our pilots, and the airports which they utilize are important to communities across my State as we again try to compete in a global economy. The ability to bring a business customer to a small community that has a manufacturing plant is dependent upon airport and air services.

The language from section 1204 of the Senate-passed bill would have significantly reformed the cost-benefit eligibility rules for contract towers—again, this is a way we provide air safety for communities that are small and have small airports—strengthening the program and providing certainty once and for all for the 253 contract towers that handle nearly one-third of our tower operations nationwide. It was a good idea. It was broadly supported—supported in the House in the Transportation Committee, supported in the Senate in the Commerce Committee and on the Senate floor—but not included in today's simple extension.

Apparently, the reason these important reforms were excluded was so they could, at a later date, be used as a political bargaining chip. The House held these popular reforms hostage in an attempt to gain leverage and to later promote an effort to privatize our Nation's air traffic control system.

By putting on hold these long overdue, noncontroversial certification reforms, the Contract Tower Program, and others, Congress is damaging the business aviation industry and the people who work therein.

Not too long ago I spoke on this floor defending general aviation from the Obama administration's repeated attempts to end the accelerated depreciation schedule for general aviation aircraft. In my view, the proposal came as a clever political sound bite—the so-called corporate jet loophole—but in reality it would have meant thousands of jobs would be gone and the unemployment lines longer. The President's proposal would have accomplished nothing for the economy—not even a meaningful increase in tax revenues—and only would have hurt 1.2 million Americans who make their living building and servicing airplanes.

This makes today all the more disappointing. It is one thing for me to come to the floor and complain about an Obama administration proposal, but today I come to the Senate floor to complain about a Republican-controlled House that was unable to take advantage of an opportunity to pass a strong, long-term reauthorization bill and instead leaves us with a simple, short-term extension.

Of course, I believe fully that the leadership of my Commerce Committee—Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON—worked very hard at crafting this Senate-passed FAA bill. I am here in support of their efforts and express my disappointment that their efforts were not rewarded by the House of Representatives. I regret that because we did not have a willing partner in the House, we are left with a watered-down extension so we can further entertain other ideas at some other point in time while uncertainty continues.

While that uncertainty continues, the rest of the world can advance their efforts, particularly in airplane manufacturing, while we wait for improvements, efficiencies, and modernization in our own. While we wait for Congress to do its work, the rest of the world moves on, with the potential of taking away jobs from the manufacturing sector here in the United States.

Americans rightfully should expect, and do expect, leadership from their officials in Washington. At a time when this partisan dysfunction puts us in places in which we constantly find barriers in the legislative process, it sure seems to me to be a waste that this opportunity to pass meaningful bipartisan reforms and improvements that could have an immediate positive impact on our economy is foregone.

We have enough other problems around here in the way this place works. Here we had, in my view, a chance to grasp victory for the American people, for its workers, and for our economy. We failed to do it, and in the process and as a result of that failure, the ability of American manufacturers

to create jobs is diminished and Kansans are more at risk for their futures as a result of our failure to do our jobs.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address my colleagues in the Senate, and I express my dissatisfaction and disappointment with the end product, recognizing the circumstance we now find ourselves in. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the FAA reauthorization we are going to be voting on, and I thank Senator MORAN for being here and talking about aviation in general and aviation manufacturing. He comes from a strong aviation manufacturing State, so I certainly support many of the things he said.

I certainly support making sure we continue to streamline our process, and it is one of the things left out of this legislation. So we need to do more on that effort. I certainly don't want people demonizing any aspect of aviation because they are all aviation jobs. People don't realize how many aviation jobs we have in the United States and the fact that we are still the top when it comes to aviation manufacturing jobs. So it shouldn't be a sector we relent on. We have a lot of work to do.

I would add to that list, though, the passage of the Export-Import Bank Board members so the Export-Import Bank can be functioning so we can actually approve aviation sales when we get them done, and this is for smaller aircraft or larger aircraft. It doesn't matter.

If we build the best product, we ought to be able to sell the best product around the globe. And we are still stuck on getting that nominee out of committee because of someone holding it up, and the fact that they are holding it up means we will go many more months before completing airplane sales.

I want to talk about some other provisions we are passing today. I am so proud to have worked with the chairman of the committee, whom I just saw pass here on the floor—I am sure he is going to speak in a moment—and the ranking member on very important aspects of aviation security.

First, we are doubling the number of terrorist-deterrent teams at U.S. airports and ground transportation. As we can see, these TSA teams are people who are very involved in making sure we handle security at our airports. This is a very important aspect of this legislation because, as we saw with the tragic events in Brussels and Istanbul, terrorists can attack us not just on airplanes or inside the security perimeter but outside security as well. So I think this legislation, thanks to Chairman

THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, is giving us the workforce we need to enhance the use of bomb-sniffing dogs, strengthen perimeter security, expand training, respond to active shooter attacks, and make sure the outer limits of our airports are secure.

I am proud that many of these provisions we passed out of the Commerce Committee are contained in this legislation and that it is doubling the number of these TSA VIPR teams that conduct controls and make sure our passengers are secure. These teams consist of a combination of law enforcement, inspectors, explosive specialists, and, as I mentioned, bomb-sniffing dogs.

What is so important about those dogs is that they are one of our best deterrents, picking up explosive material and tracking down people, and that is what we need to have at our airports. I again thank Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON for putting this in. Combining these law enforcement and bomb-detecting canine capabilities provides another layer of security at our airports. We have seen how the use of dogs helps us expedite our security lanes at SeaTac—now the busiest airport in the country as far as increase in volume—and we need to have more of these dogs outside on the perimeter as well. This will give us a visible deterrent and help us in protecting the much needed continuation of air transportation travel.

I also want to mention a couple of other things that are in this legislation—the checkpoint of the future and making sure we are streamlining our security checkpoints. We have been proud to work with the Pacific Northwest Lab in Richland, WA, where critical work is underway in detection technologies. And this legislation contains the extension of an important aviation safety item. There are 136 airports across the country that have automated weather equipment, but they need weather observers to make these around-the-clock observations. So at Spokane International Airport, this is a vital tool, and I was so glad to work with Senator MORAN and others in keeping this on.

Finally, we address in this extension a critical upcoming shortage of air traffic controllers by making improvements to the FAA's hiring process and creating a path forward for graduates like those at the Green River Community College in Washington State.

I thank Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON for these inclusions in their work. We obviously have much more work to do to maintain our aviation infrastructure, and I look forward to getting those done in the very near future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President I rise today to discuss the security, safety, and other air travel benefits included in the bipartisan aviation reform agreement that was negotiated with the House of Representatives.

Last week, Senator BILL NELSON, the ranking member on the Senate Commerce Committee, and I reached accord on a way forward with House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Chairman BILL SHUSTER and Ranking Member PETER DEFAZIO. Our agreement presents an opportunity for the Senate to break the pattern of short-term extensions for the Federal Aviation Administration that have not included any meaningful reform.

The aviation bill the Senate passed by a vote of 95 to 3 in April was a larger and, granted, more comprehensive bill than the agreement that came out of our negotiations with the House. It contained provisions added by Members in the Commerce Committee and on the Senate floor that we remain committed to enacting.

Nevertheless, we knew that certain safety and security reforms just couldn't wait until next year for the process to restart. When we looked at the ISIS attacks in airports in Brussels and Istanbul, as well as the downing of a Russian jetliner leaving Egypt, we knew there were meaningful reforms that could help efforts to prevent these kinds of attacks here in America, and so we acted.

To address the threat of an "insider" working at an airport helping terrorists, the aviation reform agreement now before the Senate enhances requirements and vetting for airport workers with access to secure areas. It expands the use of random and physical inspection of airport workers in secured areas and requires a review of perimeter security.

Responding to ISIS's demonstrated interest in targeting unsecured areas of airports, this aviation reform bill includes provisions to enhance the security presence of units that can include canines and other personnel in prescreening airport areas and increases preparedness for active shooter incidents.

Because some international airports abroad operating nonstop flights to U.S. airports lack the security equipment and expertise of U.S. and other state-of-the-art airports, the bill authorizes TSA to donate unneeded security equipment to foreign airports with direct flights to the United States, permits increased cooperation between U.S. officials and partner nations, and requires a new assessment of foreign cargo security programs.

This bill, which the House passed earlier this week, recognizes that long TSA lines aren't only an inconvenient delay for passengers trying to catch flights, but they can lead to large crowds in unsecured airport areas that create a target for terrorists. To address these lines, the bill includes the

TSA PreCheck Enhancement Act, which will help enroll more Americans in expedited security screening and reduce waits by vetting more passengers before they arrive to get them through checkpoints quickly.

Beyond question, safety and security needs drove the effort to finish this 14-month aviation reauthorization. The result, I can confidently say, ended up being the most significant airport security reform bill in over a decade. Our bipartisan, bicameral bill is good legislation that guards against the threat of terrorism, provides stability for the U.S. aviation system, and boosts safety and consumer protections for airline passengers.

As we prepare for a vote on this important bill, I urge my colleagues to support this bill that we carefully crafted over the past several months with our House counterparts that keeps the American people protected from terrorists, makes air travel safer and more secure, and addresses an issue of importance to all Americans.

Again, I thank the ranking member on our committee, Senator NELSON. Senators AYOTTE and CANTWELL, the chair and ranking member on the Aviation Subcommittee, were very involved in crafting this legislation. And, of course, there is the great work of our staffs, who put in countless hours to get us to where we are today, not only moving the original bill across the Senate floor back in April but also in negotiations with the House of Representatives to produce a result which I think we can all be proud of and which puts us on a path toward a safer travel opportunity for people in this country who use our airlines to get to their destinations.

Mr. President, I hope we will have a big vote, a bipartisan vote, in support of this bipartisan legislation.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The question is on agreeing to the motion to concur.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 127 Leg.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Ayotte	Flake	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blumenthal	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Heller	Risch
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hoeben	Sanders
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cardin	Johnson	Schatz
Carper	Kaine	Schumer
Coats	King	Scott
Collins	Kirk	Shaheen
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Markey	Udall
Daines	McCain	Vitter
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—4

Casey	Moran
Cassidy	Toomey

NOT VOTING—7

Cochran	Rounds	Wicker
Inhofe	Sessions	
Roberts	Shelby	

The motion was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 592; that there be 15 minutes of debate only on the nomination, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Carla D. Hayden, of Maryland, to be Librarian of Congress for a term of ten years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Dr. Carla Hayden to be the head of the Library of Congress. President Obama nominated her on February 24, 2016, and the Rules Committee held a hearing on April 20, 2016.

I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, the Senator from Missouri, Mr. BLUNT, and Senator SCHUMER.

Why is there an urgency to confirm Dr. Hayden?

Speaking as the vice chair of appropriations committee, the Library of Congress has \$600 million of appropriations funded through the legislative branch and 3,000 employees. In addition to the work they do that is well known with the Library of Congress, they also oversee the U.S. Copyright Office for the entire Nation, which needs leadership and resources. The Library of Congress also needs to move into the digital age, and that is why President Obama nominated Dr. Carla Hayden.

As Senators from Maryland, Senator CARDIN and I know Dr. Hayden well. She has been head of the Maryland Enoch Pratt Free Library for 23 years. She is distinguished. She was the past president of the American Library Association and was confirmed by the Senate in 2010 to serve on the National Museum and Library Services Board and has received numerous awards.

She has proven herself to be a skilled manager of large, complex projects and handling large budgets. She moved the Enoch Pratt Free Library into the digital age by leading the renovation of IT infrastructure dating back to the 1930s. When she did that, she not only brought the library into the modern age, she avoided techno-boondoggles and produced tangible results.

She established a new wing dedicated to young adults, guided the \$11 million annex to house the library's oldest and rarest materials, and also made the library a statewide research institution. She is a transformational leader who receives kudos from community leaders, archivists, and academics.

President Obama has nominated a qualified candidate, and our Nation will be well served by her confirmation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement by the American Library Association and other information related to Dr. Hayden be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the American Library Association]
BROAD PUBLIC, LIBRARY AND EDUCATIONAL
SECTOR SUPPORT OF HAYDEN NOMINATION

MORE THAN 140 NATIONAL NONPROFIT AND LIBRARY GROUPS, SCHOOLS, AND ACADEMIC LIBRARIES URGE DR. CARLA HAYDEN'S RAPID CONFIRMATION AS LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON, DC.—“The Library of Congress has never more needed the unique combination of character, acumen and humanity that Dr. Carla Hayden is so professionally, intellectually and personally qualified to offer that great institution. We urge her earliest possible approval by the Rules Committee and rapid confirmation by the Senate,” said more than 20 leading national nonprofit organizations in the letter below.

Nonprofit supporters were also joined by two dozen educational institutions (ranging from community colleges to the Big Ten and Ivy League); two dozen additional academic

libraries from every corner of the country; more than a score of national library groups; and virtually all of the nation's state library associations. Organized by the American Library Association (ALA), of which Dr. Hayden is a past-president, the letter was transmitted late yesterday to the members of the Senate Rules Committee which today holds its confirmation hearing on her nomination to become America's 14th Librarian of Congress.

ALA President Sari Feldman previously said of Dr. Hayden's nomination:

“The President could not have made a better choice. Hats off to President Obama for nominating Dr. Hayden, a professional librarian uniquely positioned with the leadership and management skills and understanding of digital technology to make the Library of Congress the preeminent national library in the world, highly-valued by and serving all Americans as a treasured resource. We look forward to working closely with her to further librarians' bedrock principle that all Americans everywhere deserve and must have equitable access to the information that they need to succeed and lead productive lives in the digital age.”

The 140+ group letter of support follows:
National organizations: American Booksellers Association, American Historical Association, Authors Alliance, Bill of Rights Defense Committee/Defending Dissent Foundation, Citizens for Responsibility and Ethics in Washington, Center for Democracy and Technology, Constitutional Alliance, Electronic Frontier Foundation, Government Accountability Project, Harry Potter Alliance, National Coalition for Literacy, OpenTheGovernment.org, Organization for Transformative Works, PEN American Center, Public Knowledge, Reach Out and Read, Reading is Fundamental, Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition (SPARC), Society of American Archivists, The OpenGov Foundation, The Sunlight Foundation

National Regional library organizations: National Association of Law Libraries, American Association of School Librarians, American Library Association, Association of College and Research Libraries, Association for Library Collections & Technical Services, Association for Library Service to Children, Association for Specialized and Cooperative Library Agencies, Association of Research Libraries, Association of Southeastern Research Libraries, Greater Western Library Alliance, Library Information Technology Association, Library Leadership & Management Association, New England Library Association, New Jersey Association of College and Research Libraries, Public Library Association, Reference and User Services Association, Southeastern Library Association, United for Libraries: Association of Trustees, Advocates, Friends and Foundations, Urban Libraries Council, Urban Librarians Unite, Young Adult Library Services Association

Educational institutions: Agnes Scott College (Atlanta), Appalachian State University (Boone, NC), Bates College (Lewiston, Maine), Clemson (SC) University Libraries, Dartmouth College (Hanover, NH), DePaul University (Chicago), Goucher College (Baltimore), Grand Valley State University (Allendale, Mich.), Illinois Wesleyan University (Bloomington, Ill.), Missouri State University (Springfield, Mo.), Northwestern University (Evanston, Ill.), The Pennsylvania State University (State College, Pa.), Rollins College (Winter Park, Fla.), St. Charles Community College (Cottleville, Mo.), Santa Clara University (Santa Clara, Calif.), Skidmore College (Saratoga Springs, N.Y.), Trinity University (San Antonio), University of Arkansas (Fayetteville, Ark.), University

of California, Los Angeles (Los Angeles), University of Colorado Boulder (Boulder, Colo.), University of Missouri-Kansas City (Kansas City, Mo.), The University of New Orleans, Utica (N.Y.) College, Wake Forest University (Winston-Salem, N.C.)

Academic libraries: Appalachian State University Libraries (Boone, N.C.), College of the Canyons Library (Santa Clarita, Calif.), Denison University Libraries (Granville, Ohio), Dominican University Graduate School of Library & Information Science (Lake Forest, Ill.), Duquesne University Gumberg Library (Pittsburgh), Florida State University Libraries (Tallahassee, Fla.), The Furman University Libraries (Greenville, S.C.), Georgia State University Library (Atlanta), Georgetown University Library (Washington, D.C.), Harvard Library (Cambridge, Mass), Ithaca (N.Y.) College Library, Massachusetts Institute of Technology Libraries (Cambridge, Mass.), Michigan Academic Library Association, Montana State University Library (Bozeman, Mont.), Montgomery College Libraries (Rockville, Md.), Montgomery College Paul Peck Humanities Institute (Rockville, Md.), New York University Division of Libraries, Oregon State University Libraries and Press (Corvallis, Wash.), The Rockefeller University Rita and Frits Markus Library (New York), Rowan-Cabarrus Community College Learning Resource Centers (Salisbury, N.C.), Temple University Libraries (Philadelphia), University of Arizona Libraries (Tucson, Ariz.), University of California Council of University Librarians (11 campuses), University of Kansas Libraries (Lawrence, Kan.)

State library associations: Alabama Library Association, Alaska Library Association, Arizona Library Association, California Library Association, Colorado Library Association, Connecticut Library Association, Delaware Library Association, District of Columbia Library Association, Florida Library Association, Georgia Library Association, Hawaii Library Association, Idaho Library Association, Illinois Library Association, Indiana Library Association, Iowa Library Association, Kansas Library Association, Kentucky Library Association, Louisiana Library Association, Maine Library Association, Maryland Library Association, Massachusetts Library Association, Michigan Library Association, Minnesota Library Association, Mississippi Library Association, Missouri Library Association, Montana Library Association, Nebraska Library Association, Nevada Library Association, New Hampshire Library Association, New Jersey Library Association, New Mexico Library Association, New York Library Association, North Carolina Library Association, North Dakota Library Association, Ohio Library Association, Oklahoma Library Association, Oregon Library Association, Pennsylvania Library Association, Rhode Island Library Association, South Carolina Library Association, South Dakota Library Association, Tennessee Library Association, Texas Library Association, Utah Library Association, Vermont Library Association, Virginia Library Association, Washington Library Association, West Virginia Library Association, Wisconsin Library Association, Wyoming Library Association

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN ROY BLUNT FOR DR. CARLA HAYDEN, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS NOMINEE

QUALIFICATIONS

1. You led the Pratt Library amidst some very difficult circumstances. What about that experience has prepared you to lead the world's largest library?

Answer: For more than 20 years leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library, I ran a library

system that was the State of Maryland's research and reference library and an opportunity center for patrons of all ages and abilities. I witnessed how the Library made a significant impact on the lives of thousands of people, from researchers to job seekers.

During my tenure at the Pratt, the Library faced severe fiscal challenges, and transitions in management structures. At the same time, it strikingly became the main source of public computing for literacy and life empowerment. I led the Pratt Library as it redefined and refined its role as the research and reference library for the entire State of Maryland, providing internet service, staff training, public programs and digitization of collections. I enlisted substantial private and public support for the library, including major capital projects and technological improvements. My leadership required intense board and donor cultivation as well as cooperative work with all levels of government. As the primary advocate for the Library, I spoke to various constituencies, represented the institution in media, and made presentations on the needs of the Pratt Library to various stakeholders.

2. If confirmed, what goals and perspectives will you bring to the Library of Congress, and how will they advance the mission of the Library?

Answer: My primary goals for the Library of Congress are threefold: to ensure that it serves Congress at the highest level; to expand and enhance the reach of the Library's collections to innumerable settings throughout the country, including classrooms and public libraries; and to engage key stakeholders, including in the copyright community, to address how the Library can best meet their needs.

Should I be confirmed, my perspective and experience will assist the Library in meeting those goals in the following ways. As chief executive officer of a complex library system serving multiple constituencies with specialized services and collections, I know the importance of consensus building and strategic planning as vehicles to operate in a rapidly changing technological environment and profession. During my tenure at the Pratt Library, I also had the opportunity to serve on numerous civic and professional boards and to be elected President of the American Library Association (ALA) with a membership of over 63,000. These experiences, combined with my previous academic and professional tenures at the University of Pittsburgh School of Information Science and the Museum of Science and Industry in Chicago, give me a broad outlook on managing change while preserving the traditions and legacy of venerable institutions and organizations.

MODERNIZING THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

3. Problems with the Library's information technology (IT) systems and management were well documented in a GAO audit released last year. The Library has already taken steps to address its IT deficiencies, but a lot of work remains. If confirmed, how will you continue the Library's efforts to improve and modernize its IT?

Answer: Modernized IT is the key to improving efficiency and access at the Library, and in its component parts, including the U.S. Copyright Office. I understand and will not lose sight of its importance. In over 20 years at the Pratt Library, I have overseen several IT modernization projects with an attention to detail that matched the significance of the project.

As the question notes, the Library is already making great strides in IT modernization. A new Library Chief Information Officer (CIO) was appointed in September 2015, and a Library-wide IT Strategic Plan was finalized in December 2015, demonstrating

that the Library is moving in the right direction. If confirmed, I look forward to executing and, where appropriate, strengthening that plan.

4. Please explain your efforts as CEO of the Pratt Library to improve access to digital resources, including computers and e-readers, and to expand that library's electronic collection.

Answer: One of my main priorities as CEO of the Pratt Library was to secure resources to enable the library to modernize its technological infrastructure not only in the City of Baltimore but for the entire State of Maryland. The Library serves as the State Library Resource Center. Accordingly, it is responsible for providing internet and reference services for library users across the state.

During my tenure, I led the effort to raise and secure public and private funding to build the internet service for libraries, school systems, and other government agencies in Maryland. In the City, we established an IT plan and unit to expand the Library's electronic collection by lending e-books and e-readers while enhancing broadband and computer access at all facilities. At present, the Pratt Library is the largest provider of public access computers in Baltimore. In fact, the Pratt Library was the first entity to utilize the city's broadband network for public access. Also as the State Library Resource Center, the Pratt Library maintains, coordinates and updates the digitization program of collections across the state.

5. Please explain how your experiences renovating and modernizing the Pratt Library would guide you in modernizing the Library of Congress and improving its IT infrastructure.

Answer: In my experiences at the Pratt Library I learned first-hand the value of building a leadership team of senior IT managers whose highest priority was the core mission of the organization. In addition, I learned that where I continuously stressed the importance of strong IT infrastructure to the organization, the team was responsive. If confirmed, I will take a similar approach at the Library, a task made simpler by the strides the Library has recently made in this area.

COPYRIGHT OFFICE

6. The Copyright Office is also in the midst of an IT modernization effort. If confirmed, how do you plan to assist the Copyright Office in its effort? Would you advocate for keeping the Copyright Office's IT systems aligned with those of the Library, or are you open to giving the Office a degree of independence (and the necessary resources) to manage its own unique IT needs?

Answer: My goals for IT infrastructure at the Library generally, and the U.S. Copyright Office more specifically, are efficiency and effectiveness. I will approach the issue of whether the U.S. Copyright Office should have separate IT infrastructure with an open mind, and I will embrace the solution that is most efficient and effective. As I approach the issue, I will do so with an understanding that the U.S. Copyright Office has particularized technology needs, and has a weighty task in serving its important and diverse stakeholders.

7. Some have noted that the Copyright Office's registration process has become outdated, cumbersome, and backlogged, particularly for those operating in the digital space. What plans do you have to help the Register improve the copyright registration process so the Office can meet the needs of those industries at the core of the digital economy?

Answer: I understand that proposals are in place to address these concerns. If confirmed I look forward to working with the Library's

CIO and the Register of Copyrights to secure the necessary resources for implementation.

8. In your view what role should the Librarian of Congress play in shaping copyright policy and influencing the agenda of the Copyright Office?

Answer: By statute, the Librarian appoints and supports the Register as the chief administrator of the U.S. Copyright Office. In so doing, the Librarian relies on the significant subject matter expertise provided by the Register. If confirmed, I will carry out those responsibilities to ensure the U.S. Copyright Office has what it needs to function fully, effectively, and efficiently. In addition, if confirmed, I will be attentive to the views and concerns of stakeholders.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

9. If confirmed, what will you do to ensure that CRS fulfills its mission of providing to Congress authoritative, objective, nonpartisan legislative research and analysis? How would you respond to a Member's concerns that CRS has fallen short in this regard?

Answer: I believe the Library's Congressional Research Service staff are the "special forces" who are there to provide comprehensive and objective research to members of Congress. If confirmed, I would fully support the CRS mandate "to provide Congress, throughout the legislative process, comprehensive and reliable legislative research, analysis and information services that are confidential, objective, nonpartisan, authoritative, and timely, thereby contributing to an informed national legislature." If a Member concluded that CRS had fallen short of that mandate, I immediately would want to know how and why, and I would work with CRS to address the concern.

CHAIRMAN BLUNT QUESTION DURING HAYDEN NOMINATION HEARING RE: CHILD INTERNET PROTECTION ACT

Chairman Blunt. Thank you, Senator Boozman. I have a couple of other questions. Being the president of the American Library Association is, I am sure, a great honor, but maybe not an unmixed blessing, because suddenly you are responsible for everything that is being talked about as part of the association. There are a couple of areas of criticism that you and I have talked about and I would like to get your response to those on the record today. One was when the Congress passed the Children's Internet Protection Act, the American Library Association challenged the constitutionality of that, arguing that it violated the First Amendment. And I know, beginning then as a leader of the national organization through really up until now, you have commented on this several times, but you want to talk about that whole issue of what kind of violation that would have been, and then the issue of what kinds of things need to happen in a library to be sure that children do not have access to material that we would not want children to have access to, and then how often you have to revisit that whole concept?

Dr. Hayden. I really appreciate that question, Senator, because there has been quite a bit of just misinterpretation of the Library Association's position during that time. That was in 2003-2004, and at that time, the filters that would have been required for libraries to install were found to prohibit access to the very important health information, and the most notable at that time was breast cancer. And since that time, the technology has improved and the filters that are installed to receive federal funding—and my library, the Pratt Library, in its state role, has installed filters—have improved, and the need to be vigilant is also something that libraries are doing in not only the technological aspect, but just plain physical arrangements of computers, making sure that

there are faceout positioning of computer monitors, as well as very few, if any, cubicles that contain computers as well, and education and making sure that people know that pornography is illegal and we do not support that in any shape or form.

Chairman Blunt. You do not think that pornography, illegal, as you described it, has a place in the library?

Dr. Hayden. Not online, no.

Chairman Blunt. And there are, at the same time, things in the library that are not appropriate for everybody that visits the library to see.

Dr. Hayden. Right, and Senator, the way you described it is exactly the way that libraries even design their buildings and the furniture, and making sure there is even signage that unaccompanied adults in children's sections are going to be questioned. There are so many safety measures that are put in public libraries, and even college and university libraries, to make sure that minors are safe and that they are not exposed to objectionable material as far as we can prevent.

SENATOR CRUZ QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD FOR DR. CARLA D. HAYDEN COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION—NOMINATION TO BE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

1. The Library of Congress recently announced its decision to eliminate the terms "aliens" and "illegal aliens" from subject heading and search classifications, replacing them with the supposedly less "pejorative" terms "Noncitizens" and "Unauthorized immigration." Numerous important historical materials use the former terms. And at over 100 years of age, the heading "aliens" is one of the oldest headings used by the Library. Moreover, Congress has chosen to utilize these terms throughout the United States Code. The Library's decision to nevertheless move forward with this revisionist maneuver appears virtually unprecedented, and it will waste resources and hinder research efforts.

Do you believe the largest library in the world should be sacrificing research efficiency and resources in the name of political correctness?

Answer: The Library of Congress has a long history of (i) providing assistance to researchers in finding what they are looking for in its vast collections, and (ii) sharing its processes with libraries of all types throughout the nation. Part of the Library's process includes reviewing catalog subject headings, often at the request of the public or the library community. In fact I was involved in a similar review of the terms referring to African Americans, which evolved from Negro, Black, and Afro-Americans during extensive debate and discussion among numerous communities. In this current subject heading review, my understanding is that the Library is engaging in a customary public comment period and after the comments are received will engage in additional review regarding the matter.

Similarly, do you believe the exclusive research arm of Congress should be eliminating search terms used extensively by Congress in the United States Code?

Answer: I understand that the Library is reviewing this matter and will consider the most effective and efficient use of subject headings for research and reference for the public in searching the Library's collections, as well as those in libraries throughout the nation. This review will consider the needs and use of Congress, as the core mission of the Library is to assist Congress in performing its constitutional duties.

As Librarian of Congress, would you reverse this unprecedented and harmful action?

Answer: If confirmed, I would ensure that the responsibilities of the Policy and Standards Division of the Library, which responds to constituent request regarding catalog subject headings, are performed and carried out in the most professional, efficient, and objective manner. In the position of Librarian of Congress, I would welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to ensure that the Library's mandates are fulfilled.

Ms. MIKULSKI. In the interest of time, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the library of Congress is at a critical juncture. We seldom talk about the Library because there have only been 13 Librarians who have served in the Library of Congress in the entire history of the Library, dating back to the starting of the Federal Government here in Washington. It is an important time for the Library to have a chance to really focus on the technologies available to us today.

I am the chairman of the Rules Committee, and the ranking Democrat on that committee, Senator SCHUMER, and I proposed legislation earlier in the year that would set a limit—for the first time—for the Library of Congress. This nomination is the first nomination for a Librarian to have a term limit. That 10-year term will replace what was previously a lifetime appointment.

It is a critically important 10 years for the Library. Congress unanimously agreed to make this change, and then the nomination of Dr. Carla Hayden was received by the Rules Committee at the end of February this year. Since that time, the committee has thoroughly vetted Dr. Hayden. We reviewed her qualifications, writings, experience, and in particular, her role in leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore for the past 23 years. She oversaw the expansion and modernization of the library and how it could be made more available to people.

This committee spent more time reviewing this nomination than any previous nomination for this position. I think she has an extraordinary professional background. By the way, the longest serving Librarian of Congress was a librarian, and she brings that skill in ways that nobody else has in the past. She earned her Ph.D. from the University of Chicago in library science. She served as an assistant professor at the University of Pittsburgh, and spent 40 years working in her chosen profession of leading library systems in Chicago and Baltimore.

She has been endorsed by librarians around the country, associations, and higher education entities in many States, including my State. Missouri State University and the University of Missouri in Kansas City have both endorsed her service. The librarian in Ferguson, MO, served on panels with her and has endorsed her. The libraries in both Ferguson and Baltimore played their own roles in dealing with the stress that those communities have faced over the last 2 years.

Dr. Hayden led the American Library Association from 2003 to 2004. This is the national organization for librarians. In 2001, before she began her tenure as President, the organization's council voted to challenge the Children's Internet Protection Act on First Amendment grounds. This act requires libraries receiving public funding to install Internet content filters on public computers. This requirement helps protect children from harmful Internet content in public libraries, and, of course, I support its implementation.

In 2003, right before Dr. Hayden became president of the association, the Supreme Court upheld the law, and she was actually the president of the association not when they challenged the law but when they implemented the law.

I specifically asked her about her position on the Children's Internet Protection Act during our public hearing on the nomination, and I wish to make a couple of points about her response to my questions. She explained to the committee that the American Library Association's concerns were focused on unintentionally restricting access to nonpornographic materials, including health information related topics like breast cancer. At the time, according to Dr. Hayden, the filters were not as sophisticated as they are today, and they had a tendency to overfilter in some areas. However, she made it clear that her view of pornography was that it has no place in public libraries and noted that her library, the Enoch Pratt library, has installed filters consistent with the requirement of the law.

I will quote her testimony at this point because this has been the one area where some Members have expressed concern. She said:

Technology has improved and the filters that are installed to receive federal funding . . . have improved. And, the need to be vigilant is also something that libraries are doing in not only the technological aspect, but just plain physical arrangement of computers, making sure that there are face-out positioning of computer monitors, as well as very few, if any, cubicles that contain computers as well, and education and making sure people know that pornography is illegal and we do not support that in any shape or form.

The committee went through a thorough process. She was unanimously approved by the committee. I certainly agree with Senator MIKULSKI when she said that this is an important time. We have taken the time to look at this, and we don't need to wait any longer.

I urge my colleagues to approve this nomination.

Mr. President, I also ask that Senator CARDIN have a chance to speak about Dr. Hayden. He also knows her very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator BLUNT for his leadership and for bringing this nomination to the floor. I wish also to thank Senator SCHUMER and the manner in which it

was handled by the Rules Committee. The staff did a lot of work, and I thank all who were involved in bringing this nomination forward.

We have heard from my colleagues, Senator MIKULSKI and Senator BLUNT, about the extraordinary qualifications of Dr. Hayden. She has the academic credentials, experience, and proven leadership, as we saw with the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore and what she was able to do.

I wish to add one more dimension to this, if I might, and that is the person she is. She is admired by all. She knows how to bring people together. She has incredible people skills in addition to having the technical skills to be an extraordinary CEO and to manage a complex operation. The Library of Congress is a complex operation. It takes a great deal of management skills.

She has received many acknowledgements and awards during her career, but the one that I think perhaps speaks to her character the most was when the Daily Record gave her the award for the most admired CEO 2 years ago. That is a hard award to get, and it just shows that she knows how to lead—but to lead in an effective way. Quite frankly, the Library of Congress, I think, will benefit from those skills and use those skills very effectively.

I also want to share with my colleagues that, in addition to her credentials in her profession, which we have already gone through—including being president of the American Library Association and also serving on the accreditation committee—she has done a lot of the nuts and bolts with regard to libraries both locally and nationally.

She has also been involved in many community activities. I know that locally she served on the Goucher College board, the Baltimore Gas and Electric board, and the Baltimore Leadership School for Young Women. I could mention a lot more activities. She has been an extremely engaged individual in our community.

I know she will do a great job in this capacity, and I know she will make us proud. We know the Library of Congress is the envy of the world, and I think we have a world-class leader to lead the Library of Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this confirmation.

If there is no one else who seeks recognition, I suggest that we yield back all time and move toward a vote.

Mr. BLUNT. I yield back our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

All time is yielded back.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 74, nays 18, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 128 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Alexander	Fischer	Moran
Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Baldwin	Franken	Murphy
Barrasso	Gardner	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Booker	Hatch	Portman
Boozman	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Burr	Hoeven	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Shaheen
Capito	Kaine	Stabenow
Cardin	King	Sullivan
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Lankford	Thune
Collins	Leahy	Tillis
Cooms	Manchin	Toomey
Corker	Markey	Udall
Cornyn	McCaskill	Warner
Donnelly	McConnell	Warren
Durbin	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Mikulski	

NAYS—18

Cassidy	Ernst	Perdue
Coats	Heller	Risch
Cotton	Isakson	Rubio
Crapo	Kirk	Sasse
Cruz	Lee	Scott
Daines	McCain	Vitter

NOT VOTING—8

Cochran	Rounds	Shelby
Inhofe	Sanders	Wicker
Roberts	Sessions	

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 (Mr. CASSIDY). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about the pace of judicial confirmations with my friends, the Senator from Hawaii and the Sen-

ator from Massachusetts, who have been real leaders on this issue.

Well, we have only one more day of legislative session before Congress breaks until September. It is an appropriate time to take stock of how the majority has handled their job of scheduling and confirming judges. More than a year into this new Congress, the Republican leadership has allowed only 22 judges to be confirmed—only 22. In the last 2 years of the Bush administration with a Democratic majority—the mirror situation of what we are in today—there were 68. So that is 68 versus 22.

The Republican majority is confirming judges at the slowest rate in more than 60 years. This has real consequences across America. Vacancies have risen from 43 to 83 since Republicans took over the majority; 29 have been judicial emergencies. I know that in my city of Buffalo in Western New York we had an emergency. We have one of the busiest courts, and for a while we had no judges. Now we have one.

At this point in time in the Bush administration, with Democrats in control of the Senate, we had reduced the number to 39. That is half as many vacancies as now exist. From the district courts to the Federal courts of appeal, all the way up to the Highest Court in the land, the Republican majority has been showing the American people that when it comes to judges, they just are not doing their job.

This is hardly a Senate that is back to work. The nuts and bolts of governing is the process of nominations, especially for the judiciary. By this measure, the Republican Senate and its Judiciary Committee are not back to work; they are sleeping on the job. There is no better example of it than the irresponsible, partisan blockade of President Obama's Supreme Court pick, now in its fifth month.

The speedy application of justice, the right to petition the government for redress of grievances is a bedrock of American values enshrined in the Constitution. This is not an abstract concept. It has real, everyday consequences for American litigants. Justice delayed is justice denied.

Without judges on the bench, justice is denied for a woman who was unjustly fired, suing to get back her job and support her family.

It is denied for a small business owner seeking to resolve a contract dispute and keep his stores open. Any small business owner can tell you that when lawsuits hang over them, whether they are plaintiffs or defendants, it causes them sleepless nights. My dad was a small business man. Our Republican colleagues are just twiddling their thumbs.

It is denied for criminal defendants who deserve to have their cases heard in a courtroom before an impartial judge and a jury of their peers. This matters in so many of the States, including my home State of New York.

One of the judges who has been languishing on the calendar is Gary Brown. He is currently serving as a magistrate judge in the Eastern District of New York. He has been nominated for a seat on the Islip court, a crowded bench. Long Island has 3 million people, more than many States. That seat has been vacant for 18 months—18 months.

The small business people in Long Island who need these cases settled and the many others who are awaiting justice are in anguish. Our Republican colleagues just sit there. We know why. The American people know why too. They are not doing their jobs.

Gary Brown is eminently qualified for this seat. As a magistrate judge, he heard a number of cases related to the fallout from Superstorm Sandy. Only through Judge Brown's intelligence and integrity were deficiencies in the insurance claims process uncovered, and hundreds of homeowners began to recoup their losses. So we need a Judge Brown. The people of Long Island need a Judge Brown. Without judges on the bench, we are diminishing that corps.

Our majority leader likes to talk about the fact that the Senate is working again. Give me a break. If you can't even appoint judges, how can you say the Senate is working? There is no good reason other than the usual political games, games that Democrats did not play when we were in the same position in the last 2 years of George Bush's term and we had the Senate majority.

Well, we have 1 day left before we break. Yet this body has failed to pass adequate legislation dealing with Zika, failed to pass real funding on the opioid crisis, failed to pass sensible gun safety measures after another senseless tragedy in Orlando, and failed to fill our benches, whether it is the Supreme Court, the circuit courts, or the district courts.

Our Republican majority owes it to the American people to make some progress on judges before Members run for the hills. We should not be adjourning with this many vacancies, this many judicial emergencies. It is time to confirm these uncontroversial nominees. I say to every one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, particularly the majority leader, it is time to do your job.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 11, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 505, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, 573, 597, 598, 599, and 600; further, that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations; and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and, of course, I

will. I would like to put all this in perspective and talk about the theatrics that we sometimes call the discussion on the Senate floor. You know, I think that we have a tendency here—maybe it is because we are busy and we have got a lot of other things we are doing, but we have a tendency to have very short memories.

We should remember that we confirmed a judge last week and the prior week. In fact, one of those judges was a judge put forth, supported by Senators from the State of New Jersey, both Democrat Senators. We moved forward with the confirmation.

I also want to talk a little bit about history because I am new here. But my facts seem to stand in contrast to what is discussed on this floor from week to week. When it comes to judicial nominations, the President has been treated much more fairly, I would submit, than President George W. Bush. To date, the Senate has confirmed 329 of President Obama's judicial nominations. At this point, President Bush had only 312 judicial nominations confirmed.

In fact, President Obama has now surpassed President Bush in terms of the total judicial nominees confirmed for the entire Presidency of George W. Bush. During his entire Presidency, the Senate confirmed only 326 of President Bush's judicial nominations. We have already confirmed 329. So I would submit, that is getting the work done. That is getting the job done. That is doing our job.

I know the other side of the aisle does not like the fact that they don't set the floor agenda. But any reasonable, objective review of the record demonstrates that President Obama has been treated more fairly than his predecessor, George W. Bush.

So, for that reason, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, Donald Trump spent years pedaling Trump University, a sham college that his own former employees refer to as one big, fraudulent scheme. Now he is being sued for fraud and, worse, for targeting the most vulnerable people he could find, lying to them, taking all their money and then leaving them in debt.

Now, the judge presiding over Trump's case is Gonzalo Curiel, a former Federal prosecutor who has spent decades quietly serving his country, sometimes at great risk to his own life. The Republican Governor who first appointed him calls him an American hero, and he was confirmed with bipartisan support from the Senate.

Like all district court judges, Judge Curiel's work is not political so he is following the law in the Trump University case, but Donald Trump wants Judge Curiel to bend the law to suit Trump's own personal financial interests and Trump's very, very fragile ego.

A little over a month ago, Trump began savagely attacking the judge's

integrity and his Mexican-American heritage at political rallies. Some Republicans in Congress claimed to be shocked by the assault on our legal system. PAUL RYAN called Trump's attack the "textbook definition of a racist comment."

Oh, please. Spare me the false outrage. Where do you suppose Donald Trump got the idea that he can demean judges with impunity? He got it from Republicans right here in Congress.

It is bad enough that Senate Republicans will not even give Merrick Garland, the President's Supreme Court nominee, a hearing—while the Republicans' allies spend billions of dollars conducting a nonstop campaign of slime against him. But the story is actually much bigger than Judge Garland.

Sixteen noncontroversial district court judicial nominees—16—are waiting to take their seats alongside Judge Curiel on the Federal bench. They have been investigated, they have gone through hearings, and they have been voted out of committee. About half have been sitting there for more than a year.

But in a few days, the Republicans who control the Senate are planning to pack up and shut down this body for most of the rest of the year, leaving every single one of these men and women to twist in the wind. Why? Because in 6 months Donald Trump might be President. Make no mistake, Republicans want Donald Trump to appoint the next generation of judges. They want those judges to tilt the law in favor of big businesses and billionaires like Trump. They just want Donald Trump to stop being so vulgar and obvious about it.

It is ridiculous. If Republicans expect the American people to believe they don't agree with Trump's disgraceful attacks on an independent judiciary, they should confirm these judges.

We have just one message for the Republicans: Do your job—now—before shutting off the lights and leaving town. At least confirm the 13 noncontroversial district court judges who were nominated before 2016.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, 508, 569, 570, 571, 572, and 573; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Sometimes when I come to the Senate floor, I can't help but think that people who are watching me in the Gallery and watching on C-SPAN are thinking: What's going on? I thought we were working on funding the veterans, coming up with a solution to Zika, funding the DOD, making sure States and localities have adequate resources to combat drug addiction and the opioid epidemic. Instead, we get floor speeches that have nothing to do with doing our jobs.

I am doing my job today in objecting to these measures so we can actually get back to the pressing matters that hopefully will get passed out of the Senate before we go to the state work period and return in September.

Mr. President, for that reason, I object to the motion from the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am not sure what version of the Constitution you are reading that doesn't say confirming judges is part of doing your job in the U.S. Senate.

These judges have all been completely vetted, they are noncontroversial, and they have bipartisan support. The amount of time it would take to get these judges confirmed is simply: Don't object. Let us go forward.

We hear a lot of talk these days from Republicans in Congress suddenly caring about the rule of law. Talk is cheap. Real cases are piling up. Real courts are starved for help. Real justice is being denied, and the American people aren't easily fooled. If Senate Republicans leave town without putting a single one of these highly qualified, noncontroversial judicial nominees on the bench, they are making it clear that for them politics is everything 24/7, that politics trumps everything, even an independent judiciary.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I thank Senators SCHUMER, WARREN, and others for their efforts to get some movement on these neglected judicial nominees. When we talk about the Senate doing its job, of course confirming judges is a part of the Senate's job. In fact, only the Senate can do that job.

So far 23 of the 24 nominees on the Executive Calendar were approved by the Judiciary Committee by voice vote, including 16 district court nominees. This includes Hawaii's own Clare Connors. Before I speak about Clare, I want to also mention that she and the other nominees before us today—who were unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee—will be kept from serving on the Federal bench, kept from doing those jobs because of Republican inaction.

I will tell you something about Clare. She has wide-ranging experience, in-

cluding district and appellate venues, criminal and civil arenas, and litigation on issues ranging from tax law to tough cases such as crimes against children.

I met with Clare in Hawaii and when she came before the Judiciary Committee. She is more than qualified to serve on the Federal bench today. Senator GRASSLEY has indicated that Republicans will shut down the nomination process this month, even though vacancies have nearly doubled.

If Clare is not confirmed, the Hawaii district court seat would be left vacant for a year. Historically, the Senate has held confirmation votes on widely supported nominees into September of a Presidential election year.

The nominees before us all have bipartisan support and come from States throughout the country: Tennessee, New Jersey, New York, California, Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Utah, and of course Hawaii.

I urge my Republican colleagues to do their job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 359, 362, 363, 364, 459, 460, 461, and 508; further, that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2577

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

I wish to just touch briefly on what the distinguished Senator from Hawaii mentioned regarding vacancies. If you take a look at the average number of vacancies over the last 25 years or so, during every presidency, the average vacancy rate has been higher than it is in 2016. It is a natural part of the process that when judges move up to senior status, we are filling the vacancies. This goes up and down. This is not a crisis. It is no different than a situation the Senate has dealt with long before I got here.

Mr. President, so that we can dispense with these matters and move back onto the legislation before us that can fund the VA, that can address the Zika crisis and do things that we need to do before we get out of town, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to get back on doing my job. I promised the people of North Carolina I was going to help fund the VA.

That is why I am proud to be a member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I told the soldiers down at Fort Bragg and Camp Lejeune and across this Nation we were going to work to fund the Department of Defense.

What I wish to do is see if we can get back to these matters that are necessary and important. They will save lives. They will equip our men and women to take the fight wherever we may go.

Today I want to talk specifically about the MILCON-VA-Zika bill that is before us. It is a conference report. For those who are not familiar with conference reports, they are unamendable. We need an up-or-down vote, and we need to send it to the President's desk.

That is what lies before us. That is a bill we can pass this year, funding that the Democratic conference in large numbers supported at \$1.1 billion when it went to the House.

What is that funding going to do? It is going to fund remediation programs to make sure we don't have an epidemic that is spread through mosquito bites. Right now, the known U.S. cases are all travel related, but we are afraid of that threat—particularly as mosquito season sets in across the Nation. It has been going on in North Carolina and the South for several months. We want to give local health professionals and the CDC the resources they need to find a vaccine that the CDC promises we can get in a matter of 18 months, and we want to make sure we do everything we can to educate people about the potential dangers of this disease. That is what approving this conference report will do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2577 and that the conference report be agreed to with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object, and I am going to say a few words.

I say to my friend, the junior Senator from North Carolina, this is the first time I have ever heard anyone say the problem with the judges is it is just one of those things, let's not worry about it, it happens all the time—but that is not true. Around America today, we have a number of extremely important judicial emergencies, meaning we have all these judicial districts where there are not enough judges to do the work.

Justice delayed is justice denied. Having practiced law quite a few years, it is very hard to go to a court and be told: We are sorry, but the judge is doing all civil cases today. He has no time for criminal cases—or vice versa.

So I appreciate his succinctness saying: Well, this is no big deal. Don't worry about the judges.

We are worried about the judges. It is very difficult.

Let's move on to the second subject he brought up, the second subject—judges are no big deal. I think that is a tremendously big deal and so do the American people.

Once again, the Senator from North Carolina seeks to pass the very partisan VA-Military Construction-Zika bill. Yes, he said—for those not familiar with the conference reports, I am familiar with lots of them. I have been through lots of conference reports. I understand the rules, but I also understand that we as a body can do anything we want to do. That is the way the Senate operates. We have the ability to change the rules in a manner of minutes and move on to change what is before this body. We know the reason the Republican leader cannot move forward on a Zika funding bill that is reasonable is because the House of Representatives is unreasonable.

We passed out of this body a very good bill. It wasn't what I wanted. I wanted \$1.9 billion that the Centers for Disease Control and the National Institutes of Health said they need—\$1.9 billion. But I said: OK, \$1.1 billion will help a tremendous amount. It is emergency spending, no offsets.

So we agreed and sent it to the House. Eighty-nine Senators voted for it. The Democrats voted for it and the vast majority of Republicans voted for it. That was good. It wasn't perfect, but it was good.

So what did the House of Representatives do? They filled this report, this conference report. They ignored what we had done in the Senate, and they decided they were going to stick some of their favorite poison pills onto this legislation. Why? Because the Speaker, to his credit, is trying—but he is not doing much good over there. He is finding that Speaker Boehner couldn't do much better than he has done. That is why Boehner left. He couldn't handle it because, as Boehner used to call them, the "crazies" take over that caucus.

They have a rule in the House, Mr. President—and the Presiding Officer used to serve in the House of Representatives. All the time he was there, they had this rule. When I was there, there was no such rule. The rule they have now is called the Hastert rule. Of course, Hastert is in prison, so they should at least change the name of that rule. The Hastert rule says: We are only going to pass a bill if we can get a majority of the majority to vote for it. So to get anything done in the House of Representatives, you have to have a majority of the Republicans support a bill. It doesn't matter how the Democrats feel. Basically, they do not get to vote on anything.

So what they did, in an effort to get something back here—the Speaker has told lots of people: I can't pass anything dealing with Zika unless we do something about Planned Parenthood. That is what he has told everybody, and it is obvious from what they sent us. So this \$1.1 billion, no offsets, came back to us as a—I don't know what to

call it. They are not the same two vehicles. It restricts funding for birth control provided by Planned Parenthood.

There is an obsession by the House Republicans—and I am sorry to say the obsession over here is fairly well fixed also—and they want to do everything they can to dramatically negatively affect Planned Parenthood. That is what this is about.

If you are a woman in America today and you are worried about Zika, I think you should be concerned about birth control. And women all over America are. Some women can't go to a boutique physician and get a prescription; they need to go to Planned Parenthood, where the health care needs of millions of women are taken care of—but not under Republican guidance, no.

So as part of this conference report, funding for Planned Parenthood would be restricted—birth control.

Just to make sure they covered all their poison pill areas, they said: We have to do something to whack the environment, so we will change the Clean Water Act. That is what they did. That is what we got back.

We hear all these great speeches about "We want to do something to take care of the veterans." Well, \$500 million was taken out of veterans to help pay for Zika funding—\$500 million. What was that veterans money to be used for? Processing claims. There is a tremendous backlog. But that is in there.

Ebola funding. Two years ago, America was up in arms over Ebola. The epidemic has died down, but it is not gone. There are still pockets of real problems in Africa, and on any one day, they could burgeon into something like they were 2 years ago. The National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control want to keep some money there so they can take care of this epidemic, but, no, they whacked \$107 million off of that.

Everyone knows the money they took from ObamaCare—I could raise a point of order right now and it would fall. They can't do that. That is wrong. They have had 67 votes in the House to defund ObamaCare. None of them have passed, but they have had fun trying.

But in a final effort to kind of stick their finger in our eye, they said: Here is what we are going to put on this great bill. We believe it would be appropriate to fly the Confederate flag in military cemeteries. You can't make up stuff like this. That is what they did.

We have repeatedly reached out to the Republicans to try to compromise, to reach a solution to the threat of Zika. Of course, if we work together, we have a chance to prevent babies from being born with these terrible birth defects. The Presiding Officer is a physician. I wasn't able to listen to all of his speech last evening, but I watched part of it. He had a picture of a little baby, and he was explaining about what Zika is all about.

We have reached out to Republicans to try to work something out. We can work together. Even now, when we can see just over the horizon the Republican convention starting on Monday, we can still do it before then. We need to work something out. We want to do that. I have tried.

I know what is going on in the House. They can't pass anything on their own unless they put this kind of stuff in it. All they would have to do on the bill that passed the Senate with 89 votes—if the Speaker would allow a vote in the House of Representatives, it would pass overwhelmingly. Democrats, with rare exception, would vote for it. It would get 98, 99 percent of the Democratic vote, and a few Republicans would vote for it. It would pass overwhelmingly. That is what should happen, but it can't.

I understand the Speaker is constrained by—he hasn't gone this far, at least publicly. Boehner publicly said he had to deal with his crazies. Speaker RYAN is dealing with the same crazies.

So I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass the same Zika legislation that passed this body with 89 votes. As I said, if the Speaker allowed a vote on this, it would pass.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 5243

So I ask whether the Senator from North Carolina would amend his request to this: I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5243; that all after the enacting clause be stricken; that the substitute amendment, which is the text of the Blunt-Murray amendment to provide \$1.1 billion in funding for Zika, be agreed to; that there be up to 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, with no intervening action or debate.

Finally, Mr. President, I would ask that everyone be reminded that we have had emergencies all over America. The Presiding Officer—I am sorry to keep referring to him, but this is the subject at hand. When his State had that terrible devastation with that terrible hurricane, we were there. We were there the next day, the next week, the next month, the next year, doing what we could to provide emergency funding for the beleaguered State of Louisiana. We did it because it was the right thing to do. It was an emergency. It was unpaid for. There were no offsets. We have done that with an earthquake in California and with a manmade fire in Texas. That is what we do. That is what emergencies are all about.

So I ask that my consent request that I have outlined be approved.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina so modify his proposal?

Mr. TILLIS. No.

Mr. REID. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I guess the shake of the head takes care of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will be very brief—sometimes when I hear these debates, they seem to be far-ranging and they are getting off the main subject.

The motion that is before us would basically unwind a carefully crafted compromise that could come crashing down if we don't move forward with this deal. What the minority leader has suggested takes us back to a process that takes days or weeks. We can't afford days or weeks; we need to get this done now.

The motion we should be considering—that the Senator from Nevada objected to—is the one that would get this to the President's desk. The Senator's request adds time, complexity, and most likely is going to suffer the same fate in the House, so for that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. REID. I have objected to his request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

SENTENCE REFORM AND CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to give a few remarks about how I first became involved in the cause of sentencing reform within our Federal criminal justice system.

I will never forget when I first began to appreciate the full magnitude of this problem—the problem we face within a Federal criminal justice system that is sometimes too inflexible and sometimes doesn't allow judges to take into account the unique circumstances of each case. It was 2004. I was a Federal prosecutor, an assistant U.S. attorney in Utah. In some cases, I witnessed judges being forced by Federal law to impose punishments that simply, under any standard, did not fit the crime—first-time offenders sometimes being locked up for periods of time longer than some rapists or murderers, terrorists or kidnappers. These were real people—people with children, siblings, parents, spouses, and, of course, dreams for a better life. Yet in too many cases the so-called system that was supposed to correct their mistakes arguably compounded them. This system wasn't just wasting money, it wasn't just wasting physical material resources, it was wasting lives.

I know some in my party may view this as a progressive cause. I view it as a conservative one. Think about it. When there is a major problem tearing at our economy and our civil society—a problem that is threatening our most vulnerable families in our communities—conservatives don't just shrug their shoulders and expect a bunch of outdated laws and bloated government bureaucracies to take care of it. We know better. Criminal justice reform doesn't call on conservatives to aban-

don their principles, it calls on them to fight for them.

This process and the conservative cause are all about making our communities—these little platoons, if you will, of service and cooperation at the very heart of our constitutional republic—safe and prosperous and happy. It is about basing our laws and basing our court procedures and our prison systems on a clear-eyed understanding of human nature—of how human beings respond, what brings out their better selves and what doesn't, about man's predilection toward sin and his capacity for redemption—along with an uncompromising commitment to human dignity.

Respect for the dignity of all human life, the basic dignity of the human soul, no matter how small or how weak, how rich or how poor, and the redemptive capacity of all sinners, no matter how callous, are the foundation for everything that conservatives purport to stand for. Our approach to policing and of punishment should be no different.

Moreover, as a conservative, I believe we ought to watch out anytime we give the government extraordinary powers, especially powers that deprive the individual of liberty. And nowhere is the deprivation of liberty more severe, more intense, more long-lasting than the deprivation of liberty that occurs when a person is locked up for years or for decades at a time, with no opportunity to progress, no opportunity to interact with family members, no opportunity to interact with the vibrant growing economy.

So when I got to the Senate and I was assigned to the Senate Judiciary Committee, I started looking for partners—partners on both sides of the aisle—who shared my concerns with the Federal criminal justice system, shared my concerns with the way Federal minimum mandatory sentences were working. I started looking for partners on both sides of the aisle who shared this commitment to reform. Progress in this area is difficult, and for a long time the progress we made in this area was slow, just as any deliberative process often is.

I found an ally in my colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois. We teamed up and put together legislation. That legislation gradually started gaining some support. At first, it gained more support on the other side of the aisle than it did on my side of the aisle, but we were pleased with the progress that was made. But in the fall of last year, we struck an agreement and we started making more progress. We introduced a bill called the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act. Like most legislative compromises, it isn't perfect and it doesn't accomplish everything that every member of our coalition might wish we could accomplish, but it is an extraordinarily great start, and it proves it is possible to design our laws in a way that can balance the sometimes competing interests of

retribution and rehabilitation, justice and mercy, the rights of victims and the rights of perpetrators.

The Sentence Reform and Corrections Act will expand the now-limited discretion of Federal judges so they can treat offenders like human beings and not mere statistics and punish them according to their particular circumstances. It would broaden the Federal safety valve, a provision of existing law that allows judges to sentence a limited number of offenders below the mandatory minimum. Contrary to what many of this bill's critics claim, this would not absolve offenders of their crimes, nor would it suddenly and indiscriminately release legions of violent predators into our communities. In fact, under this reform, the status of violent offenders would not change at all. They would remain ineligible for Federal safety-valve relief.

Our criminal justice system simply has to be flexible—at least flexible enough—to apply in many different situations. Prosecutors and judges need to have the ability to impose lengthy sentences on serious offenders who pose the greatest threat to public safety, just as they must have the ability to impose modest sentences on those who violate our laws but do not pose an ongoing threat to public safety. Whenever we interfere with the flexibility of either of these, we impair the effectiveness and the efficiency of our Federal criminal justice system. When we do that, we necessarily make our country less safe, rather than more safe.

So this bill would leave untouched the maximum penalty levels that exist under current law. It also would not eliminate any mandatory minimum sentences. Instead, it takes a targeted approach, reducing the harshest mandatory penalties and providing relief for low-level offenders with limited criminal history. It is this type of offender that helped draw my attention to this issue back in 2004, just as I described a few minutes ago.

One of the cases that was being handled by the office in which I worked, the Office of the U.S. Attorney for the District of Utah, involved a young man named Weldon Angelos, a young man in his midtwenties, the father of two young children. He got involved in some criminal activity and was caught selling three relatively small quantities—dime-bag quantities—of marijuana to what turned out to be an informant. Because Mr. Angelos had a gun on his person at the time of these transactions, because of the way he was charged, and because of the way some of these provisions of law have been interpreted—including a provision of law in 18 USC, section 924(c)—Mr. Angelos received a sentence of 55 years in prison.

Now, we may ask: What on Earth was this judge thinking? How could such a judge be so cruel, so arbitrary, so capricious as to sentence this young man to 55 years in prison for selling three dime-bag quantities of marijuana? The

judge didn't have a choice. In fact, it was the judge who first drew my attention to the case because it was the judge who took the unusual—the almost unprecedented, almost unheard of—step of issuing a written opinion prior to the issuance of the sentence, disagreeing with the sentence the judge himself was about to impose.

Then-Federal district judge Paul Cassell issued a lengthy opinion stating: This is a problem. This young man is about to receive a sentence that is excessive under any standard. It is a longer sentence than he would have received had he engaged in many acts of terrorism or kidnapping. So why are we sending this guy away until he is about 80 years old simply because of this minimum mandatory penalty? But, the judge said: This is a problem I cannot address. This is a problem I am powerless to remedy. Only Congress can fix this problem.

Those words have haunted me ever since then: Only Congress can fix this problem. So when I became a Senator in 2011, I still remembered those words. Those words continued to haunt me and continue to haunt me to this day.

Miraculously, fortunately, Mr. Angelos has been released through a variety of procedural maneuvers that I don't have time to address right now. He himself has been released. Many others are still in prison, under the same system, who have been locked up for years—decades—at a time, much longer than any reasonable person would think would be a just sentence. In fact, I have yet to meet a single person—Democrat, Republican, old, young, male, female—who believes that the sentence Mr. Angelos received was just. His story, his example is a good reason why we need to pass this bill.

Finally, this bill improves the quality of our Federal prisons. If it became law, it would increase access to vocational training, therapeutic counseling, reentry services, and other programs, so that we would have fewer first-time offenders turning into career criminals.

All of these are commonsense and, I believe, long-overdue reforms. But make no mistake. We are at the beginning, not the end, of this generation's story of criminal justice reform. As all of us know, the road to reform is long and full of setbacks and obstacles. Today's movement for criminal justice reform is no exception. But so long as the people here today are involved in this effort, I am confident we can together succeed where our prisons today often fail—in preparing offenders to reintegrate into their communities as productive and law-abiding citizens, as spouses, parents, neighbors, and employees, instead of career criminals.

We can fix this problem. This bill would begin to address this problem. But we need to bring this up. We need to have the opportunity to debate this, to discuss this, to vote on it, and to pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Senator BOOKER from New Jersey is on the floor. The three of us asked to come to the floor at 3, because the rollcall was delayed.

I ask unanimous consent, if it is all right with the Senator from Ohio, that Senator BOOKER be allowed to follow and to complete his statement on the legislation we are supporting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I am going to be brief because I want to defer and give my time to the Senator from New Jersey.

We are going through a moment in America's history that we are going to remember for a long time. We are used to shooting deaths. Sadly, gun violence has become part of America. Unfortunately, we are also used to mass murders, where more than four people are killed in one of these shooting incidents. But it rocked America's conscience and soul when five policemen from Dallas were murdered. Those five policemen were Officer Brent Thompson, age 43; Officer Patrick Zamarripa, age 32; Officer Mike Krol, age 40; Senior Corporal Lorne Ahrens, age 48; and Sergeant Michael Smith, age 55.

Yesterday, President Obama and former President Bush were there for the memorial service to honor these men and to honor everyone in law enforcement who gets up each morning, puts on a badge, and risks their lives for us—for me, for my family, for my neighbors, for my community, for my town, for my State, and for my Nation.

America was rocked by the senseless murder that took place in Dallas, TX. But it isn't the only thing that has stunned the conscience of America. At the same time, we have seen some shocking and disturbing videos. In Baton Rouge, LA—the home State of the Presiding Officer—Alton Sterling, a 37-year-old father, was shot and killed outside a convenience store. In Falcon Heights, MN, Philando Castile, age 32, was fatally shot in his car during a police traffic stop for a broken taillight. His fiancée and her 4-year-old daughter were in the car.

Those three events came together—the killings of the police in Dallas, and these video shootings—and shocked the conscience of America in a way that I haven't seen before. It really called into question some basics about our country and where we are going and what we need to do.

President Obama said we must try to find common ground when he spoke at this memorial service. He is right. I thought about that over the weekend, and I called my colleague and friend from New Jersey and talked to him about it. I said to him: When it comes to really showing America, and particularly those who feel aggrieved by the current State of justice, our bill on criminal justice reform speaks to a fundamental issue as to whether or not minority populations—people of

color—are treated fairly in our system of justice.

Senator LEE just spoke. For those who may not know him, Senator LEE is a conservative—a tea party conservative, I believe he would probably say—Republican from the State of Utah. Senator LEE is joining us—DURBIN of Illinois, BOOKER of New Jersey, and Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa—in this effort. How many times do we run into that, where four Senators with such diverse political beliefs come together on one bill—this bill? As Senator LEE explained, what we are setting out to do here is to right an injustice—an injustice that is filling the Federal prisons, sentencing individuals to lengthy sentences for nonviolent, nongun drug offenses.

This is long overdue, and it is something that we need to do. If we did it, it would say yes to those across America who are asking: Is Congress listening? Is the Senate awake to what is going on in our country? It would say to them: Yes.

On a bipartisan basis, these four Senators, and many more, are prepared to bring reform to our criminal justice correction and sentencing system. Will it solve all of our problems? No, not at all, but it is a significant step forward.

I was serving in the U.S. House of Representatives over 25 years ago when a famous basketball star at the University of Maryland died from a drug overdose. We were shocked by this. They came in and said it is possible that he was a victim of crack cocaine. We had never heard the term before. What is crack cocaine? A new form of cocaine crystals that are cheap, highly addictive, and destructive. Len Bias was his name. We were asked to put into law a sentencing provision that would be a warning to everyone across America: Don't use crack cocaine.

We did. We imposed a new sentencing guideline for crack cocaine 100 times the penalty over powder cocaine—100 times. What it meant, sadly, over a span of 25 years is that hundreds, if not thousands, of individuals were convicted of possessing and selling crack cocaine and sentenced for extraordinarily long sentences.

I ran into one of them in the city of Chicago. Let me tell a story. It is brief, but it tells a story.

Alton Mills, age 24 in 1994, was a runner, a seller when it came to street drugs. He was caught on his third offense of selling street drugs. His third offense. He had never served a day in jail, not one. His two previous offenses ended up in probation, and he didn't end up with any correctional time. But this third one was the third strike. It turned out that Alton Mills at age 24, for his third sale of crack cocaine, was sentenced to life in prison—life in prison.

He languished there. Thank goodness, his mom and dad never gave up on him. He found a public defender, whose name, ironically, was MiAngel Cody. She went to work and fought for

him and took her message to every office, including mine, and I took her message to the White House. Alton Mills' sentence was commuted. He came out of prison after 22 years behind bars. That is one example—22 years.

What we are trying to do is come up with a sentencing system that is sensible, that punishes those who are guilty for sure, but does it in a smart and thoughtful way—reforming and saying to populations across America, yes, we can be a more just society.

This criminal justice reform idea is one that is not only bipartisan, but it passed out of the Senate Judiciary Committee in October of last year—October—by a vote of 15 to 5. It was a bipartisan rollcall vote that came out of committee. Why haven't we taken up this bill? Why don't we take this up as soon as we return in September? Why don't we say to people across America that we are going to do something positive in terms of restoring justice in this country to everyone across the board in this bipartisan bill?

That is why we come to the floor today, and that is what we are asking for. It will save money for taxpayers in addition to bringing justice to the system. I believe the money we save can be brought back to our law enforcement agencies for training and equipment. So let's show our faith in their efforts to keep America safe, and let's show our commitment to justice in this reform.

I am fortunate because I was joined in this struggle by a brand-new Senator from New Jersey then named CORY BOOKER. He has been an extraordinary voice in this effort.

Senator LEE and I were doing pretty well until CORY BOOKER came along, and he has added more firepower and more horsepower to this effort than any other Senator could, certainly any new Senator. I commend him for helping us in this effort and being committed to it in his heart.

At this time I would like to yield the floor to my junior colleague from the State of New Jersey, Senator BOOKER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I want to thank MIKE LEE for coming to the floor and speaking with such heart and conviction. Also, I want to thank Senator DURBIN for his stand on the floor today.

Please understand, Senator LEE, Senator GRASSLEY, Senator DURBIN, Senator LEAHY, and so many Senators on both sides of the aisle have been speaking on this issue for years. In fact, since before I became a U.S. Senator, this moment has come. As Senator DURBIN began talking about the issues of the day, where there is so much frustration, so much concern, so much consternation, so much divisiveness on this issue of criminal justice in America, it made me think personally about this idea of hope because this week I have talked to a lot of people who seem

to be indulging in a dangerous, toxic state of being, which is hopelessness about criminal justice issues in our country.

I have appreciated Senator DURBIN, who has not just been a senior Senator, not just been steadfast in working on this issue, but he has been a friend, calling me up, not just this past week but weeks before, when lots of Americans were indulging in hopelessness about the divisiveness in our country, about the injustices in our country, about the ravages of a broken criminal justice system.

As I have been thinking about hopelessness, I keep coming back to this understanding, taught to me by teachers on the streets of Newark, NJ, that hope does not exist in an abstract; that hope is the active conviction that no matter how bad things get, despair will not have the last word; that hope is a choice that must be made amidst hopelessness; that amidst despair, amidst frustration, you have to choose hope; and that choosing hope means you commit yourself to a process that doesn't divide this country but that unifies it with the conviction that we can be a nation that makes real the words we pledge when we say we are a nation, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

This week we need those words. We need that hope. MIKE LEE and DICK DURBIN, two politicians on opposite sides of the spectrum, said: Hey, this is a time that we should be pushing hope, indivisibility, and we have a bill that addresses issues at the core of so much of the frustration going on. It doesn't solve all the issues, it doesn't wave a wand, but it will advance us toward liberty and justice for all because, unequivocally, we have gone off the rails.

Since 1980, the land of the free broke with the rest of the world and became the incarceration nation. Our prison population has exploded since 1980. The Federal prison population is up 800 percent. Our overall prison population is up 500 percent. We have only about 5 percent of the globe's population, but one out of every four incarcerated people on the planet Earth are right here in America.

In response to a criminal justice system that has lost its proportionality in its punishment and that seems to have become more about retribution than restorative justice, a criminal justice system that is rife with the stories that MIKE LEE talked about when he talked about Weldon Angelos and a judge who himself cried out about the injustice of sentencing someone to 55 years for a nonviolent drug crime or Alton Mills, whom Senator DURBIN spoke about, who was sentenced to life in prison for a nonviolent drug crime, we in America went off the rails.

I am hopeful today because on the right and the left, not just Members of this body but from the Koch brothers to Newt Gingrich, to Grover Norquist, to the ACLU, people on both sides of the political spectrum said we can do

better because this broken criminal justice system is hurting us. Rather than being a tool for public safety and social order, as was intended by our criminal justice system, it instead became an industry and an end to itself. It became a massive exploding bureaucracy, draining our economic prosperity.

In fact, one study has shown we would have 20 percent less poverty in America if our incarceration rates were similar to our industrial peers. This has been a divisive drain on our cohesive society, a misappropriation of taxpayer funds.

While our infrastructure has been crumbling, we have led the planet Earth in building out a prison infrastructure. In fact, between the time I was in law school in the mid-1990s to the time I became mayor of Newark, we were building a new prison in this country every 10 days.

Congress has increased Federal spending on prisons alone by 45 percent since about the year 2000. Congress has cut spending on the things that keep us safe, such as law enforcement at the State level, by 76 percent—putting someone like Weldon Angelos in prison for 55 years, hundreds of thousands of dollars in a long, disproportionate sentence for a nonviolent crime that could have gone to public safety, like hiring police officers for our community. What is painful to me in this time is that our criminal justice system—the data that I gave would be painful enough, but our criminal justice system clearly disproportionately affects poor people, leading authors like Bryan Stevenson to say that we have a criminal justice system that seems to treat you better if you are rich and guilty than poor and innocent.

Blacks and Whites have no difference in America in using or selling drugs, but African Americans are about 3.6 times more likely to get arrested for selling drugs. Instead of a criminal justice system that unites us under principles of justice and fairness, we see it disproportionately persecuting groups because they are poor or because they are of color.

If you look at Latinos, they account for the largest group of offenders convicted of offenses that have a mandatory minimum at 38 percent. Native Americans are grossly overrepresented in the criminal justice system with an incarceration rate 38 percent higher than the national average.

Eighty percent of Americans in our criminal justice system are represented by public defenders, meaning that they are deemed by the court to be indigent, to be too poor to afford an attorney.

Our justice system does not reflect our values. This drug war is not being carried out in a way that is fair or just, and it is not just hurting the poor, the mentally ill, the drug addicted, the minorities. It hurts all Americans because it drains our resources; it drains our treasure. When I say "treasure," I

don't just mean money. We have come to a point in America today where millions of children have had parents who are incarcerated, and it hurts generationally the best of our Nation, the promise of our Nation.

The irony about our lack of action in putting this bill to a vote is that States are already moving more quickly than we are. Red States, Georgia and Mississippi and Texas, have been doing things for years that we have been proposing in this bill, and have yet to enact, that have shrunk their prison populations. Guess what has happened in States such as Texas and Georgia and Mississippi, which have lowered their prison populations. Guess what happened. Their crime went down, as well, because when you have a system that is not about retribution but about restorative justice, that has proportionality in sentences, you not only save money for your State, but you also empower people to succeed and lower crime.

When States start to put drug addicts in treatment as opposed to jail, it empowers people to succeed, saves money, and lowers the prison population. It is common sense. Red states have acted. We have seen the success. But in the Federal prison population, there is an 800 percent increase. It takes away money that should be spent on homeland security, money that should be spent on investing in public safety, money that should be spent for our public universities, money that should be saved for the taxpayers but is now going, still fueling one of the biggest growing bureaucracies we have seen in the last 40 years.

This calls for unity in our country. I tell you, we have unity. When I can stand in partnership with MIKE LEE and CHUCK GRASSLEY, when you have people like PATRICK LEAHY and DICK DURBIN—these folks are not normally mentioned together as partners on legislation, but I am proud that some of the most esteemed Members, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, both agree that we can put more justice in our justice system. We can do something to reverse this trend, and we can begin to put rationality back so that the values of this country are made more real.

I am proud to have negotiated and worked with Chairman GRASSLEY, who is sitting across the aisle from me right now. I am honored. In the 3 years I have been in the Senate, one of the more proud things that I have accomplished is to find common ground with my Republican colleagues on the other side in a bill that I know—from the neighborhood and block that I live on to across the country—would make a difference.

Now we have encountered some sclerosis, some blockage. A dam exists between where we stand now and greater justice for our Nation. This has been a tough week. It has been a week of frustration and grief and sadness. This is a

time that we should choose hope. It is a time that we should choose unity. It is a time that this very body should be saying to America: Hey, we have challenges, but we can find common ground. We can come together, left and right, Black and White. We can do better than we are doing now. It is a hard walk that we have ahead, but this body can start leading on issues of justice.

There have been other difficult times in our country when this body answered the call. There have been times where people were fearful, people doubted, and there have been times where people felt their heart was heavy. I am proud that, in our history, it was in those times that leaders emerged and chose hope.

My prayer is that in the waning days of this Congress, with all the important things we have on our agenda, we remember that there are people right now who are stuck in despair. There are people who don't believe in our indivisibility, as we say in our Pledge of Allegiance. There are people who are frustrated. It is my hope, when it comes to issues of criminal justice, a system that is so obviously broken, that we choose reform; that we choose healing; that we demonstrate unity; that on this issue we bring forward a bipartisan bill that begins to cast away some of the darkness that hangs over our country with the light and wisdom that is in this bill that reflects both sides of the political aisle and, I believe, that reflects the best of who we are as a body.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise because I continue to believe that the Senate should take up the Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act. There is still time this year for both the Senate and the other body to pass legislation reforming sentencing. In light of recent and justified public concern over treatment of suspects by some police and treatment of police by people who would do them harm, the need for the bill is even greater.

The Sentencing Reform and Corrections Act contains three parts, each of which was formed as the basis of a bipartisan compromise among Judiciary Committee members, as well as members off the Committee.

The first is a reduction in the mandatory minimum sentences for non-violent drug offenders. The bill takes great pains to limit sentencing reductions to people with minimal criminal histories and no history of serious violence. Second, the bill enhances prison programming that has been proven to reduce the likelihood of reoffending, and reduces the sentences of inmates who successfully completed those programs. Reducing the likelihood of future crimes reduces the crime rate. And third, the bill makes various reforms to the federal criminal justice system. For instance, it allows people convicted of certain crimes as juveniles

to expunge their criminal records if they turn their lives around. And it remedies a constitutional defect in Federal criminal law by permitting individuals sentenced to life sentences as juveniles to seek parole after many years, but doesn't guarantee that parole will be granted. It even adds two new mandatory minimum sentences to the Federal criminal code for serious crimes.

The confidence of people in the criminal justice system is not as strong as we would like. There are various reasons for this lack of trust, and some of them are valid.

The Judiciary Committee reported a compromise bill that is designed to address some of those concerns. The sponsors' willingness to compromise was further demonstrated by a managers' amendment that narrowed the bill's sentencing reductions.

Those changes responded to concerns of some of my Republican colleagues and brought on board a number of new Republican cosponsors.

I have been willing for a long time to enter into an agreement where members can offer amendments of various kinds and we can vote. For instance, the House has determined that a provision of substantive criminal law addressing intent should be part of any bill. I have been open to any compromise on that issue that could gain 60 votes. And I would agree to have a vote on the subject if a compromise cannot be reached. The differences can be aired and resolved.

I am certain that this bill would receive many more than 60 votes and that most of the Republican conference would vote for it if given the chance.

No one thinks the sentencing bill is perfect, as it represents a compromise among people with strong differences of opinion. But the people of this country want action to address deficiencies in the criminal justice system.

This bill would make important but limited changes in the way the Federal Government sentences those who commit crimes.

We should take the bill up, debate it, and show the American people that we are willing to take on one of the most important domestic challenges facing the country.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. We had a good vote earlier today on proceeding to that legislation, and it is my expectation and hope that we will vote on this legislation either today or tomorrow morning.

Let me say first say, this legislation called CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, also includes some criminal justice reform. It is one step closer to this broader bill that Senator GRASSLEY and Senator BOOKER just talked about. I am a cosponsor of their bill because I do think we need sentencing reform, but CARA actually

has some reforms called diversion programs. Instead of putting people who are in the criminal justice system and addicted to drugs in prison, they are put into a treatment program, and those treatment programs have proven to be successful. We have drug court funding and specific new programs for our veterans. The notion is, this is part of criminal justice reform, to actually take people who are suffering from drug addiction in the criminal justice system and move them into treatment, which makes so much more sense for them, their families, taxpayers, their communities. That is part of this underlying legislation that we will vote on later today in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act.

I also support broader legislation. I am hoping the broader legislation will have more to do with the prisoner re-entry programs as well—the so-called second chance. I am the author of the Second Chance Act from my House days, and I hope that legislation can be reauthorized as part of this larger criminal justice reform issue.

Today I will focus on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act because this legislation is badly needed. It is an emergency in our communities right now. This is the heroin and prescription drug issue that unfortunately many more people are learning about because it is affecting many more of us.

I had a tele-townhall meeting last night, which I do monthly. We had 25,000 Ohioans on the call. We typically have a few polls where we ask about the top issues. Last night, we asked how many people on the call were directly affected by the heroin and prescription drug issue. We asked people to indicate that by hitting “1” for a yes and “2” for a no. Sixty-eight percent of the people on this call said: Yes, they were directly affected. We had a lot of calls from people who were affected. We had a call from a woman whose stepson was addicted and he was trying to get treatment but couldn’t find a place, and they wanted me to help them find a proper place to get treatment and recovery services. Others called in about the legislation and asked why we haven’t passed it yet. My answer to them was, it is coming and help is on the way.

I am frustrated, just as they are, that we haven’t moved more quickly on this, but, again, we finally had a vote today to move this legislation forward. I hope the final passage vote will occur later today or tomorrow morning, and we will be able to get this to the President’s desk for his signature.

It initially passed the Senate with a 94-to-1 vote back on March 10. It then went over to the House of Representatives, where the House worked through their own process. They had 18 separate bills rather than 1 comprehensive bill, and then in the period between then and now, we have had this conference between the House and Senate to work out the differences. That conference re-

port was voted on in the House last Friday, and it was an overwhelming vote. Why? Because this makes so much sense. Again, on the Senate floor today we had a very strong vote result of 90 to 2 on the cloture motion to move this legislation forward, and I am hopeful we will have a strong vote tomorrow morning so we can send this to the President and get it to our communities and begin to get those who need it some help.

The legislation is considered by some to be inadequate because it doesn’t have enough funding in it. Well, it is not a funding bill. It is not an appropriations bill. It is a bill that establishes new programs to fund new and better ways to deal with addiction. It authorizes significant new spending. Since the Senate passed the bill with a 94-to-1 vote, only two things have happened with regard to funding. One is that we more than doubled the authorization so there is more funding authorized—\$181 million per year. Second, we also had the Appropriations Committee go through its process and both the Senate and House Appropriations Committee voted to actively increase funding in this area, and that is a good thing.

I think it is an emergency, I think it is urgent, and I think we should spend more money here because it will save money over the long haul and because there are so many people who are not achieving their God-given purpose because this addiction has taken them off track. We have to help them and help them now. We have to help keep people from getting into that funnel of addiction by focusing more on prevention and education, but all that has happened since the 94-to-1 vote in the Senate is that there has been a 93-percent increase over last year’s funding which will go into effect next year, and by the way that is a 539-percent increase over the funding just 2 years ago.

The House appropriations bill has a bigger increase in the funding. I will fight for that funding, and I will fight to ensure that that funding actually applies to the programs that are in the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act because it is the kind of legislation that will actually make a difference helping to ensure that we can begin to turn the tide on this issue.

The legislation before us is one that 94 Senators have already voted for, and, again, it passed the House with big numbers so I am hopeful there will not be any roadblocks in the way of getting it done.

Today I was asked by some people: What does the bill really do? I started to go through all of the specific grant programs for our veterans, mothers who are pregnant, kids who are born dependent on drugs, and those folks who find themselves unable to get treatment. There are specific provisions for our law enforcement personnel, which is why the Fraternal Order of Police has been a strong supporter. I appreciate them for standing

up early as a law enforcement entity. Others have backed this legislation as well because it provides more training on how to use this miracle drug called Narcan, or naloxone, which will help save people who have overdosed. There are a lot of specific programs here, but I think the answer to the question as to what it does is pretty simple. For the first time ever in this United States Congress, it begins to treat addiction like the disease it is, and this means, by necessity, if it is a disease, we need to get people into treatment. It begins to change the way we approach addiction by saying: Let’s remove the stigma so people will come forward and families are willing to talk about it.

Last night on that call, when 68 percent of the respondents to the poll said they were directly affected by this issue, I bet many of those people had not thought about talking about that issue publicly. I think this legislation helps to establish the fact that this is a disease.

This legislation will also help deal with an underlying problem, which is how we will deal with prescription drugs in our communities. Too often in our society there has been an overprescribing of painkillers that are addictive.

I heard another story today, and I hear them every day when I am back home. This was somebody whose family member had gone to the hospital for a knee operation, and when he was done with the procedure, the doctor gave him 80 Percocets. He didn’t take any of them because he didn’t need them, but his point was: Why 80 pills? Four out of five of the heroin addicts in Ohio and around this country started with prescription drugs, and often it was very inadvertent. It was something where someone had a wisdom tooth taken out and was given a number of these prescription pain pills but didn’t understand the risks. When that person started taking them, there was a physiological change in that person’s brain. That person became addicted and that person went to heroin and that person then died of an overdose. That has happened to two families in my home State. Those parents have now come forward not to just tell that story and share their grief but to channel that grief into something positive, which is to let other parents know. That is in this legislation. We have a national awareness program to let people know about the fact that the prescription drug link to heroin, opioids, and addiction is real, and we must be very careful.

For the first time ever in Federal law, it also promotes recovery. Treatment is one thing, but as one of my friends back home who is in recovery told me, getting clean is easier, but staying clean is hard. In other words, so often what we found as we did our research around the country is that people go through a treatment program, but the recovery services aren’t

there to take them through that longer term support to enable them to stay clean. Tragically, we save a life only to see someone overdose again later. Recovery is about finishing the job and helping people get their lives back, and it is an incredibly important part of this legislation.

Earlier this week, I spoke to Faces & Voices of Recovery. They have been terrific in promoting this legislation, and just as important, letting people who are in recovery know that you have friends, that this can be addressed, and that you can come out on the other side as a person who is achieving their purpose in life and God-given abilities. You can get through this.

I was honored to speak at their rally here in Washington, DC. This was about a year ago, and they brought in people from all over the country. They had some great entertainers and people who were willing to stand up for the first time and say: I am in recovery. If you are in recovery, too, we want to embrace and help you.

One of the advocates whom I met with the other night is a woman named Sarah Nerad. Sarah is someone I have gotten to know over the years. A couple of years ago, we had a roundtable discussion as this legislation was being drafted, and Sarah told me her story. She was a recovering addict who went to Ohio State University. She found there were no support services at the university. She started a student recovery support community. That community at Ohio State University not only has a lot of people now joining and participating in it—recovering addicts, family members, and friends—but she is also now spreading this at colleges and universities around the country.

There are grants in this legislation to promote these support communities because they work, and I hold up Sarah as an example of someone who was brave and courageous enough to talk about her addiction and therefore was able to get other people attracted to her and her support group. As a result, she was able to go on and help so many other people and change so many other lives, and really, in her case, to be able to say that she is a major part of this legislation, because we included this partly because of her testimony and her stories.

Until we end this stigma, we are not going to make the progress that we must. The Drug Enforcement Agency tells us that this is not getting better, this is getting worse. They tell us that from 2010 until the most recent data we have, which is 2014, there has been a tripling of heroin overdoses.

In my own State of Ohio, we have seen a dramatic increase. Since March 10, when 94 Senators voted for CARA, we have lost more than 14,000 Americans. Think about that. Since March 10, more than 14,000 Americans have succumbed. In other words, they have overdosed and died from heroin and

prescription drugs, opioid overdoses. Unfortunately, this is just the tip of the iceberg.

As horrible as those numbers are—the 14,000 overdose deaths—think of all the casualties. Think of the 16,000 people in Ohio who have been saved from overdoses by Narcan. But many of them have not gotten into treatment, have not gone into recovery, and they continue to be broken apart from their families. The drugs are everything—not their kids, not their parents. They continue to be unable or unwilling to work. They continue to commit crimes. In most communities in my home State of Ohio, law enforcement will tell us that the No. 1 cause of crime is this issue. They continue to be unable to pursue their God-given abilities. Those are the casualties of this.

No one suffers alone. In Ohio, we are told that 200,000 people are now struggling with addiction. That is the size of a major city in Ohio. Many of those addicted are parents. We are told that 30 percent—think about this—30 percent of all kids in Ohio who are in the custody of the State are there because their parents are opioid users. Among infants, that number is 70 percent. Seventy percent of the infants who are in the custody of the State of Ohio are there because their parents are opioid users. I call that an epidemic.

It is driving up crime, as I said. In Marion, OH, Police Chief Bill Collins put it this way: “All of the property crimes we have—the shoplifting, the theft, the robberies—all go back to one thing, and that’s heroin.” That is a quote from him. He says that this epidemic makes him and other law enforcement officials feel like they are “in the ocean without a life jacket.” That is what we are trying to do with CARA, is to provide that life jacket.

It is not just the silver bullet. It won’t solve all the problems. Washington is not going to solve this problem—it is going to be solved in our communities and in our hearts—but this will help. It will help make the Federal Government a much better partner with State and local government, with the wonderful nonprofits that are doing the good work, and with the families and the communities.

Last week, in just one 36-hour period in Akron, OH, 20 people overdosed on opioids, 3 of them fatally. That is not even 2 days in one city. When the first responders arrived at one of the overdoses, by the way, there were two small children present.

In Central Ohio, in Columbus, nine people overdosed, two of them fatally, on Sunday. That is in one city in 1 day. Two of those occurred at McDonald’s, by the way, with families around. It was in broad daylight.

A few months ago, we lost seven-time Grammy Award winner Prince to a fentanyl overdose. We all know about Prince. You might not know that this week, 10-time Grammy Award-winning singer Chaka Khan checked into a rehabilitation center for fentanyl addic-

tion. I want to commend her for having the courage to admit she needed help and for taking the steps—very publicly—necessary to get her life back on track. This will help others to do the same thing. God bless you for doing it. I think this is, sadly, an instructive case because, much like Prince, she has fame, she has fortune, 10 No. 1 hit songs, and all of the talent you could ever ask for. Most people would say those aren’t the kinds of people who get addicted. Addiction knows no ZIP Code. Addiction spares no one. It affects people of every single background.

If you talk to people in Ohio, they get it. Ohioans understand the scope of this epidemic now, and they are taking action. They expect us to help and to take action too. That is what this legislation is about. They couldn’t believe how slow we have moved on this. They couldn’t believe these ideas that we might try to delay this further for reasons that had nothing to do with the substance.

The Talawanda School District outside of my hometown of Cincinnati, OH, announced last week that they are now adding to their health and wellness curriculum key information about opiates. I talked to a couple of superintendents today who are doing the same thing in their schools. I believe this is critical to preventing overdoses from beginning in the first place, by using better prevention and identification, keeping people from getting into that funnel of addiction, and that is what is happening. CARA supports this.

In Trumbull County, OH, more than 200 Ohioans participated in a Walk Against Heroin over the Fourth of July weekend. Again, people are starting to take action.

I know it can be very discouraging. The scope of this problem is overwhelming, but there is hope. Treatment can work. Recovery does work. If we can get this legislation to the President, I am confident he will sign it into law, and in many more of our communities we will have better treatment and better recovery and more hope for the people we represent.

I thank Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE for his work with me on this issue. He has been the coauthor of this. We started more than 3 years ago, going to conferences here in Washington, DC. We had five conferences. We brought in experts from all over the country—people whom I have talked about earlier included—from Ohio but every State. We talked about how to actually make a difference in communities around the country. We didn’t care where the idea came from—Republican, Democrat, Independent. That didn’t matter. What mattered was whether the idea made sense. Senator WHITEHOUSE and his staff have done a terrific job in keeping this bill moving and making sure we didn’t get off track.

I also thank other colleagues who have been helpful, especially Senator

KELLY AYOTTE and Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR for their passion and for their help in crafting this legislation.

The American people are tired of the partisanship. We all hear that. We all know that. It is time for us to act.

I also thank some of the staff who have been so helpful on this legislation and who have put their heart and soul into this effort, including Megan Harrington, Pam Thiessen, Mark Isakowitz, Teri Geiger, Brian Riedl, Allen Ernst, and Sarah Schmidt on my staff. I am proud of their work throughout this process.

I thank all the advocates we have worked with all across Ohio and all across the country. They have been here in Washington. They helped us to get the great vote in the House last week, and they are working today on the vote tonight or tomorrow. I want to point out in particular that Jessica Nickel has helped to keep us all moving in the same direction. The outside advocates have been terrific.

Last, I thank those who have shared their stories, and most importantly, I thank them for their willingness to allow us to hear from them. These are people who are in recovery. These are people who are in the trenches, dealing every day with this issue, who are providing the love and the attention and the support to help people get their treatment and into recovery. These are our first responders who are out there on the frontlines dealing with this issue every single day. These are our doctors and nurses who find our waiting rooms and our emergency rooms are filled with people who have addiction problems and overdoses. These are the people who work in the neonatal units with these babies who are born dependent, a 750-percent increase in my home State just in the last 12 years, and they take these babies through a recovery and treatment program so that they can be healthy and get back on track. I thank all of them.

I want to finish with a story. About a year ago I visited a treatment center in Ohio. I have been to more than a dozen treatment centers in my home State to talk about this issue and to get ideas. It was the Zeph Center, which is a center in Toledo, OH. I had asked if we could have a discussion, a roundtable discussion, and sure enough, we did. At this roundtable discussion, some people came forward who are in recovery. There were about a dozen people there. Again, I congratulate them for coming forward and for being willing to talk to me and to be public. There were people there from the community who heard their stories for the first time, and they did share their stories, but also they came ready to talk. They had reviewed the draft legislation. They had it in front of them. They had ideas. They had input. They had looked at every single section of the bill. They knew what programs were funded. They talked about what they thought worked and what didn't work in their lives. It was an ex-

ample of the process we went through with this legislation. It wasn't just a bunch of people in Washington saying we know what is best; it was people back home saying: We need this help, and we want to be sure you do it right. And by the way, keep it nonpartisan. Make sure we get this done. Don't let anything get in the way.

That is what we have done. That is what we will do tonight or tomorrow morning when we vote on this bill. That is why it is so important that we get it passed, because it is those recovering addicts at the Zeph Center and others around the State of Ohio who have patiently waited for this legislation. It is now our duty to deliver that legislation and help turn the tide in this epidemic.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

OUR AMERICAN FAMILY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to give my second speech this week discussing the issues we are facing as a nation following last week's tragedies in Dallas, Minnesota, and Baton Rouge. This speech is perhaps the most difficult because it is the most personal.

On Monday, I talked about how the vast majority of our law enforcement officers have only two things in mind: protect and serve. But, as I noted then, we do have serious issues that must be resolved.

In many cities and towns across the Nation, there is a deep divide between the Black community and law enforcement. There is a trust gap, a tension that has been growing for decades. And as a family, one American family, we cannot ignore these issues because while so many officers do good—and as I said on Monday, we should be very thankful and supportive of all of those officers who do good—some simply do not. I have experienced it myself.

So today I want to speak about some of those issues—not with anger, although I have been angry. I tell my story not out of frustration, although at times I have been frustrated. I stand here before you today because I am seeking for all of us, the entire American family, to work together so we all experience the lyrics of a song that we can hear but not see: peace, love, and understanding. Because I shuddered when I heard Eric Garner say, "I can't breathe." I wept when I watched Walter Scott turn and run away and get shot in the back and killed. And I broke when I heard the 4-year-old daughter of Philando Castile's girlfriend tell her mother, "It's OK, I'm right here with you." These are people. Lost forever. Fathers, brothers, sons.

Some will say and maybe even scream: But they have criminal records. They were criminals. They had spent time in jail.

And while having a record should not sentence you to death, I say, OK, then, I will share with you some of my own

experiences or the experiences of good friends and other professionals.

I can certainly remember the very first time I was pulled over by a police officer as just a youngster. I was driving a car that had an improper headlight. It didn't work right. And the cop came up to my car, hand on his gun, and said: Boy, don't you know your headlights are not working properly? I felt embarrassed, ashamed, and scared—very scared.

But instead of sharing experience after experience, I want to go to a time in my life as an elected official to share just a couple of stories as an elected official. But please remember that in the course of 1 year, I have been stopped seven times by law enforcement officers—not four, not five, not six, but seven times in 1 year as an elected official. Was I speeding sometimes? Sure. But the vast majority of the time I was pulled over for nothing more than driving a new car in the wrong neighborhood or some other reason just as trivial.

One of the times I remember I was leaving the mall. I took a left out of the mall, and as soon as I took a left, a police officer pulled in right behind me. That was my first time. I got to another traffic light, and I took another left into a neighborhood. The police followed behind me. I took a third left onto the street that at the time led to my apartment complex and then finally I took a fourth left coming into my apartment complex, and then the blue lights went on. The officer approached the car and said that I did not use my turn signal on the fourth turn. Keep in mind, as my colleagues might imagine, I was paying very close attention to the law enforcement officer who followed me on four turns. Do you really think that somehow I forgot to use my turn signal on the fourth turn? Well, according to him, I did.

Another time, I was following a friend of mine. We had just left working out and we were heading out to grab a bite to eat at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. He pulls out, and I pull out right behind him. We are driving down the road, and the blue lights come on. The officer pulls me into the median, and he starts telling me that he thinks perhaps the car is stolen. Well, I started asking myself—because I was smart enough not to ask him but was asking myself—is the license plate coming in as stolen? Does the license plate match the car? I was looking for some rational reason that may have prompted him to stop me on the side of the road.

I also think about the experiences of my brother, who became a command sergeant major in the U.S. Army, the highest rank for an enlisted soldier. He was driving from Texas to Charleston and was pulled over by a law enforcement officer who wanted to know if he had stolen the car he was driving because it was a Volvo.

I do not know many African-American men who do not have a very similar story to tell, no matter the profession, no matter their income, no matter their position in life.

I also recall the story of one of my former staffers—a great guy, about 30 years old—who drove a Chrysler 300, which is a nice car, without question, but not a Ferrari, not a super nice car. He was pulled over so many times here in DC for absolutely no reason other than that he was driving a nice car. He sold that car and bought a more obscure form of transportation. He was tired of being targeted. Imagine the frustration, the irritation, the sense of a loss of dignity that accompanies each of those stops.

Even here on Capitol Hill, where I have had the great privilege of serving the people of South Carolina as a U.S. Congress Member and as a U.S. Senator for the last 6 years—for those who don't know, there are a few ways to identify a Member of Congress or Senate. Well, typically, when you have been here for a couple of years, the law enforcement officers get to know your face and they identify you by face, but if that doesn't happen, then you have an ID badge, a license you can show them, or this really cool pin. I often-times said the House pin was larger because our egos are bigger. So we have a smaller pin in the Senate. It is easy to identify a U.S. Senator by our pin.

I recall walking into an office building just last year after being here for 5 years in the capital, and the officer looked at me, full of attitude, and said, "The pin I know, and you I don't. Show me your ID." I will tell you, I was thinking to myself, either he thinks I am committing a crime, impersonating a Member of Congress, or—or what? Well, I will tell you that later that evening I received a phone call from his supervisor apologizing for the behavior. That is at least the third phone call I have received from a supervisor or the Chief of Police since I have been in the Senate.

So while I thank God I have not endured bodily harm, I have felt the pressure applied by the scales of justice when they are slanted. I have felt the anger, the frustration, the sadness, and the humiliation that comes with feeling like you are being targeted for nothing more than being just yourself.

As the former staffer I mentioned earlier told me yesterday, there is absolutely nothing more frustrating, more damaging to your soul than when you know you are following the rules and you are being treated like you are not.

But make no mistake—no matter this turmoil, these issues should not lead anyone to any conclusion other than to abide by the laws. I think the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., said it so well. Returning violence with violence only leads to more violence and to even darker nights, nights, to paraphrase, without stars. There is never ever an acceptable reason to harm a

member of our law enforcement community—ever. I don't want anybody to misinterpret the words I am saying.

Even in the times of great darkness, there is light. As I shared Monday, there are hundreds—thousands of stories of officers who go beyond the call of duty. Ms. Taylor—whom I spoke about on Monday night—at the Dallas incident was covered completely by at least three officers who were willing to lose their lives to save hers. We have a real opportunity to be grateful and thankful for our men and women in uniform.

I shared another story on Monday night as well, and while the one I want to tell you today does not involve a tragic loss of life, it does show support that meant a lot to me at the time it occurred. Prior to serving in the U.S. Senate, I was an elected official on the county level, State level, and a Member of the U.S. Congress. I believe it is my responsibility to hang out and be with my constituents as often as possible and to hear their concerns. At some point during my time as a public servant, I traveled to an event I was invited to along with two staffers and two law enforcement officers—all four were White, and me. When we arrived at the event, the organizer seemed to have a particular issue with me coming to the event. They allowed my two staffers to go into the event and seemed fine with allowing the two officers to go into the event, who both said they weren't going in unless I was going in. So in order to avoid a tense situation, I opted to leave because there is no winning that kind of debate ever. But I was so proud and thankful for those two law enforcement officers who were enraged by this treatment. It was such a moment that I will never forget and a situation that I would love to forget.

This situation happens all across the country. This situation happens all across the country whether or not we want to recognize it. It may not happen a thousand times a day, but it happens too many times a day, and to see it as I have had the chance to see it helps me understand why this issue has wounds that have not healed in a generation. It helps me to appreciate and to understand and helps me communicate why it is time for this American family to have a serious conversation about where we are, where we are going, and how to get there. We must find a way to fill these cracks in the very foundation of our country.

Tomorrow I will return with my final speech in this three-part series on solutions and how to get to where we need to go by talking about the policies that get us there and the people solutions because I, like you, Mr. President, don't believe that all answers are in government. I don't believe all the solutions we need start in government, but we need people doing things that only individuals can do.

Today, however, I simply ask you this: Recognize that just because you

do not feel the pain, the anguish of another, does not mean it does not exist. To ignore their struggles—our struggles—does not make them disappear; it simply leaves you blind and the American family very vulnerable. Some search so hard to explain away justice that they are slowly wiping away who we are as a nation. We must come together to fulfill what we all know is possible here in America—peace, love and understanding. Fairness.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).
The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, before Senator SCOTT leaves the floor, let me say to my colleague how much I appreciate his frank discussion today. We are so blessed to have you and CORY BOOKER here. We don't have enough diversity here—let me just be clear. As much as all of us want to walk in each other's shoes because we each have different experiences in our lives, it really matters who is in the room, who is at the microphone, who is sharing the truth.

Senator SCOTT has shared a truth with us today, and I want to say Senator BOOKER shared similar stories with us in our caucus, and it is life-changing for us. I so appreciate everything you said, and it makes us better to have you and CORY BOOKER here.

RACE RELATIONS

Having said that, Mr. President, I think it is important to discuss a very similar topic, which is the status of race relations today, because I don't think Senator SCOTT and Senator BOOKER should have to be the ones to have to carry this forward.

Mr. President, when I was a little girl—I was 10—I came face-to-face with ugly, vile, stupid, and dangerous discrimination. I cheered on Jackie Robinson with all my girl power to counteract what my dad said was hatred aimed at Jackie because of the color of his skin. And how blessed was I when I worked hard with a Republican colleague to make sure Jackie Robinson got the Congressional Medal of Honor.

When I was with my mother in Florida—the same age, 10 years old, 1950—I saw African Americans forced to sit in the back of the bus. I got up to offer my seat to an elderly woman. She must have been 55 at the time—I was 10—she looked old to me. I stood up and she refused me. She said no, no. I was hurt.

I said to my mother: What is happening here? Why won't the woman take my seat?

And my mother said: Segregation.

Well, growing up in Brooklyn, this made no sense to me. My mother could have let it go; instead, she told me to follow her to the back of the bus—not that anyone noticed, but we knew exactly what we were doing. And I felt like a part of her team—part of a team against this craziness where people had to go to the back of the bus simply because of the color of their skin.

The civil rights movement has made enormous progress in our laws, but the

trouble remains in our hearts. There is too much hatred in our communities. But let's be clear. Whether you are a police officer—regardless of the color of your skin—kissing your family good-bye in the morning or the parents of a young African-American teenager, no one should ever have to fear that they will not see their loved ones at night. Yet that is a truth in America—a truth that has been witnessed by a couple of our Senators. No one should have to fear that they won't see their loved ones at night because of this type of hatred.

Now is not the time to paint whole groups of people with a broad brush because when you do that, that is the exact definition of prejudice. You can't broad-brush a whole community because of the color of their skin or their religion or whom they love, and you can't broad-brush all the police in the police department.

What we need is a de-escalation of suspicion and an escalation of trust—a de-escalation of suspicion and an escalation of trust. It is long past time that we stood together united. It is long past time that we look inside our own hearts, look inside our own souls, and banish the hatred. We must instead embrace each other and God's creation, because we—each of us—are God's creation. Dr. Martin Luther King wrote: "Men often hate each other because they fear each other; they fear each other because they don't know each other; they don't know each other because they cannot communicate; they cannot communicate because they are separated."

That is what Martin Luther King said—a man who taught us love, a man who taught us compassion, a man who taught us nonviolence, a man who taught us to listen to each other, a man who taught us to walk in each other's shoes. So we need that conversation. We start it by breaking down barriers that separate us, bridging the gap between communities and law enforcement and establishing trust. Healing will begin in the streets. It should.

Policing should be for the community, by the community, and with the community. When I was a county supervisor in the 1970s, there were police-versus-community issues. So I recommended, and my colleagues concurred, in a new system of community policing. What does it mean? It means you get the police out of a central precinct and you move them into the community. Relationships develop. It seems so right. It works so well that I was shocked when I got out of local government and I realized that not enough communities were following that same community policing method.

Where it exists, there is cooperation and true protection of the community. It is an obvious step that should be implemented widely. Well, what can we do? We can't force people to love. We can suggest it. We can't force people to be tolerant. We can suggest it. But I

think there are certain things we can do.

I have introduced legislation with Senator CORY BOOKER. It is called the PRIDE Act. It would start us off by getting statistics that we need. How many shootings are there in our communities by the police toward the community? How many shootings by the community toward the police are there? Believe it or not, we don't really collect those numbers. We would provide funding for States for the use-of-force training for law enforcement agencies and personnel, including de-escalation and violence training and funding for tip lines and hotlines and public awareness announcements to gain information regarding the use of force against the police. So it is a very balanced piece of legislation that looks at the problems on both sides.

Secondly, we need to better support law enforcement agencies who work to advance the practice of community policing. Now, we can do that by increasing funding federally for the Justice Department's Community Policing Development Program, which provides law enforcement agencies with funding to implement innovative community policing practices. But guess what; the funding for this critical program, which may well be one of our most important programs, is \$8 million a year. That is it for the whole country. It is not enough. We need to do better.

Number three, we should provide dedicated funding for Justice Department programs to initiate formal gatherings or summits to bring community members and police into one conversation. Anyone who looked at Dallas understands how hard they are trying, how much they have done. When I saw President Obama with Mrs. Obama and President George W. Bush with Laura Bush, I was so happy.

They are starting that conversation, the building of that trust, the tearing down of that suspicion. One of the founders of Black Lives Matter, Alicia Garza, said:

"We have so many different experiences that are rich and complex. We need to bring all those experiences to the table in order to achieve the solutions we desire."

To anyone listening to Senator SCOTT or anyone who has heard the stories or read some of the words of Senator BOOKER, we have a lot to learn. A U.S. Senator was stopped—he said seven times; this is what I heard Senator SCOTT say—in one year because of the color of his skin. What? It is just too much for these people to bear. We need to help them change policies that lead to this suspicion.

Yes, we have so many different experiences that are rich and complex. We need to bring those experiences to the table. My friend the Senator from Alaska is here. We are only 20 women out of 100 Senators. I think our colleagues understand that we have brought something to the body. We have brought our experiences to the body. It transcends partisanship. When we are in the room,

it is a little bit of a different conversation. Not that we are any better, but we have had different experiences. When our African-American colleagues tell us: Look at our lives. Look at what we have been through. We have the same job as you. Why are we pulled over seven times in a year? Why have we been scared? Something is wrong. We can't turn our back on it. We can't leave it up to just those two colleagues to lead us. We need to help them, work together, and have this conversation that Alicia Garza says we should have.

Number four, we must formally recognize and encourage police departments that epitomize what it means to be a keeper of the peace—a keeper of the peace. That is what they want to be—those officers who attend community meetings after work, who spend their Saturdays playing basketball with the neighborhood kids, who attend church services so they can connect with the congregants, who take lower income children shopping for toys and gifts at Christmas, who stop to check in on residents just because they care. That is happening all over the country. That is why we can't paint people with a broad brush. It is wrong.

In my State, in the community of Vallejo, in the San Francisco Bay Area, you should see what some of these officers do. They had a growing divide between the community and the police. The police department knew something had to change. So they invited the public to participate in those changes. They held open-door community meetings. They created a citizen advisory board to ensure residents' voices were heard. They invited residents to experience their training simulator and give them a new perspective on that police experience.

See it through our eyes, they said, and we will see it through your eyes, and let's deescalate the tension and escalate the trust. They put a high importance on the hiring of officers who had a connection to Vallejo and wanted to serve the public. They even started a late-night youth program at the local high school. They started change from within that community.

So I think we should have a community policing innovation fund at the Justice Department which would reward law enforcement agencies and localities that are doing the right thing.

Lastly, I want to bring up that issue where everyone goes into their corners. I beg colleagues not to go into their corners. We have to address gun violence. Now, we know we can't prevent every tragedy. But we can do some smart things while protecting the Second Amendment.

We don't need military weapons on the streets. They are weapons of war. The family of the gentleman who developed these weapons said to his family: I didn't develop them for people on the streets; I developed them for the military and law enforcement. We can't have the people who are protecting us outgunned. We don't need

these weapons on the streets. There is only one reason—to kill as many people as you can as fast as you can without reloading.

Don't tell me hunters need this. That is a bunch of baloney. The people who want to keep these weapons on the street are the ones who sell them. Let's be clear. The vast majority of people support this. We can expand background checks—90 percent of the people support that, even a majority of NRA members—so we can keep guns out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill.

We should prohibit the sale or possession of high-capacity magazines and end the ban preventing the Centers for Disease Control from researching gun violence. Have you talked to doctors who work in big city hospitals? I have. They say: We are prepared to go to any war zone. Those are the kinds of wounds they see. They tremble at what they see. They mourn about what they see.

Somebody goes out to a nightclub. They hide in the bathroom. They call their mother. They never see their family again.

My State of California has created a new research center on gun violence to understand the impact of firearm fatalities and injuries and, hopefully, reduce them in the future. It should happen at the Federal level.

There are 30,000 of our people killed a year by gun violence. We lost 55,000 to 60,000 in the Vietnam War—a 10-year period. It tore the country apart. This is 300,000 of our people over 10 years.

So I am going to close with this. There will always be bad people. I have lived long enough to know that. There will always be bad people. There will always be lost people. There will also be mean people. But we cannot and must not allow them to poison this Nation wherever they are. Good people—and that is most of America—must join hands across every line that divides us—race, religion, color, creed, and, yes, politics.

We must call out the racists, the prejudiced, and the haters—whoever they are, wherever they are—even if they are in elected office. We have to support those who believe in community, who believe in community policing and not support those who refuse to admit that there is a problem with profiling. Just read what Senator SCOTT said about his life, about his fears, about what happened to him. Ask CORY BOOKER, a Rhodes Scholar, what it is like.

We have to support those activists who bring us together, support steps to improve our institutions, and reject those who inflame fears on any side in which they are found.

We must speak out and support those who believe this is the United States of America, not the “Divided States of America,” and we will not allow this Nation to be divided by race, color, creed, religion, or whom you love. I know America. I believe we will over-

come. I want to quote JOHN LEWIS as I close. He was beaten, bloodied, and jailed, fighting for civil rights. He tells this story, and I quote:

“I saw those signs that said ‘white men,’ ‘colored men,’ ‘white women,’ ‘colored women,’ ‘white waiting,’ ‘colored waiting.’

I would come home and ask my mother, my father, my grandparents, my great grand-parents, ‘Why?’

They would say: ‘That’s the way it is. Don’t get in the way. Don’t get in trouble.’”

He goes on:

“In 1957, I met Rosa Parks at the age of 17.

In 1958, at the age of 18, I met Martin Luther King, Jr., and these two individuals inspired me to get in the way, to get in trouble.

So, I encourage you to find a way to get in the way. You must find a way to get in trouble—good trouble, necessary trouble.”

That is JOHN LEWIS. We are blessed to have this hero, JOHN LEWIS, among us in the Congress. We must listen to him because he is right. It is our job to get in the way of prejudice and hate. We may do it each in his or her own way. My way may not be your way, but our way is to fight against prejudice and hate wherever we see it. Our job is to move forward with respect and understanding, with tolerance and love.

Our Founders knew we were not a perfect union. They told us we had to make a more perfect union. That is our job. I know we can do it, and we must do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

VETERANS' COMPENSATION COLA ACT OF 2016

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5588, which was received from the House.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5588) to increase, effective as of December 1, 2016, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 5588) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016—CONFERENCE REPORT—Continued

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, there is a great deal of discussion this week on very difficult and hard issues.

The comments of the Senator from California, which were preceded by the comments of our colleague from South Carolina, remind us that as lawmakers, as policymakers, our jobs are indeed difficult, as we do try to make good on that pledge for a more perfect union because we are clearly not there today.

I am on the floor to speak to another type of killer that we face in this country, and that is the killer that comes with drugs, substance abuse, illegal drugs, opioids, heroin—this insidious scourge that has afflicted us as a nation. We are fortunate in that we have an opportunity—hopefully soon—to be voting for the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA.

I thank all of my colleagues who have been involved in this effort, very aggressively pushing this bill. Senator PORTMAN from Ohio, Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire are among the many who have stepped forward to really shine a light on an area where we know that we need to work to develop a comprehensive solution, a community-focused solution to so much of what we are dealing with.

The CARA act touches on all areas of this issue, from education to awareness, from access to treatment to preventing and treating overdose, from families to veterans to infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome, and even teens who may suffer a sports injury. Opioid and heroin addiction is a serious threat to our Nation's prosperity, and the legislative initiative that we have in front of us is one way to fight back.

The rates of opioid abuse have skyrocketed. Drug overdose-related deaths have more than quadrupled since 1999. When an addict can no longer afford to get access to opioids, we find, unfortunately, that they oftentimes turn to heroin, a cheaper alternative with similar effects.

The rates of heroin overdose have tripled between 2010 and 2014. In my State of Alaska, we like to think that sometimes we are far enough away geographically that we are isolated or insulated from some of what happens in the lower 48. But in fact we have seen instances of heroin use, opioid abuse, that have resulted in statistics that are shattering. Efforts to prevent those deaths by overdose have resulted in many States, like the State of Alaska, passing legislation which has removed the liability for a family member to administer the lifesaving drug naloxone. CARA does this, as well, through grants that improve access to medically assisted treatment, opening access treatment to overdose treatment, and it provides for first responder training.

Over the course of these many months, there have been so many personal horror stories about the impact of opioid and heroin addiction in our respective States. We have witnessed the sense of urgency and desperation as we hear those stories from families who are truly desperately seeking help.

Too often those families face a multitude of different challenges from treatment centers that are at capacity, very expensive private options—if you can find them—that put families in a financial bind. In so many cases, there is just no option. In Alaska our options are extraordinarily limited, so what happens is that you have to send your loved one outside of the State to find treatment if you can find it. There are so many of our families that simply lack the tools or the resources to help those they love who are suffering from substance abuse. They don't have the resources, and they really don't know where to turn. They don't even know whom to talk to.

Addiction to opioids and heroin does not just harm the individual; it breaks the community. It leaves these communities with a sense of hopelessness amongst the loss.

But despite the anguish that we know that addiction brings, I actually have been very inspired by several of the communities in my State that have really come together to fight back and to deal with the levels of addiction that they see in their communities and say: No, we are going to be engaged; we are going to come together to make a difference.

In 2014, the community of Juneau lost seven young people—all in their early twenties—to drug overdoses. After they lost their loved ones, what happened was that these families just kind of closed up. It was very difficult, extraordinarily hard, to be able to talk about what had happened because, quite honestly, of the stigma that is attached to drug abuse.

By 2015, a year later, that community came together and said: Enough. Our silence is not going to help anyone.

So they came together to help support families. They formed a group that provides support, educational tools, and community outreach.

This group, which is called Stop Heroin, Start Talking, works proactively with Alaska's young people, goes into the classrooms to talk with the kids early on about drug abuse, and focuses on making kids active participants in the discussion, instead of just kind of preaching the talk to them.

In the Matanuska Valley, another group called Fiend 2 Clean runs a Facebook page and reaches out to at-risk teens in the community. They also run a peer-run support system that really empowers these young people by reminding them: Look, you are not alone in this. We are here as a resource, we are here to talk to, and we are here with you.

Fiend 2 Clean works with another organization called MyHouse to empower young people and really support them as they are developing job skills, building self-worth, and understanding their role in the community. These peer-focused programs make the difference. They really help make the difference in the day-to-day lives of these young people, their families, and their com-

munities. More importantly, these efforts highlight the importance of making sure that all members of the community are involved in addressing addiction.

CARA acknowledges that any successful efforts at combating opioid and heroin addiction must focus on building community-centered and culturally inclusive methods that engage everyone who may be impacted by drug abuse.

The grants within CARA will give States and local communities the funding, as well as the tools they need, to build these sorts of relationships and work toward not just treating but really preventing that abuse up front.

We have seen rapid rates of prescribing opioids for pain, largely due to a lack of consensus on uniformity or prescribing opioids. While many State legislative bodies in the Department of Health and Human Services have already begun to do their part in addressing prescribing guidelines and establishing prescription drug-monitoring programs, CARA takes this one step further. The task force on pain management will provide more information about pain management practices by supporting evidence-based practices as they examine the trends of opioid prescription nationwide.

CARA also offers support for our Nation's veterans by improving opioid prescribing safety measures within the VA system through education and training on pain management for our providers. I think we have all heard far too many stories of concerns from our veterans or from their families where, in an effort to get a vet through the system and with not enough providers or with a backlog, the easiest thing to do is just to provide a prescription for pain medication rather than really trying to work to rebuild that body.

In addition, there are provisions to improve patient advocacy, support the integration of care, and enable multiple treatment options—depending on that particular veteran's needs—really moving away from this rush to prescribe opioid medications.

CARA provides the support and treatment needed for postpartum mothers and infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome and establishes a pilot program meant to enhance funding flexibility so that States can support the services that will properly benefit women and their children. CARA will also improve the reporting and understanding of addiction related to youth sports injuries. I think we recognize that kids are out playing soccer or basketball, doing things, and they get hurt. Those providers who are treating them need to be included in the discussion of how to treat sports-related youth injuries. Kids shouldn't just be given highly addictive medications, opening them up to possibly future addiction. Again, let's look at comprehensive pain management care that is focused on different treatment options.

The families, friends, and communities that are working together to address opioid addiction need to know that they are not alone and that the situations they face are not hopeless.

We can provide that hope. We can provide the tools needed to build up these communities so they can really come together to fight back against the addiction that we see. I think that by moving forward and passing CARA, we take the steps to do this.

This legislation takes into consideration the diversity and the magnitude of the opioid epidemic and works to address this issue head-on through improved research, pain management practices, community-focused programs, and opening up the dialogue about drug addiction because we know that the more we allow ourselves to talk openly and honestly about this issue, the more that stigma fades.

CARA is an encouraging first step. We all know there is much more work to be done, and I certainly remain dedicated to the fight against substance abuse now and well into the future.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today we have the opportunity to vote on an important piece of legislation that will support efforts to combat the opioid epidemic our country is facing. In my home State of Oklahoma, we have seen deaths from prescription drug overdose on the rise. In 2014, Oklahoma set a new record in the number of deaths by overdose. During that time, 864 people lost their lives and 510 of those people had prescription drugs as the cause. Oklahoma has continuously ranked near the top of the nation in narcotic prescribing activity and overdose deaths.

In 2015, Oklahoma sought to address this problem by introducing House bill 1948 that requires doctors to check an online database before prescribing opioids. This law went into effect in November and was designed to help spot patients who are receiving prescriptions from several physicians at the same time, a practice known as doctor-shopping. Oklahoma is taking an important step in addressing the opioid epidemic, but as we know, this does not just affect my State, but the entire Nation.

The Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, CARA, will provide grants to States to fight the abuse of prescription pain relievers and heroin, as well as grants that address criminal justice activities, treatment of pregnant and postpartum women with substance abuse problems, first responder education and training and treatment and recovery programs.

In addition, CARA addresses the opioid issue as it affects the veterans' community specifically. Our veterans have put their lives on the line to protect our Nation, and it is our job to make sure that they are getting the

treatment and prevention services they deserve. Many of our veterans come home with painful injuries that will alter their daily lives going forward. It is important that, through the Department of Veteran's Affairs, we develop best practices for pain management that do not lead to addiction. CARA addresses this by requiring that all VA employees who prescribe opioids receive education and training on pain management and safe opioid prescribing practices.

This truly is a comprehensive response to the opioid epidemic, and I hope my colleagues will join me in support of this bill as we take an important step in combating this addiction crisis.●

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

IRAN

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, tomorrow will mark 1 year since the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, China, and Iran reached an agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining or developing a nuclear weapon. This afternoon, I intend to review where we are today 1 year after the deal—also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA. I am grateful a number of my colleagues will come to the floor today as well, or are submitting statements for the RECORD, reviewing where we are 1 year later.

As I said 1 year ago, roughly—in September—when I ultimately decided, after long and thorough and detailed consideration, to support the agreement, those of us determined to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran have a real, enduring, and ongoing responsibility to undertake consistent and clear-eyed assessments of how this agreement fares and not just over the course of its first year but over the many years to come.

In short, in my assessment so far, this deal has done what it intended to do. Because of aggressive enforcement of the terms of the agreement, the JCPOA has cut off Iran's most likely short-term uranium and plutonium pathways to building a nuclear weapon. The time it would take for Iran to break out, to assemble enough fissile material for one nuclear weapon has extended significantly from just 2 to 3 months to well over a year.

The international community, in turn, has upheld its commitments under the deal, providing Iran with relief from nuclear-related sanctions. More importantly, the agreement has given the IAEA, or the International Atomic Energy Agency—the world's nuclear watchdog—unprecedented searching access to oversee all of Iran's nuclear activities with intrusive inspections and round-the-clock remote monitoring.

I will review for a few more minutes all the different ways I and some of my colleagues have worked to ensure effective enforcement of this agreement.

First, as to the IAEA inspections I just mentioned. At my urging, the Sen-

ate State and Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee provided nearly \$95 million in funding for the IAEA—a \$5 million increase over the level requested by President Obama. On top of giving the IAEA greater resources, this increase, I believe, sends a strong signal to Iran and our international partners that we intend to enforce the JCPOA; that we intend to encourage voluntary contributions by our international partners to strengthen the agency and to sustain its ability to take advantage of the unique opportunities under this agreement for a searching and continuing insight into Iran's nuclear activity.

Advocating for additional U.S. support for the IAEA is just one of the steps my colleagues and I have taken over the past year to ensure the nuclear agreement is implemented effectively and enforced strictly. In a series of 15 floor speeches since December, during which I have been joined by nearly a dozen members of my caucus, I have sought to keep this agreement on our radar to ensure that Congress is effectively monitoring it and that we are relentlessly enforcing its terms.

Holding Iran accountable doesn't just mean enforcing the JCPOA. It also means pushing back on that regime's bad behavior across the Middle East—behavior that falls outside the scope of the nuclear agreement. That is why I have called for the Obama administration to strengthen its efforts to interdict Iranian arms shipments to the Houthi rebels in Yemen, and—like a police department after a successful drug bust—to then publicize that those interdictions have occurred and the weapons they have seized, demonstrating to the American people and our partners in the Middle East the full scope of Iran's destabilizing activities and our intention to keep cracking down on those activities, which is crucial to building a broad coalition that will sustainably counter Iranian aggression.

That is why I have also worked with my colleagues to provide \$117 million this year for the U.S. Treasury's Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence, which enforces American sanctions against bad actors, including enforcing some of the very sanctions that crippled Iran's economy and forced it to the negotiating table in the first place. That funding represents a significant increase of \$17 million since 2013, and I am fighting for an additional \$6 million this next fiscal year.

I have also held discussions with foreign leaders, from Israel to Saudi Arabia, India, Qatar, Turkey, and Russia, about how we can work together to sustainably counter Iranian aggression. I have called on the administration to levy new sanctions against an entity affiliated with Iran's hardline Revolutionary Guard Corps, known as Mahan Air, and I will make the same demand of the next administration.

I have worked to impose penalties on Iran for its dangerous and provocative

behavior, which means taking action against their destabilizing support for the murderous Assad regime in Syria and their promotion of terrorism throughout the Middle East, Iran's ongoing ballistic missile tests, and the regime's human rights abuses, from its executions of juveniles to its detention of journalists and Iranian-American citizens.

I have also joined my colleague Senator GRAHAM in leading a letter to President Obama calling on the administration to include a strengthened 10-year MOU, or memorandum of understanding, on defense priorities with our vital ally Israel.

I am determined to continue these efforts in the months and years to come. We cannot avert our eyes from Iran's destructive behavior, even as we review what progress has been made in the year since the JCPOA.

If we are to ensure that agreement remains intact, if we are to succeed in our task of preventing Iran from developing or obtaining a nuclear weapon, Congress must play an active role. If the agreement succeeds, we should recognize those successes. If Iran falls short of the terms of the agreement, we need to make certain the international community reacts swiftly to bring Iran back into compliance.

Regardless of whether my colleagues opposed or supported this agreement a year ago, regardless of where one stood then, we all have an interest today in working together to ensure we prevent Iran from ever being able to develop a nuclear weapon. We have a responsibility then to review Iran's actions and hold them accountable through aggressive enforcement of the deal, pushing back on their bad behavior, and maintaining a credible conventional deterrent.

As my colleagues comments later today will make clear, in addition to holding Iran to the terms of the nuclear deal, we have to push back against their dangerous nonnuclear bad behavior—as I mentioned, the ballistic missile tests, human rights violations, and support for terrorism.

I know my colleagues and I remain committed to overseeing strict enforcement of the nuclear agreement with Iran and protecting the security of our allies and partners in the Middle East, especially our vital ally Israel. I also know we remain committed to showing that international engagement and multilateral diplomacy can be effective, even with rogue regimes like Iran.

These commitments are why my colleagues and I are on the floor this afternoon and evening. These commitments will continue tomorrow, as the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, on which I serve, holds a hearing that will review closely where we are 1 year since the JCPOA.

I thank Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for regularly holding hearings to assess the nuclear deal and for convening tomorrow's hearing, which I look forward to attending.

Our commitment to overseeing the implementation of this important agreement can and must continue for its entire duration. Even if another crisis emerges, we must remain vigilant and push for the most aggressive enforcement of this deal and not be distracted by developments in other parts of the world. That is my commitment for as long as I have the honor of representing the people of Delaware in the Senate.

I am grateful to some of my colleagues who will join me on the floor later today—Senator CARPER, Senator PETERS, and Senator BLUMENTHAL. I would also like to thank the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. CASEY, for his steadfast effort to support our vital ally Israel and ensure swift multilateral consequences for JCPOA violations.

In closing, let me say this. We—this body, this Congress, the people of this country—must make a clear distinction between the Iranian regime and the Iranian people. The Iran regime deserves scrutiny, condemnation, and opposition for a decades-long pattern of human rights abuses, support for terrorism, and bad behavior, but the Iranian people deserve our support in their fight for freedom, democracy, and human rights.

With that, I am hopeful we will hear soon from my good friend and fellow Delawarean, the senior Senator from our State of neighbors, who has been a leader in my State for decades. I know later this evening we will also hear on these important topics from Senators PETERS and BLUMENTHAL as well.

I am grateful to all of my colleagues who have joined me in colloquies and statements on the floor on this important topic in the past, and I just hope we can, in a sustainable and bipartisan way, insist on effective and rigorous enforcement of this deal throughout its entire term.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, this week we are marking the 1-year anniversary of the signing of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This week, 1 year ago, my colleagues and I began the enormous task of reading, analyzing, and making a decision about whether or not we would support the deal.

For me, that task took 6 weeks of careful study, several classified briefings, countless meetings with experts and conversations with constituents. As I wrote, on September 1 last year, “This agreement will substantially constrain the Iranian nuclear program for its duration, and compared with all realistic alternatives, it is the best option available to us at this time.”

We were under no delusions that the JCPOA would be a panacea for all of our problems with Iran. Rather, it was envisioned and designed to meaningfully address one major issue: Iran’s pursuit of a nuclear weapons capability.

In my decision, I wrote, “We need not, and indeed should not, trust the

Iranian regime.” On the 1-year anniversary of the deal, that statement remains true.

One of the strengths of the JCPOA is a robust, arguably unprecedented, monitoring and verification mechanism. We need to fully fund the International Atomic Energy Agency in support of its efforts to monitor Iran’s compliance with the JCPOA; that is why I supported an increase to the U.S. voluntary contribution to the IAEA in this year’s budget.

We also need to see greater transparency from the IAEA. On July 6, Ambassador Dennis Ross wrote, “Recent reports from the International Atomic Energy Agency indicate that Iran is in compliance with the JCPOA, but the level of information they provide is dramatically less than that found in previous IAEA reports on Iran’s nuclear program.”

Specifically, Ambassador Ross identified several key elements of the deal that were not included in the IAEA’s most recent report: the amount of low enriched uranium currently stockpiled in Iran, the number of centrifuges still operating at Natanz, and research and development activity on centrifuges, to name a few. I urge the administration to work with the P5+1 and the IAEA to increase the transparency of these reports. If Iran is indeed complying, there should be no need to hide the details.

My decision was also predicated on the assumption that Iran would continue to foment instability and support terrorism in the region. The JCPOA did not address this issue, and likewise, it in no way curtailed our ability to sanction and hold accountable terrorist groups and facilitators. These tough sanctions remain in full force and effect.

Iran continues its aggressive and destabilizing actions in the region, including by providing robust financial and material support to its terrorist proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, as well as to the murderous Assad regime in Syria and the Houthi rebels in Yemen.

Iran unequivocally remains the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism. The Hezbollah Secretary General Hassan Nasrallah recently stated, “Hezbollah’s budget, its income, its expenses, everything it eats and drinks, its weapons and rockets, come from the Islamic Republic of Iran.” We know that Hezbollah is seeking advanced rocket capability, which could be used against Israel. We know that Hezbollah has become the ground force of the Assad regime in many parts of Syria.

Last week, I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senator ISAKSON called the Stop Terrorist Resources and Money, or STORM Act. This bill will authorize the President to designate countries that are not doing enough to stop terrorist financiers and facilitators as “Jurisdictions of Terrorism Financing Concern.” With that designation comes significant penalties or the requirement to enter into a

technical assistance agreement with the United States to improve their capability to investigate and prosecute terrorist financiers. Although Iran is already designated a state sponsor of terrorism, the President could use this new authority to hold accountable jurisdictions where Iranian terrorist proxies and their supporters operate with relative impunity.

When the Iranians complain that they are not getting the influx of European business that they anticipated following the deal, maybe they need to take a hard look at their support for terrorism. With the sanctions on Iran for terrorism and human rights still firmly in force, it is no wonder that European financial institutions and other businesses are wary of doing business in Iran.

One year on from the signing of the JCPOA, I continue to believe that implementation of this agreement is firmly in our strategic interests. We knew that implementation would be difficult and that the Iranians could not be trusted.

Rigorous congressional oversight has been critical in this first year. We have pushed for increased sanctions on illicit ballistic missile activity, and the administration responded. We have tightened sanctions on Hezbollah and introduced new legislation to counter terrorism financing more broadly. We have advocated for a transformative investment in our defense relationship with Israel, which continues to face threats from Iran and its proxies. We will continue to ask tough questions and demand answers.

We will also continue to prepare for the possibility that Iran may violate the agreement. This means maintaining the legal architecture that would be needed to snap back sanctions in the event of a violation; I have said that I will support a clean reauthorization of the Iran Sanctions Act. This also means toughening our deterrence policy, both here in Congress and in the White House, to ensure, as I wrote in my statement last year, “The Iranian regime should not doubt our capability and willingness to respond swiftly should they attempt to break out and develop a nuclear weapon.”

One year after the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was signed, we should redouble our commitment to ensuring that Iran cannot acquire a nuclear weapons capability and be firm in our resolve to counter their aggressive actions in the Middle East. But we should also commend the wisdom of this body for allowing the agreement to go forward, as it remains the best available alternative to constrain Iran’s nuclear ambitions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the only remaining postcloture time be the following: Capito-Baldwin, 15 minutes; Carper, 10 minutes; Markey, 10 minutes; further,

that following the use or yielding back of that time, that all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote on the adoption of the conference report to accompany S. 524.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONGRATULATING CARLA HAYDEN

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I would like to begin my statement first of all by congratulating Carla Hayden, who was just confirmed as the 14th Librarian of Congress. I know she will do a good job. I am very proud of her and I look forward to working with her and the Library.

Mr. President, earlier today I was proud to support cloture for the CARA bill. It puts us on track to reverse this epidemic and promises to provide help to so many who are impacted by addiction. We will be hearing also from my friend and colleague Senator BALDWIN because we both believe strongly that our veterans are one of those many groups this bill seeks to assist.

A little over a year ago, under the leadership of Senator BALDWIN—and I thank her for that—the two of us introduced the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act, which provides safer and more effective pain management for our Nation's veterans. This legislation, named after U.S. Marine veteran Jason Simcakoski of Wisconsin, who died at the Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a result of a mixed drug toxicity, is included in the CARA bill. In fact, title IX of the bill is titled the Jason Simcakoski Memorial and Promise Act.

Tragically, stories like Jason's exist all around the country, including my own State of West Virginia. Andrew White, another marine, returned home to West Virginia only to be placed on a cocktail of drugs, including anti-psychotics, over twice the recommended dosage. Andrew died in his sleep at the age of 23.

Far too many of our veterans have returned home from overseas to fight another battle here at home. This legislation will update and strengthen the guidelines for opioid prescriptions and require—require—the VA to expand the scope of research, education, delivery, and integration of alternative pain management.

Chronic pain should not be something our veterans are forced to live with, and the VA must be on the cutting edge of developing effective pain management. Our hope is, this will provide the VA with the tools it needs to help prevent these types of tragedies from occurring.

Again, I thank Senator BALDWIN for her very great work in this area.

So many across the Nation, and particularly in rural States like West Virginia, which has the unfortunate distinction of having the largest amount of drug-related overdose deaths—more than twice the national average—are impacted by addiction. CARA is a comprehensive step forward in the national response to this drug epidemic.

We have heard throughout the day how it expands prevention, education, promotes resources for treatment and recovery. It includes reforms to help our law enforcement create alternatives to incarceration, such as successful drug court programs.

We have also heard of the many organizations that are in support of this—over 200. It may be approaching 300 now. These organizations deal with addiction and the results of addiction on a daily basis. I believe one of the reasons so many organizations support this bill—and I know that part of the reason I am so proud to support the bill—is it addresses how addiction affects not only the addict or their family but the well-being of an entire community.

Following a drug prevention seminar I held last year, one of my constituents said:

There is a need for the community to be involved in resolving the drug addiction issue. It is my hope and prayer that we can find community based solutions that will improve the lives of all the citizens in our community, county and state.

CARA contains many ideas and opens the door for communities to take actions to help neighborhoods and schools. It authorizes much needed programs for prevention and education.

Another one of my constituents wrote:

Our young people are dying off by the dozens and a generation of children think of this as normal.

Some of the saddest letters I have received have been about those who have already lost their battle to the scourge against addiction. A grandmother from Martinsburg wrote the following:

Our granddaughter—that tall, exuberant redhead who laughed her way into our hearts, is now a statistic.

As a grandmother myself, I love the way she phrased that—laughed her way into our hearts.

Several days ago our son called to tell us that she had died the night before from a heroin overdose. . . . It was that quick. Our granddaughter started her drug journey with prescription drug opiates. When those pills weren't enough, heroin stepped in, and the downward spiral began.

It isn't just the problem kids . . . who get hooked. Our granddaughter came from a stable, affectionate home. Even though her parents tried their best to save her with countless sleepless nights, multiple trips to rehabs, tough love and loving persuasion, that drug won the battle.

Now, we are not even allowed to grieve. We must also contend with the many forms of our anger; impatience with our granddaughter for not being stronger, rage at those who sold her the drugs, frustration with the authorities for not doing more to stop the trafficking or establishing more treatment centers, and self-recrimination for maybe not doing enough.

We are also trying to cope with the guilt of feeling relief that her hell is finally over. There is nothing more we can do for her now, no more treatments that we can try.

She's gone. Just . . . gone.

Will the passage of CARA stop all overdoses or ensure that no other grandmother or family feels this an-

guish? No. But it does begin to address the frustrations and pain this grandmother and so many others feel. CARA attempts to break the cycle of repeated overdoses by encouraging the use of followup services for those who have received the drug naloxone to reverse the opioid overdose.

Too many stories of addiction start like this one, with prescription pain killers. By allowing the partial fill of certain opioid prescriptions, reviewing best practices for acute pain management, and expanding prescription take-back days and locations, CARA will reduce the number of unused painkillers and hopefully prevent future cases of drug abuse and addiction.

We cannot continue to lose 129 granddaughters, sisters, fathers, neighbors, and friends every single day to drug overdoses. As I have said before and will say again, we will lose a generation if we don't address this crisis now. This cannot be the new normal for our young people or for our communities.

I commend all who have worked on this bill to get us to this point. It is time to pass CARA and send it to the President's desk. Our communities in West Virginia and across the country cannot afford to wait any longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, Congress is taking a critical first step to combat our country's opioid crisis and a major step in providing safer, more effective, and higher quality care for America's veterans.

I want to speak about my bipartisan Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act, which is included in the final version of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, known as CARA. This bipartisan legislation reforms opioid prescribing and pain care at the VA.

These bipartisan reforms to veterans health care that I authored, along with my colleague Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO, should unite us all. They represent our responsibility to honor and care for those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation, and their families—and all our families.

This bipartisan legislation is named in honor of Wisconsin Marine Veteran Jason Simcakoski. On August 30, 2014, Jason tragically died. He died in Wisconsin's Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center of mixed-drug toxicity. At the time of his death, Jason was on 14 different prescription drugs, including opioids.

Jason's heartbreaking story is just one example of the overprescribing and pain care problem within the VA in Wisconsin and across the country. I believe the VA's overreliance on opioids has resulted in getting our veterans hooked rather than getting them the help they need, and it is our job to act now to address this epidemic.

At this time last year, I joined Senator CAPITO on the Senate floor to introduce our bipartisan measure in honor of Jason and the entire

Simcakoski family. I was proud to work closely with the Simcakoski family, as well as medical professionals and veterans service organizations, to craft these reforms to prevent Jason's tragedy from happening to any other veteran or their family.

This legislation, shortly to be approved by the U.S. Senate, will provide safer and more effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans by strengthening and updating VA opioid prescribing guidelines. It will enhance education and training and expand access to opioid alternatives. It will create an independent Office of Patient Advocacy at the VA to give veterans and their families a stronger voice in their care. The bill strengthens VA hiring practices to help prevent bad doctors from treating veterans. It will hold VA accountable for providing quality care to our veterans by strengthening opioid oversight and reporting.

The story of Jason's bill is a story of Congress doing the job that we were elected to do by the families of our States and the communities we represent.

The Simcakoski family called on us to stand up for our brave men and women in uniform, and we took action. For more than a year, I have worked across the aisle with Senator CAPITO and leaders of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to advance my reforms in the Senate. The House of Representatives did their part by moving forward with a House companion measure based on our bill. When it came time for my colleagues to agree on the final package that we have before us today, I worked with the Simcakoski family to ensure that it reflected the strongest possible response to the opioid overprescribing and pain management problems at VA.

I thank my colleagues—particularly the 20 Senators who cosponsored the bill—for their work and help in passing the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act today.

I thank my partner in this bipartisan endeavor, Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia.

I wish to express my sincere appreciation for Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman ISAKSON and Ranking Member BLUMENTHAL and their staffs for their commitment to combating opioid abuse at the VA.

I thank Leader REID and Senators MURRAY, SCHUMER, LEAHY, WYDEN, ALEXANDER, and all the members of the conference committee for their steadfast support of these reforms. And importantly, I want to thank and recognize all of their staffs and my staff for their tireless work through late nights and weeekends to get this bill to the finish line.

This legislation is informed by the collaborative efforts of a broad range of outside health and veterans organizations, and I am grateful for their expert contributions.

I cannot forget the incredible work of Senate legislative counsel—specifically

Tom Heywood for his expert drafting, redrafting, and redrafting, and technical expertise on this bill.

Today we send major veteran reforms—my Jason Simcakoski Opioid Safety Act—to the President's desk for his signature. I am proud that Congress put aside differences and joined together to help fix what has been broken and help restore the sacred trust with our veterans and their families.

The Simcakoski family has inspired us by showing tremendous courage and strength in sharing their tragic story of loss and in working to make a difference in the lives of other veterans and their families. I believe that today's passage of the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act marks one of Congress's great accomplishments—to provide our veterans and their families with the care they have earned and deserve.

My closing message comes from Jason's widow Heather. Heather said:

When I look back at the past, I want to know we made a difference. I want to believe we have leaders in our country who care. I want to inspire others to never give up because change is possible.

I want to say to Marv and Linda, Jason's parents; to Heather and Anaya, Jason's wife and daughter; and to Jason: Thank you for inspiring me. Thank you for demanding that we stand together to enact the strongest opioid safety reforms for veterans and their families. You have inspired true change. This change will save lives, and you have given us all hope for a brighter future.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before I talk a bit about the 1-year anniversary of the signing of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany, with Iran, I want to take a moment to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am privileged to serve with her on the Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs. I have had a chance to see and witness her sincerity, her commitment, and her dedication on this front, and I commend her.

I serve with the Senator from West Virginia—not on Homeland Security but on Environment and Public Works. I commend her for her bipartisan spirit that we see here and I commend the leadership they have both shown to ensure that the right thing is done.

IRAN

Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS, my colleague from Delaware, for organizing a floor colloquy of Members to take place this afternoon to discuss the 1-year anniversary of something we call the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—or the Iran nuclear deal—that was signed literally a year ago tomorrow by the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council, plus Germany, with Iran.

At this time a year ago, there were a lot of skeptics as to whether Iran would keep its part of the bargain and not go forward with developing nuclear weapons. We heard arguments that they would evade inspection and that Iran would never live up to their obligations under the agreement that we signed a year ago tomorrow. We heard that they couldn't be trusted. We heard that they would not keep their word. We heard any number of accusations and speculation. We heard that the people of Iran wished death upon America and wished to continue the antagonistic relationship with the United States that dominated U.S.-Iranian relations after the Iranian revolution.

I just want to say a year later that I believe there is good reason to believe the critics were proved wrong when Iran took those irreversible steps to dismantle its nuclear weapons program—steps that were certified by the nuclear watchdogs at the International Atomic Energy Agency. For example, national inspectors certified that Iran had reduced its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent and that the remaining enriched uranium was only enriched at levels consistent with peaceful energy uses. Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency certified that the nearly 15,000 centrifuges for enriching uranium have been dismantled, leaving Iran with only its least sophisticated centrifuges that can be used solely for peaceful purposes. The inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency have also certified that the special heavy water reactor that could produce the kind of plutonium needed for a nuclear bomb will produce no more. Inspectors saw firsthand that the core of that reactor had been filled with concrete, rendering it incapable of ever producing plutonium again. Inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency continue to assess that Iran is keeping up with its commitments in the nuclear agreement.

I have never been to Iran. I hope to go someday. But a place I have been to is Southeast Asia. I served 3 years in a war in that part of the world, with a country with which we were at war—in some cases, almost a proxy war but at war for many years, the Vietnam war. The names of 55,000 men and women are on a granite wall about 2 miles from where we are standing here today, close to the Lincoln Memorial.

When the war was over—the war was winding down—my Active-Duty tour with the U.S. Navy as a naval flight officer came to an end, and I resigned from my regular commission and assumed a Reserve commission and continued to fly with the Navy as a P-3 aircraft mission commander in the Naval Reserve for another 18 years.

The month after I retired from the Navy as captain, I was a member of the House of Representatives. I led a delegation of six of us—all Vietnam members of U.S. House of Representatives—back to Vietnam in August of 1991. We

went at a time when, even though we were not at war with Iran, there was still great animosity between our two countries. Some of that was spurred by the fact that we never found out what happened to thousands of American MIAs. They disappeared, in some cases almost without a trace. We had very little cooperation from Vietnam to try to find out the truth of their demise. There is a lot of speculation that they are being held as POWs in Vietnam, Cambodia, or Laos, and there were actually photographs of people alleged to be our MIAs who were being held in captivity—we didn't know where but the assertion was in Vietnam or Cambodia or Laos.

During our congressional delegation trip in August of 1991, it turned out that the pictures that were shown on the cover of Newsweek and TIME magazine and on the front pages of newspapers across the country were not Americans; they were Soviet nationals. There was an effort by people in Cambodia—bad people—to try to extort money from the families of the American MIAs who never came home. The people in those pictures were actually Soviet nationals, not missing Americans.

During the midst of all of this back-and-forth about the MIAs from America from that war, six of us participated in a congressional delegation. We went to Vietnam. We met with the new leader of Vietnam, a fellow named Do Muoi, who became the leader in August of 1991 of the Communist Party, making him the top leader of Vietnam. We presented to him from the George Herbert Walker Bush administration a roadmap to normalize relations. This was the deal: Vietnam, if you will open up your archives, open up your war museums, allow us to explore, excavate crash sites, have free movement around your country to see if Americans respond or people believed to be Americans respond—if you will do all those things, we will reciprocate, and we will move toward normalized relations with your country.

There was a lot of lack of faith on the sides of both countries, Vietnam and us. The Vietnamese were fearful that we would move the goalposts, that even if they did all the things they were required to do under the roadmap to normalize relations, we would move the goalposts and still not normalize relations. For our part, there was concern that they would never do those things anyway, so why should we bother.

At the end of the day, we engaged with the Vietnamese, and they engaged with us. They did the things they were supposed to do, and we did as well. We normalized relations about 4 years later.

John Kerry and JOHN MCCAIN did good work in the Senate. Our delegation did good work in the House. The George Herbert Walker Bush administration passed the baton to President Clinton, and normalized relations were

established about 4 years later. The first U.S. Ambassador to Vietnam was a member of our delegation, former POW and former Air Force pilot Pete Peterson.

Fast-forward about 25 years later, a month and a half ago, President Obama was nice enough to invite me to join him on a trip to Vietnam, along with a couple of Congressmen. A lot changed in those 25 years. Today the United States of America is Vietnam's top export market. Today Vietnam is part of the 12-member transpacific trade partnership we are endeavoring to establish and get approved here and in 11 other countries.

While we were over there a month and a half ago, the Vietnamese announced an \$11 billion deal with Boeing. They are going to buy 100 737 jets valued at \$11.3 billion from Boeing. They announced that they are going to buy from Pratt & Whitney—a big aircraft engine company—another \$3 billion worth of engines to put in 63 Airbuses.

The President lifted the ban on arms sales to Vietnam, and a lot of other announcements were made. While we were over there, we learned that a survey of the Vietnamese people done earlier that year indicated that 84 percent of the Vietnamese people had a favorable opinion of the United States. Another survey indicated that 95 percent of the Vietnamese people have a favorable opinion of the United States. They like us more in Vietnam than we like us.

Meanwhile in Iran, Iran is not unlike Vietnam—a young nation. There are about 78 million people who live in Iran. More than half of them are under the age of 25, and they have a great affection for our country. Some of the leaders do not, but many of the people do, particularly the younger people. They want a better life with us and a better relationship with us.

They have had elections since the joint agreement was agreed to, elections in their Parliament and in the Council of Experts, which elects the next Supreme Leader. The moderates, the reformers made great strides in those elections earlier this year. There were very encouraging results.

A year later, among other things that have happened, the Iranians decided they have had a hard time accessing capital to be able to purchase things—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. I request 1 more minute, Mr. President.

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

Mr. CARPER. Just as the Vietnamese have finalized a large deal—the purchase of American jets—the Iranians announced about 2 weeks ago that they will be purchasing a number of 747 jumbo jets built by Boeing, 737s, 777s. The value of the deal is worth about \$17 billion over the next 4, 5, 6 years.

I would suggest to our colleagues who say we can't trust these guys that we still have problems with what they are doing with some of their missile testing. We have problems with support of Hezbollah and other terrorist groups like that. For the most part, they have kept their word on the joint deal we signed, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

We are starting to see some commerce transact between both countries that actually inure to our bottom line to strengthen the economy of this Nation.

I just want to say—is it time for us to spike the football? Is everything fine? No. Eyes wide open. That is important. Eyes wide open. Having said that, I think most fairminded people would say: So far, so good. Let's continue to be vigilant, and hopefully a year from now, the second anniversary of the signing of this joint agreement will have even better news not just for us but for the rest of the world.

With that, I thank you, Mr. President, for that extra minute.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I would like to start my remarks on the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act with a story I received from one of my constituents, David. He is a patient at Hope House in Boston. Hope House is the oldest and one of the largest residential treatment programs for adults in Massachusetts. This is what he said:

Senator Markey: Addiction has totally ruined my life. It quickly took everything from me and my family. It has stripped me of my dignity and self worth along with my self respect. I also lost the trust of my entire family.

Addiction started late for me. I was 44 years old. I had everything I could possibly dream of. A beautiful wife, a son, two stepdaughters that I raised and put through college. We also built a new home in 2000. I had a great career and was a few years away from 20 to retire.

Then my family and I went on vacation for two weeks and I came home with a parasite in my stomach for which I was prescribed pain medication. That was at the end of April that year. In May, I had my appendix taken out. In June, I had to have my gallbladder out. All the while being prescribed pain meds.

Before I knew it, I was addicted. It wasn't long after that there were no more scripts to be had. Then I was doing heroin. This was so scary for me because I had not used any drugs my entire life. Within two years, everything was gone. Wife, family, job, house. Everything.

It has been a real struggle to get out and stay clean between not being able to get a detox bed, or, if I did, after five days, only to be told that there were no beds available for further treatment. Which meant back on the street to start the whole process over again.

I finally did make it to the Hope House, which I am so grateful for. I know I am going to make it this time; I just feel it. Thank you for the chance.

I pray for David and all the patients at Hope House. They found the help they needed, and we hope they will

have the strength and the support to achieve long-term recovery.

I am proud that this opioid legislation contains provisions of the TREAT Act—The Recovery Enhancement for Addiction Treatment Act—a bill I introduced with Senator RAND PAUL of Kentucky and other colleagues here in the Senate. The TREAT Act addresses the demand side of the opioid epidemic.

I firmly believe that if we are going to reduce the supply of heroin, fentanyl, and illicit prescription drugs, we have to reduce the demand through treatment. But for far too long, outdated and scientifically unsound Federal restrictions have severely limited access to effective medication-assisted treatment like Suboxone for opioid addiction. The TREAT Act removes these restrictions. Importantly, the TREAT Act would allow appropriately trained nurse practitioners and physician assistants to treat patients with these lifesaving therapies.

These TREAT Act provisions, which are included in the CARA conference report, will increase access to treatment, especially in community health centers and rural communities across this country. I am grateful that these provisions are included in the bill we will vote on today. I am hopeful they will have an impact in the future.

It has been a long haul and hard work over the last few years, but we have achieved a measure of success that will impact lives as soon as this bill is signed into law. I sincerely thank Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER for their support on the TREAT Act. I thank Senator HATCH and Representatives PALLONE and UPTON and all the CARA conferees who worked to get the TREAT Act provisions included in this final package we are voting on today. I would like to express my appreciation to Senators WHITEHOUSE and PORTMAN and all of the Senate and House cosponsors of the TREAT Act who supported efforts to get the law changed so that more people can get the treatment they need.

In Massachusetts, I am hearing enormous frustration from people who don't feel that adequate resources are being brought to bear on this enormous epidemic of prescription drug and heroin addiction. Just like David, countless people suffering from addiction cannot find a bed for detox, and then when they are at their most vulnerable moment in recovery, they cannot find a place or provider of long-term treatment.

For the months that we have been debating CARA in this Chamber, we have heard the statistics. Our Nation is experiencing more deaths from drug overdoses than from gun violence or auto deaths. Eighty percent of people suffering from heroin addiction started on opioid pain medications approved by the Food and Drug Administration and prescribed by doctors who aren't required to receive education on safe opioid prescribing.

Nearly 30,000 people in the United States died of an opioid overdose in

2014. Approximately 1,300 of those were in Massachusetts. Of those 1,300, 754 had fentanyl in their system. Massachusetts is 2 percent of America's population. If you multiply 754 times 50, you are up to 37,000 people dying from fentanyl in our country. That is like having a war in Korea every single year. We haven't even begun this battle on fentanyl. But it is coming, and it is coming with an urgency that is very difficult to even imagine. The total deaths from opioids in America would be equivalent to a Vietnam war every single year, and fentanyl is 50 times more powerful than morphine—unbelievable. That is how powerful it is—50 times more powerful.

This is just something that we are going to have to deal with, and approximately 2.5 million Americans abused or were dependent on opioids in 2012, but fewer than 1 million received treatment for their condition. Out of the 2.5 million people who needed help, only 1 million got it in our country. We are being overwhelmed by a tsunami of heroin, prescription drugs, and fentanyl addiction, and we must stop it before it drowns any more families in our country.

We had an opportunity here to make sure we put real funding into this bill for more treatment. We are not going to meet that challenge here today. We do need funding for those families—funding for treatment providers who help put people on the path to recovery and funding for our sheriffs, firefighters, and other first responders who carry the overdose prevention drugs that save lives. We need funding for the public education campaign so that we can prevent addiction before it takes hold. We will not save lives and stop this scourge of addiction unless we, in fact, ensure that there is full funding for treatment. We will save lives with more treatment options, more Narcan, more counselors, more education, more beds, and a better continuum of care, but we must fund it.

The bill we are voting on today is a good step, but we still have much further to go. Without that funding, this effort will not do the full job that our country wants us to do. Our cities are fighting a war, and we need to help them. We are hemorrhaging lives by the day. If we are to staunch the flow of suffering and death, we desperately need funding to implement all of the programs in this bill.

Ladies and gentlemen, we are at a defining moment in our national discussion to address the public health crisis of addiction. Our work doesn't stop here. It has only just begun. Let's be clear. Stopping the overprescription of opioid pain medication that is fueling addiction and overdoses starts with the prescribers. We need to require anyone who prescribes opioid pain medication and other controlled substances to undergo mandatory training on safe prescribing practices and the identification of possible substance use disorder.

We need to make sure that people who enter the judicial system don't ar-

bitrarily have their Medicaid coverage terminated, making it more difficult to access treatment once they are released and fueling, once again, the vicious cycle of incarceration.

We need to make sure that all opioids approved by the Food and Drug Administration are first reviewed by independent experts to ensure that these drugs are not only safe and effective but also won't continue to fuel the epidemic of addiction in this country.

We need to make sure that prescription drug monitoring programs are fully utilized and nationally interoperable in order to prevent doctor shopping, and we must let Big Pharma know that their army of lobbyists on Capitol Hill will be matched by an army of advocates that work every day to raise awareness and save lives.

The Congress has an opportunity to let all those struggling with addiction know that help is on the way. We know that we have heard their stories, and we will not forget them.

We must let them know that no matter how dark life seems right now, there is hope, and sunlight will grace them once again, and this Chamber has not finished this job—this journey—that we must be on with every family in our country. Substance abuse is a crisis the likes of which we have never seen in America. A decade from now people will ask: What did you do to help end this epidemic? That is why I stand today congratulating all of those who worked on this bill, and we must also pledge to continue to stand up and fight for the funding and other investments we need to make.

We must stand united to end this crisis of addiction in our communities now and for generations to come so that children will not have to look to the history books to find that there ever was a year like 2016 with an epidemic that is raging across the country.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 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.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 129 Leg.]

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—2

Lee Sasse

NOT VOTING—6

Cochran Roberts Sessions
Inhofe Rounds Wicker

The conference report was agreed to.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VENUE ACT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak in support of legislation I introduced, the Venue Equity and Non-Uniformity Elimination Act, or VENUE Act, that addresses patent venue reform.

Patents are an important part of our economy and are vital to promoting innovation and spurring growth, but the patent system is at risk. There is an ever-increasing problem of patent lawsuits brought by nonpracticing entities, also known as patent trolls. This problem is exacerbated by plaintiffs being able to handpick friendly judicial venues that are otherwise unrelated to the alleged infringement. An article in the Harvard Business Review states that “patent trolls cost defendant firms \$29 billion per year in direct out-of-pocket costs” and “in aggregate, patent litigation destroys over \$60 billion in firm wealth each year.”

It is clear these types of abuses impose substantial costs on the economy and simply cannot be ignored any longer.

Additionally, according to a 2013 White House patent report, the bulk of

patent troll suits target small and investor-driven companies. This is a real threat to innovation.

The VENUE Act addresses this issue and ensures that patent cases are litigated where there is a connection to the patent dispute. Under the VENUE Act, in order for a case to be properly litigated, it must be brought where either, No. 1, the defendant has a principal place of business or, No. 2, the alleged infringing act occurred or, No. 3, where the inventor conducted research and development that led to the patent.

In addition to the provisions relating to proper venue, the VENUE Act provides a more streamlined avenue for those seeking review of erroneous venue determinations. I believe my legislation strikes the right balance for determining when venue is proper, but I also understand that addressing venue is just one piece of the puzzle when we are talking about overall patent reform.

There are a number of ways patent reform can be achieved, and that is why I support the principles of the PATENT Act and believe it goes a long way in combatting this growing problem. The PATENT Act includes much needed reforms, such as fee shifting, heightening pleading standards, and customer stays that would provide relief to retailers, small businesses, and startups that are constantly under assault by these nonpracticing entities.

I commend Chairman GRASSLEY for ushering that legislation out of the Judiciary Committee. However, one piece missing from that comprehensive package is venue reform. Such a reform was included in the House version of the patent bill, and I believe it needs to be added to the Senate bill as well. All one has to do is look at the numbers and the problem surrounding venue becomes clear.

In 2009, 9 percent of all U.S. patent cases were filed in one particular Federal district. By comparison, in 2015, that number increased to just over 44 percent. That is an increase of over 400 percent. Again, the increase went from 9 percent in 2009 to 44 percent in 2015. In addition, of the cases brought in that Federal district in 2015, 95 percent of those cases were brought by nonpracticing entities. Such a distortion in case distribution is problematic, especially when the venue has no real connection to the alleged infringement at issue.

One hope for relief was the Federal circuit case in TC Heartland, but after the court’s decision on April 29 declined to impose more stringent venue restrictions in patent cases, it appears judicial relief will have to wait. Therefore, this decision has only made the need for congressional action on venue even more important. I hope it will bring renewed attention to patent venue reform and the VENUE Act in the Senate.

While there are a number of solutions to the overall patent troll problem,

venue reform is of the utmost importance and must be central to any larger reform effort.

I urge my colleagues to support the reforms contained in the VENUE Act, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

INVESTIGATION INTO ALLEGATIONS OF FBI-FACILITATED RANSOM PAYMENTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about allegations that the FBI has facilitated ransom payments to terrorist groups. Unfortunately, the administration has been stonewalling the Senate Judiciary Committee’s investigation into the matter.

We have seen many terrible terrorist attacks recently. The government’s highest duty is to provide for national security. That means fighting the radical Islamic terrorist groups that mean us harm.

An important part of fighting radical Islamic terrorist groups is going after their funding. The U.S. Government should do everything it can to stop money from flowing to groups like al Qaeda and ISIS.

The government has had significant successes in fighting terrorist funding. Ransom payments for hostages are one of the key sources of funds for terrorist groups to raise money.

The government should not be participating in helping to make such payments. Yet, in April of last year, the Wall Street Journal reported that the FBI had helped facilitate a \$250,000 ransom payment to al Qaeda.

It was from the family of kidnapped aid worker Warren Weinstein back in 2012. That report was later confirmed by 60 Minutes in an interview with Dr. Weinstein’s widow.

Around the same time as that Wall Street Journal article, Army LTC Jason Amerine contacted Judiciary Committee staff. He is a decorated war hero who reached out to Congressman HUNTER, Senator JOHNSON, and to my office, to raise concerns about ineffective hostage-recovery efforts. He alleged that the FBI was involved in a ransom payment made in an effort to recover SGT Bowe Bergdahl.

To be clear, the U.S. Government should take all appropriate measures to recover American hostages.

But those measures cannot include ransom payments that end up funding more terrorist operations.

Ransom payments are big business for terrorist groups. According to a 2014 investigation by the New York Times, Al Qaeda and its affiliates have taken in at least \$125 million from kidnapping for ransom since 2008.

ISIS also takes in huge amounts from ransom payments. The United Nations estimated that ISIS collected between \$35 and \$45 million in ransom payments in 2014 alone.

This is a serious threat to our national security.

In 2012, David S. Cohen, who was the Treasury Department's Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Intelligence at the time, explained why in a presentation on the issue.

He said:

Ransom payments lead to future kidnappings, and future kidnappings lead to additional ransom payments.

And it all builds the capacity of terrorist organizations to conduct attacks.

Al Qaeda affiliates use ransom money to help fund the full range of their activities, including recruiting and indoctrinating new members, paying salaries, establishing training camps, acquiring weapons and communications gear and helping to support the next generation of violent extremist groups.

Paying ransoms incentivizes terrorists to kidnap more people, and it funds their terrorist attacks.

The administration says it is still U.S. policy for the government to deny hostage-takers the benefits of ransom. But its policy on helping others make ransom payments is murky.

If the FBI pays lip-service to the no-ransom policy by not making payments itself, but facilitates payments by others, then the financial incentive for terrorists to kidnap people remains the same.

The Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction over the Department of Justice, including the FBI.

The FBI's hostage-recovery efforts, including any facilitated ransom payments, must be subject to constitutional oversight by the committee.

The Justice Department has failed to fully cooperate with the committee's inquiries.

In May of last year I wrote to the Attorney General.

I asked several questions about the FBI's alleged involvement in facilitating payments to terrorist groups.

Among other things, I asked: "Has the FBI been involved in any transfer of money in connection with attempts to secure the release of hostages held by al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Haqqani network, ISIS, or associated forces?"

The Justice Department failed to respond for 5 months.

In the meantime, the President issued Executive Order 13698 and Presidential Policy Directive 30. Those established a new hostage-recovery policy as the result of an interagency review.

Then, 5 months after I sent my questions to the Attorney General, the Justice Department finally sent me a response. That response failed to answer my questions. Instead, the response just summarized the public documents released by the administration when it announced its new hostage-recovery policy.

Merely pointing to publicly available documents is not good faith cooperation with independent fact finding. So I wrote to the White House last fall.

I asked that the administration provide the committee the classified parts of the new hostage-recovery policy, PPD-30, as well as the classified part of the policy it replaced, NSPD-12. But

the administration failed to share those classified parts of the policies with the Committee.

Think about that. The FBI plays a key role in hostage-recovery efforts. The Judiciary Committee is responsible for overseeing the FBI. Yet, the administration refuses to even tell the Committee in full what its written policies say. That kind of stonewalling is unacceptable.

I referred the matter to the Inspector General for the Department of Justice last October. In February, he informed me that his office had opened an initial inquiry. That inquiry is ongoing. My investigation continues as well.

Yesterday I sent another letter to Attorney General Lynch and Director Comey seeking complete answers to my questions and complete copies of the policy documents.

If the public reports are accurate, then there is a very real possibility that the FBI has helped send millions of dollars to al Qaeda and ISIS. That money inevitably was used to help terrorists kill more innocent people.

The Judiciary committee needs all the facts to get to the bottom of this. The FBI should cooperate. The Department of Justice should cooperate. The White House should cooperate.

FBI Director Comey and Attorney General Lynch should fully respond to all the questions in my May 2015 letter.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 1, 2015.

Hon. LORETTA LYNCH,
Attorney General, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, DC.

DEAR ATTORNEY GENERAL LYNCH: I am writing in regard to the Federal Bureau of Investigation's policies and practices regarding ransom payments in hostage recovery efforts. On April 29, 2015, the Wall Street Journal, citing unnamed senior U.S. officials, reported that "the Federal Bureau of Investigation helped facilitate a 2012 ransom payment to al Qaeda from the family of kidnapped aid worker Warren Weinstein[.]" The article alleges that, although the FBI claims it did not directly approve or authorize a ransom payment, it nonetheless "vetted a Pakistani middleman used by the family to transport the money and provided other intelligence to enable the exchange." The article also quoted U.S. officials as saying that, "the family was particularly encouraged by the ransom option when the FBI said it was probably the best chance to win Mr. Weinstein's release." Another recent news article reported that the government "is reviewing its policy preventing families of hostages to pay ransom to kidnappers[.]"

In order to evaluate the FBI's policies and procedures related to ransom payments to terrorist organizations as part of hostage recovery efforts, please provide the Committee with answers to the following questions by May 15, 2015:

1. Was the FBI involved in a payment of a ransom in an attempt to recover Dr. Weinstein?

2. Did the FBI vet a Pakistani middleman for the Weinstein family to use in making a

ransom payment to al Qaeda in an attempt to recover Dr. Weinstein?

3. Did the FBI provide other intelligence to enable the ransom payment? If so, what intelligence was provided? To whom was it provided?

4. What other steps, if any, did the FBI take to facilitate the ransom payment?

5. What steps, if any, did the FBI take in preparation for a potential release of Dr. Weinstein following the ransom payment to secure his safe return to the United States?

6. What happened to the ransom money after Dr. Weinstein was not released?

7. What steps, if any, did the FBI take to secure a return of funds to the Weinstein family?

8. Has the FBI been involved in any transfer of money in connection with attempts to secure the release of hostages held by al Qaeda, the Taliban, the Haqqani network, ISIS, or associated forces?

9. What are the FBI's policies and procedures relating to ransom payments, whether by the U.S. Government or third parties, in hostage recovery efforts?

10. What audit procedures, if any, are in place to ensure FBI compliance with these policies, procedures, and all applicable law?

11. Have those audit procedures, if they exist, revealed any violation of FBI policies, procedures, or applicable law? Has the FBI otherwise learned of such violations?

12. If any violations were found, what remedial or punitive actions were taken?

13. What is the status of the FBI's current hostage recovery efforts for those hostages believed to be held by terrorist groups?

14. Is FBI facilitation of ransom payments by the families of hostages being considered as an option in those recovery efforts?

Please number your responses to match their corresponding questions. Please also provide FBI personnel to brief the Judiciary Committee on these issues after you have provided your responses, but in any event no later than May 22, 2015. If you have any questions about this request, please feel free to contact Patrick Davis of my Committee staff. Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman.

Mr. GRASSLEY. There is no excuse for stonewalling oversight, but it is especially inexcusable in a matter as important as this. It is shocking that the only answer the FBI can come up with to these allegations is silence. Burying our heads in the sand does not make the issue go away.

If our government is assisting in paying ransom money to terrorists, Congress needs to know, the public needs to know.

The government officials involved need to be accountable. The facts cannot be hidden from the FBI's oversight committee. The policies implementing our laws on this topic cannot be kept secret from the FBI's oversight committee.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING GERALD R.
SHERRATT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to a remarkable public servant, humanitarian, neighbor, and friend: Gerald R. Sherratt. Jerry was the former mayor of Cedar City and the 13th president of Southern Utah University. He passed away last week, leaving behind an unparalleled legacy that will forever bless his hometown and the great State of Utah.

A man of abundant energy and unwavering enthusiasm, Jerry transformed the town of Cedar City. The fruits of his service can be found throughout the city, including the tremendous growth of Southern Utah University, the building of a new airport terminal, the success of the Utah Shakespeare Festival, the founding of the Utah Summer Games, the inception of the Livestock and Heritage Festival, the organization of the Storybook Cavalcade Parade, and the establishment of the American Children's Festival. These and so many other achievements owe their success to the leadership of Mayor Sherratt. He was truly Cedar City's most enthusiastic cheerleader and one of Southern Utah University's most cherished presidents.

Jerry served as the mayor of Cedar City for two terms, implementing groundbreaking initiatives and infusing a new energy into the city. In recognition of the world-famous Utah Shakespeare Festival, he coined the term Festival City USA to attract visitors to the city. The tourists came in droves. Over the course of his public service, Jerry oversaw the fast growth of Cedar City's neighborhoods and helped lead efforts to improve the city's transportation infrastructure at a time of increased demand. With his trademark smile and charismatic personality, he quickly became a beloved public servant who would give his all to the good of the city and its citizens.

Jerry's academic career stands on its own. He was a graduate of Branch Agricultural College, which later became Southern Utah University. He received a bachelor's degree in elementary education and a master's degree in educational administration before serving in his first leadership position at Utah State University. He would later return to his first alma mater to serve as Southern Utah University's president from 1982 to 1997. While at the helm, SUU saw the largest increase in student population and facilities in its history, setting the pace for many years to come. Perhaps one of Jerry's proudest moments came when he successfully lobbied to turn Southern Utah State College into Southern Utah University. The crowning jewel of Jerry's tenure was the building of the Centrum—a basketball arena and special events center on campus.

Jerry's contributions to the university were memorialized with the naming of Southern Utah University's Gerald R. Sherratt Library. Today the library stands as a constant reminder of

Jerry's selfless service to the university. In the library's main entryway, there is a bust of President Sherratt. As students walk in, they pay tribute to the former president by rubbing the bald head of the statue for good luck.

Jerry was delighted by this gesture. He was a good-natured man who saw the humor in having his bald head rubbed by hundreds of students as they entered the library to study each day. In addition to being a fun-loving and jovial president, Jerry was also a strong leader who was willing to roll up his sleeves and get in the trenches year after year to help his community.

Jerry loved Cedar City. He once expressed his deep emotional attachment to his community in a simple yet profound way: "These roots, they grab hold."

Our State was well served by the deep roots and leadership of this remarkable man. I will deeply miss my good friend Jerry Sherratt and the kindness and support he always extended to me throughout my service. He made an indelible impression on me and on all those who were blessed to know him. Jerry personified everything that is good about our State and its people.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HAROLD E.
SHUFFLEBARGER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to my constituent, Dr. Harold E. Shufflebarger, for his exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Navy and to the United States of America. He has spent his life serving his Nation and his community, and I would like to recognize him today.

Harold Shufflebarger was born and raised in Grayson, KY. At the age of 20, he became a Navy corpsman, serving from 1943-1945 as part of the 4th Division, 24th Marines. Dr. Shufflebarger's combat record in World War II was exemplary; in the short space of one year, he participated in four major amphibious assaults, during which his unit won two Presidential citations. In February 1944, he conducted an assault landing onto Roi-Namur Island in the northern part of the Kwajalein atoll of the Marshall Islands. From June to August 1944, Dr. Shufflebarger assaulted onto the Saipan and Tinian Islands of the Northern Mariana Islands. Harold's heroic actions culminated in the historic amphibious assault onto the island of Iwo Jima in February of 1945.

After valiantly serving his country, Dr. Shufflebarger returned home to Grayson, KY, and became a family practitioner. For over 50 years, he served as a physician in northeastern Kentucky, a region without many medical providers.

Dr. Shufflebarger has served his community throughout his life. He founded a regional radio station that won four National Association of Broadcasters Crystal Radio Awards for community service, and he served as mayor of

Grayson. Dr. Shufflebarger is a great example of the Greatest Generation putting country and community before self.

On behalf of a grateful Commonwealth and a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Dr. Harold E. Shufflebarger for over seven decades of service to his country and to his community. We keep Dr. Shufflebarger's health in our thoughts and prayers, and we wish him; his wife, Hazel; his daughter, Alicia; his son, Eric; and his four grandchildren the best.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD AND
MAXINE HANDZIAK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a uniquely Kentuckian love story. It is a story that began in the tumult of World War II and still continues to this day, more than 70 years later. I speak of the loving relationship and marriage of Edward and Maxine Handziak, of Winchester, KY.

In 1943, America faced the Axis Powers in World War II. Many Americans bravely wore their country's uniform in the fight for freedom and democracy. Two of those Americans were native Kentuckian Maxine Hamon and her suitor Edward Handziak.

Edward was in the U.S. military and stationed in Stillwater, OK. Maxine, who had volunteered for the Women's Reserve in the U.S. Navy, was also stationed there. The two met in a chance encounter at a roller skating rink.

Edward was smitten with the young Kentuckian, and when he was sent abroad to serve in Europe he did not forget her. He wrote her letters faithfully. Even when shrapnel injured his writing hand, he wrote her with his left hand. He knew, when he returned to America, that he wanted to marry her.

As soon as the war was over, Edward came home and proposed. And it turns out that, when he fell in love with Maxine, he fell in love with her hometown of Winchester as well and longed to return. A job with Gulf Oil delayed those plans, with his career sending him all over the country. The Handziaks finally settled down in Winchester in 1985.

Today the couple has been happily married for more than 70 years, and they have three children, three grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren. Maxine's granddaughter still has her grandmother's roller skates from that fateful day when she met Edward.

I am honored to represent the Handziaks here in the U.S. Senate and want to wish them every happiness and thank them for their service. I am sure my colleagues join me in expressing gratitude for their service as well. They truly represent the finest of Kentucky.

Mr. President, an area publication, the Winchester Sun, published a compelling article on Edward and Maxine's love story. I ask unanimous consent

that said article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Winchester Sun, Dec. 7, 2011]

LOVE AND WAR—COUPLE BROUGHT TOGETHER
BY WORLD WAR II SHARE STORY OF THEIR
NEARLY 70-YEAR ROMANCE

(By Rachel Parsons)

When Edward Handziak met Maxine Hamon in 1943, he fell for her right away.

Literally.

The two were at a roller skating rink in Stillwater, Okla., when Edward skated by Maxine. That also happened to be the time he lost his balance and took a spill.

"I liked to go roller skating, mainly because I liked the music they played. I was skating right along, and I fell in front of her. So, the story is, I fell for her," Edward said.

He and Maxine were both stationed in Stillwater with the United States military during World War II. Maxine and her friend Ann Marie Bush Carter were living in Winchester when World War II broke out and, after seeing their older brothers join the Navy, the two decided to join the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency Service (WAVES), a division of the Navy. Maxine was 20 years old at the time.

Edward Handziak was living in Massachusetts when he was drafted at the age of 20. He and Maxine were both sent to Oklahoma A&M College, now Oklahoma State University, for training. There were numerous service men and women on the campus for specialized training at that time, Edward said.

"Stillwater was a small town, kind of like Winchester, with a movie house and a skating rink," Edward said.

Maxine was an avid skater and carried her roller skates with her wherever she traveled for the WAVES.

Her granddaughter still has the skates today.

After their initial meeting at the roller skating rink, Edward and Maxine began dating.

"I was shy and not very aggressive with girls, but with her, I skated with her the rest of the session," Edward said.

Eventually, Edward was sent overseas, fighting in Marseilles, France, to replace infantrymen training for the D-Day invasion, June 6, 1944.

Maxine was sent to Washington, D.C., for secretarial work, but Edward wrote to her every day. Because he was injured twice, the letter writing could be tedious at times, including trying to use his left hand after his right hand was hurt by shrapnel. There also was a period of time when he couldn't lie on his back, also because of shrapnel. The injuries earned him a Purple Heart with an oak leaf cluster.

"I wasn't a good letter writer," Maxine said.

When the war ended in the spring of 1945, Edward was stationed in Austria and Maxine was still in Washington, D.C. By that time, Edward knew he wanted to marry Maxine, so as soon as he was discharged, he returned home to Massachusetts and bought a ring. He went to visit Maxine in Washington, D.C., to propose, although, after 66 years of marriage, neither can recall much about that day.

"I assumed when I came back, I was going to be with her," Edward said.

Because Maxine couldn't leave her post in Washington, Edward traveled to Winchester alone to introduce himself to his future mother and father-in-law.

The Hamons lived on Lexington Road, and Edward got a taxi after arriving on the train.

He said his first introduction to small town life in the South was a conversation at Sam Reed's store on the corner of Lexington Avenue and Bloomfield Road, where the taxi driver stopped to ask directions to the Hamon home.

"Sam says to me, 'What are you to them?'" Edward said.

The story still makes him laugh, although he said that he immediately loved the town, and actually encouraged Maxine to move back there.

He also found the Hamons to be "two gracious people."

"They accepted him as if they'd known him forever," Maxine said.

The couple married at the Hamons' home after Maxine was discharged, and moved back to Massachusetts. It didn't take long, however, for Edward to start thinking about Winchester. "It seemed more progressive. There were subdivisions and everything down there, and there wasn't in New England," Edward said.

His wish to live in Maxine's hometown was granted, but only briefly. A job with Gulf Oil sent the Handziaks traveling all over the country. In 1985, they were finally able to settle in Winchester, on Churchill Drive, long-term.

"I enjoyed seeing all the places and meeting all the new people. He wanted to come back more so than I did," Maxine said.

Both Maxine and Edward say they have enjoyed their 66 years of marriage and can remember few disagreements. They have three children, Ronald, Donald and Peggy; three grandchildren; and four great-grandchildren.

"I guess I'll keep her now," Edward said.

CONFIRMATION OF CARLA HAYDEN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate confirmed Dr. Carla Hayden to be the 14th Librarian of Congress. This is an historic moment, as Dr. Hayden becomes the first woman and the first African American to serve in this important capacity. I congratulate Dr. Hayden and look forward to working with her to help the Library of Congress continue building its legacy as a great American institution.

As she assumes her new office, Dr. Hayden will be able to draw on her years of experience leading the Enoch Pratt Free Library in Baltimore. Through her leadership, the library has become more accessible to members of the community through expanded after school programs and career mentoring. As she powerfully testified during her confirmation hearing before the Rules Committee, the Enoch Pratt Free Library also served as a safe haven last summer when the city of Baltimore experienced painful unrest following the death of Freddie Gray. Her leadership has shown the transformative power of libraries, and I am optimistic that she will use that knowledge and expertise at the Library of Congress to the benefit of all Americans.

Since I received my first library card at the Kellogg-Hubbard Library in Montpelier, VT, I have loved libraries. A library is a place where everyone fits in and the possibilities are limitless. The Library of Congress occupies a special place within our country. It is our Nation's treasured repository for mil-

lions of books, photos, movies, oral histories, and music. But it should also lead by example, working to ensure that libraries keep their important place in our society and help Americans of all ages and backgrounds access information in engaging ways.

Dr. Hayden faces numerous challenges as she begins her tenure as Librarian of Congress. She must find ways to improve the Library's efforts to digitize its materials and preserve digital content. And she must find ways to improve the public's access to the Library's incredible collection through effective and responsible changes. I am committed to helping her achieve those goals.

I also encourage Dr. Hayden to work with me to promote access to government-funded research and information prepared by the Congressional Research Service, CRS. I have introduced bipartisan legislation to make CRS reports available online while respecting the important advisory role that CRS provides to Congress. The status quo—where the public can only access these reports by paying hefty subscription fees to third parties—is bad policy, and I look forward to working with Dr. Hayden to find solutions to make this meaningful resource available more broadly to schools and individual citizens.

The Library also needs Congress's assistance to reauthorize its film and sound recording preservation programs, which preserve important materials that would otherwise disappear or be destroyed through the passage of time. I have introduced bipartisan legislation to reauthorize these programs that I hope members of the Rules Committee and the Congress will strongly support. The Library's work on digitization and preservation can and should be a model for the world.

Finally, during her confirmation hearing and in follow-up questions asked of Dr. Hayden, much attention has been paid to the relationship between the Library of Congress and the Copyright Office, which has long been housed within the Library. Diverse stakeholders have called to modernize the functioning of the Copyright Office, to ensure that it, much like the Library, can best serve the public in the digital age. I hope that Dr. Hayden will serve as a helpful collaborator as I and other Members of Congress consider how to accomplish that goal. Among the most pressing issues is how best the Library's and Copyright Office's information technology, IT, systems can be improved to address widely recognized shortcomings. As Dr. Hayden takes office, I encourage her to carefully consider how to solve these problems, knowing that the two entities' IT needs may be vastly different and a solution that works for the Library's collection management may be ill-suited for the particular issues facing the Copyright Office. It is far more important that these IT issues be resolved correctly, particularly in light of the

fast-changing nature of technology, than that they be resolved quickly.

Dr. Hayden will serve as the Librarian for a 10-year term, and I am optimistic that she can accomplish great things during that time. I look forward to working together with her and once again congratulate her on this historic accomplishment.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN HONDURAS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, yesterday I made a statement about the situation in Honduras, where the March 3 assassination of environmental activist Berta Caceres remains under investigation. I also mentioned the brutal killing last week of Lesbia Janeth Urquia. In that statement, I said that Ms. Urquia was a member of the organization COPINH, which stands for the Civic Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras. According to information I received today, she was not a member of COPINH. However, it is my understanding that she had been active with other supporters of COPINH in opposing the construction of a hydroelectric project along the Chinacla River.

Whether Ms. Urquia's environmental activism was related to her death is a question that remains unresolved. Three suspects in the case were arrested in the past 24 hours, one of whom is reportedly her brother-in-law. According to press reports, the murder of Ms. Urquia may have been the result of a family dispute over inheritance, but the investigation is only in an early stage.

This case reminds us, again, of the unacceptable amount of violence in Honduras and the history of impunity in that country. This is a pervasive problem in each of the Northern Triangle countries, as well as Mexico. Homicides rarely result in conviction or punishment, unless there is international attention. Corruption is pervasive within the police and other public and private institutions. The courts are not as immune from political pressure as they should be. These are problems that will take years to effectively address, as they require, among other things, building professional, accountable police forces and ending the role of the military in civilian law enforcement, strengthening the Office of the Attorney General, and reinforcing the independence of the judiciary.

It also requires strong support by governments of the rights of civil society and particularly journalists, human rights defenders, and social activists who peacefully protest government policies they disagree with. This support has been notably absent in the past, and it is fundamental to any democracy.

The United States has a strong interest in helping Honduras and the other Central American countries address the culture of lawlessness that has engulfed them and in reversing the mi-

gration to the United States of desperate people fleeing violence. I welcome the assurances of top officials in those governments of the seriousness of their commitment to confront these challenges. I also know that what matters is performance.

I supported the \$750 million that Congress approved last year to implement the U.S. Strategy for Engagement in Central America and look forward to receiving the multiyear spend plan required by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, spelling out with sufficient detail and clarity the administration's plans for using those funds.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES EHLERS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Vermont environmental advocate James Ehlers has won the prestigious 2016 Zetterstrom Environmental Award, an honor presented annually by Green Mountain Power Company. I know James well from having worked for most of the last two decades to protect and restore Lake Champlain. I have often found myself as the focus of his unrelenting vision to achieve a "swimmable, fishable, drinkable" Lake Champlain, and I agree with that vision.

Since his earliest days with Lake Champlain International, LCI, James has made it his mission to restore Lake Champlain fisheries. In recent years, James has broadened his work and the mission of LCI to also address many known and suspected lake pollutants, to prevent the spread of invasive species, and to tackle many other issues affecting the our beloved Lake, which is also known as the jewel of New England.

Named for the famed osprey advocate, Meeri Zetterstrom, the GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award is presented annually to one person, business, group, or nonprofit to honor a significant contribution to Vermont's environment. It is accompanied by a \$2,500 donation to the winner's environmental cause. For James, of course, that is the Lake Champlain ecosystem.

The hard work that makes this award so well-earned by Mr. Ehlers is detailed in an article published this month in *The St. Albans Messenger*.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *St. Albans Messenger*, July 1, 2016]

LCI'S EHLERS RECOGNIZED BY GMP

A man once called Lake Champlain's loudest advocate is being honored for his tireless devotion to Vermont's most important body of water. James Ehlers, executive director of Lake Champlain International, was presented with the GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award for his unwavering efforts to protect and improve Lake Champlain. The award, named for famed osprey advocate Meeri Zetterstrom, comes with \$2,500 to support LCI's work.

"As with Meeri Zetterstrom, grit, a big voice, and a thick skin are key elements of

James' environmental advocacy," said Steve Costello, a Green Mountain Power vice president who worked with Zetterstrom on osprey restoration, and presented the award. "Both made bettering the environment their life's work, and neither was put off by tough challenges. They got energized by tackling what others might think was impossible."

Zetterstrom, an elderly widow when she set out to restore endangered ospreys to Vermont in the late '80s, was a feisty visionary who took her fight to politicians, fishermen, utility executives and community leaders to build support for her effort. She exposed the danger of venturing too close to osprey nests by shooting video and sending it to local TV stations, educated schoolchildren, and ultimately inspired an effort that resulted in ospreys' removal from Vermont's endangered species list.

Like Zetterstrom, Ehlers has been an environmental advocate for decades, and has led LCI since 1999. He took LCI—little more than a Father's Day fishing derby—and turned it into a broad lake-focused environmental group with tens of thousands of supporters. The annual LCI derby has become one of the leading fishing derbies in the nation, while LCI's focus has grown to include lake-advocacy, education, cleanup and restoration.

LCI operates Lake Champlain's first and only pollution-prevention boat, removing waste from recreational boats to reduce illegal dumping. Ehlers ensured continuation of the state's lake trout and salmon restoration program by working with the Vermont Governor's Office, the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, commissioner of the Department of Fish & Wildlife, and Senator Patrick Leahy's office. Similarly, he brought together landowners, lawmakers, scientists, and public stakeholders to effect stronger Clean Water Act rules for the benefit of Lake Champlain.

Ehlers has built a reputation as a tough, focused and effective leader. In 2010, Sen. Leahy lauded Ehlers' efforts following a federal appropriation to help the lake. He said, "Your work at Lake Champlain International has been instrumental in securing the future of Lake Champlain. All of us who enjoy its waters every year are very grateful for your dedication. Many thanks for the work that you do."

For his part, Ehlers said he is proud of his focus on lake improvement and environmental advocacy, and honored to receive the Zetterstrom Award, but more proud of all those behind the scenes who don't get the credit they deserve for making his work possible—the volunteers, members, staff, and benefactors.

"It's an honor to receive this award from Green Mountain Power. And frankly, unexpected. I am just one member of a team—a team deeply committed to truly sustainable communities. We'll use the funds received to support our important education programs at LCI and recruit more people to the team necessary to effect real change, the transition to an economy that protects water rather than the current one predicated on its pollution. We have made gains in recent years, but it's not enough. Lake Champlain is more than a place to recreate. The lake sustains our cities with drinking water and supports habitat essential to our state's unique environment," Ehlers said. "Meeri had a vision and saw it to completion, and Vermont is better for it. Like Meeri and so many others out there, we must continue the hard work ahead to reverse the effects of centuries of pollution in Lake Champlain. This will take time, but there are important steps we can take now so that future generations will have the benefit of this critical natural resource. As Cousteau said many years ago, and it is as valid now as it was then, there is

no disconnecting the life cycle from the water cycle. If I can continue to remind people of this and motivate people to act on it, both our natural resources and our most precious resource, our children, will be better off. We are all at least 60 percent water, after all.”

LCI is a federally recognized 501(c)(3) non-profit organization actively involved in shaping the future of Lake Champlain's water and fisheries health for the well-being of the people who depend on it today and tomorrow. To protect, restore, and revitalize Lake Champlain and its communities, LCI educates, advocates, and motivates to ensure that Lake Champlain is swimmable, drinkable, and fishable, understanding that healthy water resources are essential for a healthy economy and a healthy community.

The GMP-Zetterstrom Environmental Award, first presented in 2010 shortly after Zetterstrom's death, was created to honor her legacy and recognize others who follow her example. Past award recipients include Sally Laughlin, a leading wildlife advocate and scientist whose work was instrumental in restoring three species of endangered birds in Vermont; Michael Smith, the founder of Rutland's Pine Hill Park; Margaret Fowle, who leads Vermont's peregrine falcon restoration program; the Lake Champlain Committee, which for five decades has used science-based advocacy, education and collaboration to protect and improve Lake Champlain; and Kelly Stettner, who founded the Black River Action Team, which protects the Black River in southeastern Vermont; and Roy Pilcher, co-founder of Rutland County Audubon.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR PETER WESTMACOTT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I wanted to share with my friends in the Senate some news from across the pond. Sir Peter Westmacott, who served as British Ambassador to the United States from 2012 until January of this year, was recently bestowed the high honor of Knight Grand Cross of the Order of Saint Michael and Saint George for his services to British diplomacy. In other words, Sir Peter is now a “super knight.”

Sir Peter has served British diplomatic interests at home and abroad for decades. His commitment and dedication to peaceful cooperation in the international community is unparalleled. Sir Peter first came to Washington, DC, as Counsellor for Political and Public Affairs in Washington, a position he held from 1993 to 1996, after which he returned home to serve as Director for the Americas at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office.

From 2002 to 2006, Sir Peter Westmacott served as Her Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey. His experience and unwavering commitment to diplomacy were instrumental as he navigated difficult and tragic waters following the November 2003 terrorist attack on the British Embassy in Turkey. He also fostered diplomatic discussions surrounding Turkey's candidacy as a member of the European Union. Beginning in 2007, Sir Peter served as Her Majesty's ambassador to France, where he promoted diplomacy, trade, and investments between France and the U.K.

During his time as Her Majesty's Ambassador to the United States, Sir Peter worked tirelessly to maintain and strengthen U.K.-U.S. relations and to promote diverse and inclusive cultures. His long career illustrates his deep belief in unity and that we, as nations, can accomplish more together than we could dream of achieving alone.

Marcelle and I are lucky to count Peter Westmacott and his wife, Susie, among our friends and are proud of him for earning this prestigious honor. I wanted to share with the Senate the full citation from the Queen's 2016 Birthday Honours for Diplomatic Services: “Peter Westmacott has successfully and relentlessly pursued British interests at the highest levels of international diplomacy, including over the last ten years through three important relationships for the UK—the USA, France and Turkey. He has used every aspect of modern diplomacy—political, prosperity, soft power and leadership—to deliver high impact outcomes for the UK. In each of these most recent roles he has faced difficult challenges to deliver for the UK whether it be deepening the bilateral relationship at the highest levels or persuading partners to work with the UK on difficult issues. He has been one of the UK's leading and most accomplished British Ambassadors of his generation.”

I thank Peter and Susie for their many achievements and dedication to strengthening the special relationship between the United States and United Kingdom.

FAA CONTRACT TOWER PROGRAM

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to applaud the passage of the Federal Aviation Administration FAA Reauthorization, as it strengthens security, provides for critical aviation infrastructure, and maintains access to affordable travel for Montanans as well as the rest of the country. However, while many important provisions were addressed in the FAA reauthorization, improvements to the Federal Contract Tower Program that I advocated for were not included.

There are currently 253 airports in 46 States that participate in the Contract Tower Program, including three airports in my home State of Montana. The Contract Tower Program is a prime example of a successful government-industry partnership and provides safety and air traffic efficiency benefits to airports across our country.

The Bozeman, Kalispell, and Missoula airports in Montana count on the Contract Tower Program to provide essential and cost-effective services. That is why I introduced an amendment in the Senate passed FAA reauthorization bill that would protect contract towers and require the FAA to respond to airports when additional control staff and hours are needed. Unfortunately, this 14-month FAA authorization extension legislation does not

include this broadly supported provision.

Congress must take seriously the management of taxpayer dollars, and be good stewards of such. The Contract Tower Program is a clear example of a cost-efficient program that provides essential safety services. In fact, according to FAA statistics, towers in this program are responsible for 28 percent of air traffic and utilize only 14 percent of total funding.

Montanans are fully aware of the need for safe and reliable transportation services. They are also all too aware of the wasteful and careless spending by our Federal Government. Ensuring the Contract Tower Program is fully utilized is a commonsense solution that addresses both of these issues. I call on my Senate colleagues to join me in supporting this vital program.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak about the importance of recognizing the reality of climate change.

The truth is that manmade climate change is real. This past May was the planet's warmest May in the 136-year history of weather records. In fact, the last 13 months in a row all set world records for hottest average temperatures. Last year was the planet's hottest recorded year, and the last two decades include the 19 hottest years on record. Sea levels rose 7 inches in the last century. And, since the beginning of the industrial era, the acidity of the oceans has increased by 26 percent, which could destabilize the food chain.

My own home State of California is seeing firsthand the effects of higher temperatures and changing precipitation patterns. We are in the midst of an epic drought, which scientists say has been made 15–20 percent worse due to human-induced changes in the climate. This has made a drought into a disaster. The wildfires in California are made even more terrifying by the hot, dry conditions. And the fire season now lasts 75 days longer than just 10 years ago, resulting in more and larger fires.

As urgent as this issue is, it is not a surprise. We have seen these changes coming from a long way off. Scientists employed by the oil company Exxon were warning the company's leadership about climate change as early as 1977, writing that: “There is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels.”

Even before that, White House scientific advisers first cautioned about climate change in 1965, explaining that “almost certainly cause significant changes” and “could be deleterious from the point of view of human beings.”

And as far back as 1956, the New York Times reported early evidence connecting climate change with greenhouse gases from fossil fuel combustion. That prescient article concluded with a sad commentary: "Coal and oil are still plentiful and cheap in many parts of the world, and there is every reason to believe that both will be consumed by industry as long as it pays to do so."

Despite the overwhelming scientific evidence, many in the Senate refuse to accept that climate change is caused by human activity. During the Keystone Pipeline debate at the end of 2014, a majority of Senators revealed they were in denial about climate change. Over the course of three votes on resolutions concerning climate change. All but one Senator could agree that climate change is "real." However, only 14 Republican Senators agreed that human activity contributes to climate change, and only five of those Republican Senators would agree that human activity significantly contributes to climate change. This denial of the link between our greenhouse gas emissions and climate change makes political action very difficult.

Several of my colleagues have spoken about organizations and industries that have actively contributed to the political denial of climate change. These coordinated campaigns to obscure the facts and defeat legislative solutions have succeeded in delaying action.

However, whether we act now to forestall the worst changes or we are forced to react to the refugees and the floods and the fires after the fact, there is no escaping that we must reckon with the reality of climate change.

Fortunately, we have already demonstrated that political progress is possible. For example, California has implemented several policies to address the problem, including a cap-and-trade program to return statewide emissions back to their 1990 levels by 2020, a renewable portfolio standard requiring 50 percent renewable electricity by 2030, regulations to double energy efficiency by 2030, a low-carbon fuel standard to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from transportation fuels at least 10 percent by 2020, and a program to reach 1 million zero-emission vehicles by 2020.

Here is the thing: Even as California is implementing these policies, the State continues to grow. The State's economy grew by 2.8 percent last year, and unemployment was reduced by 1.3 percent. Both of those figures are better than the national average.

Combating climate change will grow our national economy; ignoring the reality will only weaken it. We will all be forced to recognize the reality of climate change sooner or later. The faster we act, the easier it will be to avoid catastrophic disasters, disruptions, and dislocations.

This problem requires the sincere, informed collaboration individuals, businesses, and every level of government.

It is hard to undertake such a collaboration, however, when well-financed special interests dig in their heels, and place profits over the public's needs.

We are out of time.

Let's end the denial of climate change and start building sustainable energy, water, and transportation infrastructure. This transformation will be good for our businesses and communities, and it is what the next generation needs.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the Farm Credit System and to recognize the important contributions of the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit to Delaware's farmers and communities.

When President Woodrow Wilson signed the Federal Farm Loan Act of 1916, he created a robust and reliable source of credit for American farmers and ranchers that would come to serve our rural communities for a century. Since its founding, the Farm Credit has supported farming operations large and small and served as a lifeline for farmers in the face of tremendous hardships—including the Great Depression, the Second World War, and the farm crisis of the 1980s.

Today, the Farm Credit System supports farmers and ranchers with a wide variety of financial services, including crop insurance, appraisal service, life insurance, and the leasing of farm-related vehicles. By providing farm operations with the financial trust and support they need to get up and running or survive and thrive through difficult times, the Farm Credit System has been crucial to the ongoing success of our farmers, rural communities, local economies, and national agriculture sector. The partnership of the Farm Credit System with communities across the Nation throughout the last century has helped to build our country's vibrant and thriving agriculture sector.

Across the country, the Farm Credit System continues to do a great deal of good for the farmers and farm families who need help the most, ensuring that farmers who are young, beginners, or own a small plot have the financial footing they need to embark on the difficult yet rewarding experience of starting their own farm operation. By supporting organizations such as 4-H and the Future Farmers of America, the Farm Credit System is working to make a brighter future for our farmers in the generations to come.

In Delaware, farms and communities rely on the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit for those essential services. With 17 branches across Delaware and our neighboring States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit supports over 11,000 members and today has more than \$2.5 billion in outstanding trust. The folks there have made a great impact on the

communities they serve, providing scholarships, sponsorships, and their own interactive educational learning system to continuously support the families and businesses they work with. The Mid Atlantic Farm Credit's dedication and commitment to their customers goes above and beyond their responsibilities in agriculture credit and funding.

I am delighted and honored to recognize the Mid Atlantic Farm Credit and the Farm Credit System, which for the past 100 years has helped meet the credit and financial service needs of rural communities and allowed American agriculture to flourish in Delaware and across these United States of America.

RECOGNIZING THE WYOMING AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is a privilege to recognize the Wyoming Air National Guard as it celebrates its 70th anniversary.

The Wyoming Air National Guard boasts a legacy of service that spans decades—and generations. Since its formation, dedicated men and women from communities throughout Wyoming have provided essential support to our State, Nation, and world during times of trial. This rich history illustrates Wyoming's devotion and commitment to serving our Nation.

The Wyoming Air National Guard was organized in Cheyenne on August 10, 1946, and designated the 187th Fighter Group. Three years after formation, the 187th was tested. During the Great Blizzard of 1949, the Guard took to the air to aid stranded ranchers, travelers, and residents in central and southeastern Wyoming. Operations Snowbound and Haylift included more than 200 flyovers to provide much-needed supplies, such as food and medicine, to those stranded below. In addition, members of the 187th provided over 550 tons of hay to livestock.

The members of the Wyoming Air National Guard have provided mission support in nearly every national military campaign. During the Korean conflict, Wyoming pilots served around the world in Germany, Japan, and South Korea, flying over 1,500 combat missions.

The Guard also served valiantly in the face of other major military conflicts. In 1953, under the threat of nuclear war, the 187th Fighter Group was redesignated as the 187th Fighter Interceptor Squadron. The squadron's members trained relentlessly and routinely executed 5-minute simulation drills to prepare for attacks from Russian bombers.

During the Vietnam war, the Air Guard flew combat zone missions in Southeast Asia. In 1966, the group was designated as the 153rd Military Airlift Group and later as the 153rd Aeromedical Airlift Group. Throughout the grueling conflict, Wyoming airmen flew dangerous missions through rough

terrain to move wounded and fallen soldiers from the battlefield. Remarkably, no Wyoming Air National Guard lives were lost during the war.

During Operations Desert Storm and Desert Shield in the early 1990s, the men and women of the 153rd supported the war effort by transporting troops and supplies within the U.S. and in Central and South America. The Guard's medical personnel were activated and sent to Saudi Arabia and were later sent to aid the Kurdish people in Iraq during Operation Provide Comfort.

The terrorist attacks of 9/11 drastically changed America. The Wyoming Air National Guard was the first unit to resume flying. In addition to transporting blood donations around the western United States, the 153rd Airlift Wing was deployed in support Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. In total, the Wyoming Air National Guard has deployed personnel abroad more than 3,700 times since 2001.

Today the Wyoming Air National Guard continues to be known for its outstanding versatility and integrity. Members remain actively involved in a wide range of missions in Wyoming, the United States, and around the world. These operations include providing humanitarian aid, supplies, and transportation for servicemembers. Additionally, the 153rd Airlift Wing provides antiterrorism support worldwide.

The heroes of the Wyoming Air National Guard proudly offer aid and support to our friends and neighbors at home. One crucial mission, especially in the Western United States, is firefighting. In 1976, two aircraft were outfitted with the Modular Airborne Fire Fighting System, beginning a long history of exceptional firefighting deployments. MAFFS has become an essential tool in our Nation's efforts to battle forest fires. In 40 years, the Guard unit has helped extinguish fires from Washington to Arizona, including the historic 1988 Yellowstone National Park fire and the 2007 wildfires in California.

The Wyoming Air National Guard continues to maintain the highest levels of integrity and reliability whenever and wherever they are called to serve. These dedicated men and women routinely pause their own lives to stand tall in the face of danger. Our State commends these heroes—and those who came before them—for all they have done to protect our most cherished ideals.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Wyoming Air National Guard's 70 years of courage, commitment, and dedication.

TRIBUTE TO JO ANN EMERSON

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Jo Ann Emerson for her tireless dedication and service to both her State and her country. I had the pleasure of serving with Jo

Ann in the House of Representatives. She has always been well-respected by her constituents, her colleagues in Congress, and the many individuals and families whose problems she dealt with as if they were her family. When Congresswoman Emerson left the Congress, she became the CEO of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, NRECA. She worked hard across the country for the kinds of communities and families she understands so well in our State of Missouri.

It would be difficult for me to convey just how great an impact she has always had on those she encountered better than the remarks made by Jeffrey Connor, interim CEO, on June 13 at the NRECA summer board meeting.

I ask unanimous consent to have his remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

Today marks the end of Jo Ann's tenure as CEO of NRECA, and there is so much for which to thank her.

Jo Ann has not walked through the doors of this building since July 29th of last year—46 weeks ago.

And I have said it many times since then: We miss our leader, but we have not lacked for her leadership. Jo Ann's influence on NRECA, our staff members, the work we do and the privilege of serving our membership—those things remained at the core of our mission—even in her physical absence.

Jo Ann and I would start each day with five minutes to reflect on the events of the day before and to contemplate the day ahead. And I still make time for that five minutes every day, for her counsel and guidance, to let her remind me what is truly important in our work.

NRECA has been through an incredible amount of change, with Jo Ann leading the charge, joyfully.

Jo Ann has made a remarkable difference in the partnership between NRECA and our members. She enhanced our reputation in Washington DC. And she brought with her: openness to new ideas, an appetite for innovation, transparency and a highly-involved, very personal approach.

It's remarkable to me that this organization is so different after just three years, and that Jo Ann accomplished that internal change even as she spent so much time out with our membership. She was everywhere at once.

And she worked constantly. She was available all the time, accessible for any reason, to any individual on our team or in our membership. She was "Always On."

I've been fortunate to see that selfless work ethic in action from the time I joined Jo Ann's congressional staff in 2003.

She made decisions with the Three C's in mind and in order: Her Conscience, Her Constituents, and Her Caucus.

She fought for every job in the district. She fought for the cost of every prescription drug. She fought for every inch of four-lane highway. She fought for every veteran who needed to see a specialist, every expectant mother who needed a home nursing visit for pre-natal care. She fought for every flood and tornado victim. She fought for every man and woman called to active duty in the armed services.

Her conscience demanded that she represent the members of her community, regardless of how they voted or even if they voted. She represented her whole constitu-

ency. No matter how cantankerous. No matter how poor. No matter how rural.

It is safe to say, and I think you know this too, that Jo Ann Emerson did not choose politics. Politics chose Jo Ann Emerson.

Even her campaign slogan reflected her personal morality. Election after election, it was, "Putting People Before Politics." And it made her a beloved leader as a member of Congress.

"Work Days with Jo Ann" in the district is one of the best examples of how she would stand shoulder to shoulder with her constituents. Of course, for Work Days, Jo Ann chose to call the cattle auction at the sale barn, deliver UPS packages, serve customers from the drive-through window at McDonald's, and read the St. Louis Cardinals report on the local sports radio station.

Perhaps there were four C's: Conscience, Constituents, Caucus, and Cardinals.

Any way you describe her, the key to Jo Ann is her perspective. When Jo Ann came to NRECA, she did so with a great perspective on our membership. It was almost as though she had gone from one congressional district in southern Missouri to a bigger one—with 42 million people in it. She knew exactly what to do, and she went right to work.

Within six months, she had been up in a bucket truck, shot an advocacy advertisement for a national audience, opened up Facebook and social media to the staff, started a strategic planning process, coined the term Co-op Nation, and laid down a challenge to submit 1 million comments to the Environmental Protection Agency on the Clean Power Plan.

I bet I've heard Jo Ann say this a million times: Perception is reality. It's usually my "reality" being generally overruled by her perception of it.

Jo Ann uniquely understands the importance of NRECA to our members, the reason we exist. She appreciates the essential partnership between NRECA and the communities we serve.

If there is one way to summarize Jo Ann's contribution here, it is to say that—at a critical moment in our history—she changed NRECA's perception of the world and the world's perception of NRECA, and therefore she changed our reality.

And so she lifted the NRECA International Program into a position of prominence with our members and in Washington. She began to build the reputation of NRECA around it.

Jo Ann re-energized our communications channels and gave our members a fresh voice in Washington. She tackled member engagement from the ground up. She re-organized our approach to the experience we offer to NRECA members.

She relished walking up to a member and asking—point blank—what do you think we can do better at NRECA?

She understood that doing right is always more important than being right. She challenged us to work collaboratively. She made it possible for us to fail, and then showed us what we could learn from failure. She opened the doors to the CEO office, and she would sit and listen for a minute with anyone who asked for her time. Anyone.

Even small changes in perception make a big difference, though, like the annual picnic we will enjoy this evening where the NRECA Board members and the Arlington staff, interns and contractors will have a chance to share a meal and fellowship.

Hers has been a short chapter in NRECA's long history, but it is a most important one.

We can thank Jo Ann for helping us realize the exciting possibilities for a united, well-informed, ambitious and innovative membership. For peeling back the layers of NRECA in order to show our members that we are an organization full of leadership. For leading

us to a heartfelt mission of service. And for showing us how to do our work energetically, humbly, and, as only she could, joyfully.

This is a different organization thanks to Jo Ann Emerson. It is stronger yet more flexible. It thinks and communicates differently. It possesses a greater degree of self-awareness. It remains a beacon to others.

That's her legacy: Jo Ann prepared us to expand the relationship with our many partners—relationships in which we are the trusted resource, champion the cooperative cause and inspire the future.

Today, her story joins those of the CEOs who made her leadership of this organization possible. Jo Ann would not have had this opportunity if not for the courage and vision of Clyde Ellis, Robert Partridge, Bob Bergland, and Glenn English. We all, Jo Ann included, look to a future full of promise at NRECA.

And it is our greatest hope that Jo Ann will continue to improve, and that she will have the opportunity to live a life filled with the blessings of family and the chance to reflect on her significant accomplishments and many wonderful friendships built over a career well-spent in service to others.

On her behalf, thank you for allowing Jo Ann the privilege of leading NRECA. I know—and she agrees—that this has been the highest honor of her distinguished career.

HONORING OFFICER MICHAEL KATHERMAN

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Police Officer Michael Katherman, a beloved husband, father, son, and brother who tragically lost his life in the line of duty on June 14, 2016.

Officer Katherman was born on October 18, 1981, in San Jose, CA. After graduating from Valley Christian High School in 2000, Officer Katherman played basketball at Simpson University in Redding before returning to his hometown to pursue his lifelong goal of becoming a police officer. In 2005, Officer Katherman's dream became a reality when he joined the San Jose Police Department, serving the community grew up in. After receiving the Department's Outstanding Police Duty Award in 2009, Officer Katherman became a motorcycle officer in 2015.

At a memorial service on June 21, friends and colleagues fondly recalled Officer Katherman's selfless nature and passionate commitment to his fellow police officers. He was actively involved with the Keith Kelley Club, a local organization that helps the families of law enforcement officers facing hard times, and recently participated in the annual Police Unity Tour, a bicycle ride to honor fallen officers and raise funds for the National Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial. "Mike means so much to me because he represents everything I've wanted to become: a good moral person," said his supervisor, Sergeant John Carr.

Above all else, Officer Katherman was devoted to his family and his faith. On behalf of the people of California, whom Officer Katherman served so bravely, I extend my gratitude and deepest sympathies to his wife, April;

sons Josh and Jason; parents Tom and Diane; and his brother, Nate.

300TH ANNIVERSARY OF GEORGETOWN, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the town of Georgetown, ME. One of Maine's oldest and most historic communities, Georgetown was built with a spirit of determination and resiliency that still guides the community today, and this tricentennial is a time to celebrate the generations of hard-working and caring people who have made it such a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families.

The year of Georgetown's incorporation, 1716, was but one milestone in a long journey of progress. For thousands of years, the region where the mighty Kennebec River meets the sea served as fishing grounds for the Etchemin Tribe, and the extensive shell middens and other archeological sites are today a treasure trove of this ancient history.

In 1607, the English established Popham Colony on the opposite shore of the Kennebec. This was an event of profound importance to Maine and to our Nation, as the rugged pioneers of the short-lived colony crafted the first oceangoing sailing vessel built in North America and created an industry that remains vital to the Maine economy and to our national security.

Drawn by one of the finest natural harbors in New England, English settlers arrived within a few years of the Pilgrims landing at Plymouth in 1620. The early English influence is underscored by the fact that the first deeds granted to the settlers were signed by the Etchemin Sagamore, who was called Chief Robinhood by the newcomers and whose name lives on at many points of interest throughout the community. By 1716, Georgetown was a growing town with an economy driven by fishing, shipbuilding, and lumber and grain mills. The wealth produced by the sea and by hard work was invested in schools and churches to create a true community.

Today the people of Georgetown continue to build on those traditions. Fishing and boatbuilding are mainstays of the economy. Fine inns and restaurants support a thriving tourism industry. Reid State Park, a gift to the people of Maine from Georgetown businessman and civic leader Walter Reid, offers spectacular scenery and abundant wildlife that makes Georgetown a haven for outdoor enthusiasts and artists. An active historical society, library, and volunteer fire department demonstrate the spirit of this remarkable town.

This landmark anniversary is not just about something that is measured in calendar years. It is an occasion to celebrate the people who for more than three centuries have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a community. Thanks to those who came be-

fore, Georgetown has a wonderful history. Thanks to those who are there today, it has a bright future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING HENRY DIAMOND

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to a fellow Tennessean Henry Diamond, who passed away Sunday, February 21, here in Washington.

He was a champion for land and water conservation, a tireless advocate for the cause of protecting and conserving some of this country's greatest natural treasures. He had the ability and personality to work across the political spectrum with members of both parties, nongovernmental groups, State and local governments, and others.

Named by then Governor Nelson Rockefeller, Henry was one of the country's first commissioners of a newly created State environmental department. From that beginning, he left an indelible mark.

I think back to the seminal Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission some 50 years ago in which Henry played a prominent role. The commission led to the creation of our wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which has invested billions of dollars from oil and gas revenues in well over 40,000 projects all across this country.

I am reminded of his involvement some 20 years later when he created and chaired a task force that pressed for a timely review of the country's commitment to land and water conservation, which prompted President Reagan to establish the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. I chaired the commission when I was Governor of Tennessee. The commission's 1987 report called for a "prairie fire of local action" to inspire States and communities to build greenways and otherwise protect outdoor resources and provide opportunities for outdoor recreation.

And then there was his work with Lady Bird Johnson as director of the White House Conference on Natural Beauty, which rallied Americans to support environmental initiatives and paved the way for an array of laws and programs Congress enacted to clean our air and water and ensure the continuing productivity of the natural resources on which our economy and our quality of life depend.

His close friendship with the Rockefeller family led to their contribution to the Nation of some outstanding landscapes in Wyoming, Hawaii, and Vermont.

After he left public service, Henry started one of the premiere environmental law firms that still bears his name, Beveridge & Diamond, where he continued to champion conservation.

Henry coauthored "Land Use in America" with another great conservation leader Patrick Noonan to take stock of our Nation's accomplishments, challenges, and new thinking in how we build communities to meet the needs of American families while protecting the lands we treasure.

In 2008, Henry Diamond helped create a task force I cochaired with our former colleague Senator Jeff Bingaman that envisioned a new day in protecting landscapes of value and fulfilling the promise of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, tying in recreation, health, education, jobs, and more. This endeavor initiated one of President Obama's signature conservation programs, America's Great Outdoors, implemented by another of our former colleagues Ken Salazar, whom the President chose as his Secretary of the Interior.

There is so much more to Henry Diamond's long and distinguished career, from chairing the National Park Service's 75th anniversary conference to serving on various boards and commissions, including Resources for the Future, the Environmental Law Institute, and the Jackson Hole Preserve.

His many contributions were recognized in 2011 when he was awarded the Interior Department's highest citizen honor, the Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award.

Henry Diamond was an exceptional lawyer, a mentor to colleagues and young conservationists, and someone many of us regularly turned to for advice and support.

We will miss him. We will miss his tireless efforts to protect the best of our Nation's natural endowment, the lands and waters that sustain us. Our condolences to his wife, Bettye, and to their family and to all who valued his friendship.

May he rest in peace.

I ask that Henry's remembrance from Beveridge & Diamond and his New York Times obituary be printed in the RECORD.●

The material follows:

[Feb. 23, 2016]

HENRY L. DIAMOND—1932–2016

We are saddened to announce the passing of one of our founders, Henry L. Diamond.

Henry was an early advocate for conservation and greatly influenced the development of environmental law in the United States. His work on the Outdoor Recreation Resources Commission under President Kennedy laid the foundation for the creation of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and our national system of protecting wilderness areas and scenic rivers.

He later served as Executive Director of the 1965 White House Conference on Natural Beauty. This bipartisan event helped to elevate environmental issues on the national agenda in the years leading up to the establishment of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the passage of the major federal environmental legislation that guides our nation today. He was a member and Chairman of the President's Citizens Advisory Committees on Recreation and Natural Beauty and Environmental Quality.

He served as the first Commissioner of New York's Department of Environmental Con-

servations. As Commissioner, he led a 533-mile bike ride across the entire state of New York to advocate for the successful legislative passage and voter approval of the Environmental Quality Bond Act of 1972 that provided \$1.2 billion for water and air pollution control and land acquisition.

In 1975, Henry moved to the private sector, joining the nascent environmental law firm that would become Beveridge & Diamond. His practice included advising leading companies and numerous municipalities on high profile environmental matters. He also served as a mentor to many young lawyers inside and outside the firm.

While in private practice, Henry remained a tireless advocate for land and water conservation. He served on more than 30 boards and commissions, including Resources for the Future, the Environmental Law Institute, The Woodstock Foundation, The Jackson Hole Preserve, Inc., and Americans for Our Heritage and Recreation. He chaired the National Park Service 75th Anniversary Conference, which produced the influential Vail Report, and co-authored the 1996 survey Land Use in America. He recently co-chaired the bipartisan Outdoor Resources Review Group, sponsored by Senators Jeff Bingaman and Lamar Alexander. The group's report, Great Outdoors America, served as a catalyst for President Obama's America's Great Outdoors initiative.

Henry's close friendship with Laurance Rockefeller over many years allowed him to facilitate some of Mr. Rockefeller's gifts to the National Park Service. These included the JY Ranch in Wyoming, additions to Hawaii's Haleakala National Park, areas in the U.S. Virgin Islands, and the establishment of the Marsh-Billings-Rockefeller National Historical Park in Woodstock, Vermont. His pro bono work included representing the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy in its defense of the constitutionality of rail banking.

Henry's contributions to conservation and the field of environmental law are widely recognized. In October of last year, the Environmental Law Institute (ELI) presented Henry with its Environmental Achievement Award before an audience of more than 700 environmental professionals from the private sector, government and non-profit communities. With assistance from some of Henry's "contemporaries and collaborators," we produced a brief tribute video that debuted at the ELI award dinner after warm introductory remarks from former U.S. Park Service Superintendent Bob Stanton.

In 2011, he received the Secretary of the Interior's Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award, the Interior Department's highest honor for a private citizen. He was also the recipient of Pugsley Medal of the American Academy for Park & Recreation Administration in 2008.

As Pat Noonan, founder and Chairman Emeritus of The Conservation Fund, said in the ELI Tribute video, "Henry Diamond embodies the values of public service, political insight, and private sector activity. He has blended all of those into his life's work in a remarkable mosaic that has led to the conservation field, the environmental field, and sustainability that we now have today. It's a remarkable legacy."

Earlier this year, Henry penned an inspiring charge to us all in an article in the ELI Forum entitled, "Lessons Learned for Today." Calling for a return to the spirit of the 1965 White House Conference, Henry wrote, "We must return to the spirit of that afternoon in 1965, where government-citizen cooperation, high-level leadership, and bipartisanship can again be brought to bear on today's unfinished agenda. We cannot allow complacency to take hold. There is work to be done."

As all of Henry's friends and colleagues observed throughout the years, he was renowned as a witty story teller, a master at trivial pursuit, and an iconic commentator on political talent and lack thereof. He loved biking, hiking, reading history, and listening to the oral histories of presidents and other leaders.

Henry was an exceptional lawyer, a fine mentor to his colleagues, and a devoted conservationist. We are proud of uphold the high standards and traditions of excellence he set.

Thank you, Henry.

[From the New York Times]

HENRY DIAMOND, LAWYER AT FOREFRONT OF CONSERVATION MOVEMENT, DIES AT 83

Henry L. Diamond, a lawyer who went from the vanguard of a nascent environmental movement half a century ago to become New York State's first environmental conservation commissioner, appointed by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller on the inaugural Earth Day in 1970, died on Sunday in Washington. He was 83.

His death, at a hospital there, was confirmed by his wife, Elizabeth, who did not specify a cause but said Mr. Diamond had Parkinson's disease.

Mr. Diamond may not have been a gung-ho outdoorsman in the mold of Theodore Roosevelt; he liked to bike and hike and was a frustrated gardener. In 1959, however, after he had hitched his political star to the Rockefellers instead of the Kennedys, who were also courting him, he embarked on a career in conservation and a fruitful 40-year association with Laurance Rockefeller, the Rockefeller brother whose portfolio was devoted to the environment.

At the time, in the early 1960s, "ecology was thought to be for eccentrics," Mr. Diamond recalled in a recent article in *The Environmental Forum*.

"Conservation was an afterthought on political platforms," he continued, "slightly ahead of Esperanto and a single tax."

But by 1970, the environmental movement had gathered steam, prompting activists to declare April 22 of that year Earth Day and to promote it as a day of national consciousness-raising about environmental threats.

Governor Rockefeller chose the day to sign legislation creating the State Department of Environmental Conservation and to name Mr. Diamond, at 37, to lead it, months before Congress established a comparable federal agency.

The governor went so far as to declare that people were "ready to slow down the pace of economic progress to protect the environment."

After his appointment, Mr. Diamond symbolically took to the streets to help collect litter. In the preceding years, as a protégé of Laurance Rockefeller, he had served on White House advisory panels on conservation.

As the state commissioner, Mr. Diamond biked 533 miles from Niagara Falls to his home in Port Washington on Long Island in 1972 to promote a \$1.2 billion state bond issue to pay for water and air pollution controls and to purchase and protect pristine private land.

"It has been just crazy enough to give us an invaluable amount of publicity," he said on reaching New York City.

The bond referendum passed.

During his more than three years in the job, New York was in the forefront of efforts to ban certain pesticides, eliminate polluting phosphates from detergents and protect vast swaths of the Adirondacks.

The state also became ensnarled in a controversy over Consolidated Edison's plans to build a hydroelectric plant at Storm King

Mountain in the Hudson Valley. Mr. Diamond said at the time that he had grave reservations about the plan, but he also said he had no choice but to approve a permit because his department's jurisdiction was limited to the project's impact on water quality. Environmentalists defeated the project after 18 years of legal and administrative challenges.

He resigned the post in 1973 to become executive director of the Commission on Critical Choices for Americans, a body created by Governor Rockefeller to set goals for the nation and to keep him in the limelight for a potential presidential campaign.

In 1975, Mr. Diamond joined what became Beveridge & Diamond, a Washington law firm that describes itself as the nation's largest dedicated to environmental and natural resources law. Through the firm, he advised corporations and municipalities and served on dozens of nonprofit boards and commissions.

Henry Louis Diamond was born in Chattanooga, Tenn., on May 24, 1932, a descendant of Jews from Russia and Poland who paused in their migration for a generation or so in Ireland. His father, Louis, was a shopkeeper. His mother was the former Esther Deich.

Mr. Diamond received a bachelor's degree from Vanderbilt University in 1954, served in the Army and graduated from Georgetown University Law Center.

In addition to his wife, the former Elizabeth Tatum, who is known as Betty, he is survived by their daughter, Laura Diamond Decker.

After law school, Mr. Diamond was hired as a news writer for CBS-TV in Washington. He also worked for the federal government's broadcast enterprise Voice of America. But he aimed much higher: the White House.

Interviewed by Robert F. Kennedy for a job in his brother John F. Kennedy's 1960 presidential campaign, Mr. Diamond turned him down, apparently concluding that the candidate was too young to be elected and that Nelson Rockefeller, a Republican, offered more promise. Kennedy was 43 when he was elected.

A friend later introduced him to Laurance Rockefeller, who by then was the chairman of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, an advisory panel created to review the nation's environmental challenges and recommend legislative remedies.

Mr. Rockefeller hired Mr. Diamond to edit the commission's 27-volume report, which inspired legislation to preserve the nation's wilderness and scenic rivers.

President Lyndon B. Johnson named Mr. Diamond counsel to a Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, which was charged with drafting an environmental agenda. President Richard M. Nixon reappointed him to its successor group, the president's Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, and Mr. Diamond became its chairman.

A 1965 White House conference convened by President Johnson's citizens committee recommended strip-mining controls, bans on billboards and burying power lines.

The conference created "a bridge from traditional conservation to a new environmentalism and prompted a surge of groundbreaking legislation." Mr. Diamond wrote in *The Environmental Forum*.

In 2011, the federal Interior Department gave him its Lifetime Conservation Achievement Award.●

TRIBUTE TO BILL COORS

● Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, today I want to celebrate Bill Coors' 100th birthday, and recognize his extraor-

dinary leadership, innovation, and drive to help build the Coors Brewing Company, a great symbol of success in the State of Colorado.

Bill was born in Colorado on August 11, 1916, and went on to earn his undergraduate degree at Princeton University. After finishing his master's degree, Bill started his work at Coors and eventually became the president of the company in 1952.

The success of Coors is a direct result of Bill's impressive leadership and desire to produce only the highest quality products. Under his management, Bill advanced Coors from a regional brewery to one that was marked as a major competitor on the national stage. Known for the innovative two-piece aluminum can, implementing a program to offer customers money back on returned cans, and bolstering efforts to strengthen recycling programs, Bill demonstrated remarkable creativity and an evident desire to protect Colorado's environment.

Colorado is steeped in rich history, and Bill has without a doubt played a major role influencing that history. Bill not only helped transform Coors into a national brewery sensation but also advanced the prosperity of Colorado. Congratulations on this incredible achievement.●

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPE COD COMMERCIAL FISHERMEN'S ALLIANCE

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, fishing is a way of life on Cape Cod. But it is not always smooth sailing. That is why, in 1991, a group of Cape Cod fishermen came together to respond to the challenges facing the fishing industry in order to protect their way of life. This year, the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance, as they are now known, is celebrating their 25th anniversary of advocating for commercial fishermen and protecting their livelihood.

A few local fishermen created what is now a nationally recognized nonprofit organization and leading voice for Cape Cod's commercial fishermen. Today the organization represents 400 independent small businesses that annually bring in over 12 million pounds of seafood worth over \$16 million. They are a vital component to the local economies of the cape towns, Cape Cod as a whole, and the entire Bay State.

These fishermen have firsthand experience at sea and understand the importance of a healthy ocean and fisheries. They have come together for 25 years to share their solutions and their successes. The Fishermen's Alliance provides an outlet for the knowledge of generations of Cape Cod fishermen to be passed to the next generation. It provides help for entrepreneurial fishermen who want to use the latest business tools to enhance their efficiency and profitability. Whether it is loans or lobster, dogfish or data, the Fishermen's Alliance provides critical sup-

port to the cape's fishing industry today and works to ensure that it has a vibrant future for many years to come.

But it is not just about Cape Cod or Massachusetts, the Fishermen's Alliance is sharing its success story with other fishing communities, too. In 2015, they published a detailed roadmap for starting a permit bank based on their experience running loan programs for groundfish and scallops. This guide will help local fishermen across the country create sustainable and successful businesses in their communities. Just as cod from the waters off the cape helped sustain America in its early years, the Fishermen's Alliance ideas can help sustain small boat fishermen around America.

The Fishermen's Alliance truly lives up to their slogan: "Small Boats. Big Ideas." They are constantly striving for a better tomorrow. They have provided my office with valuable insight and perspective for many years. Their work to create sustainable fisheries for Cape Cod and future generations of fishermen distinguishes them across this great Nation and today in the U.S. Senate. I once again congratulate the Cape Cod Commercial Fishermen's Alliance on their 25th anniversary.●

REMEMBERING GARRY NEIL DRUMMOND

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of my friend Garry Neil Drummond of Birmingham, AL, who passed away on July 13, 2016. He will be long remembered as an iconic leader and skilled entrepreneur who left a positive impact on the coal and mining industry and the State of Alabama.

Garry was born in Walker County, AL. He earned a bachelor of science in civil engineering from the University of Alabama in 1961. After graduation, he joined Drummond Company, Inc., and became the first engineer hired by the company.

Garry's father, H.E. Drummond, began the Drummond Coal Company in Sipsey, AL, in 1935 to serve as a coal provider for farms and households. At age 15, Garry began working in coal mines across Walker County with his father. He was eventually named chief executive officer of the Drummond Company, and he served in this role for more than 50 years.

Garry was a founder of the American Coal Foundation, and in 1978, he served as the first chairman of the Mining and Reclamation Council of America, which later merged with the National Coal Association. Garry also served on the boards of the National Mining Association and the Alabama Coal Association.

He was a longtime member of the University of Alabama board of trustees and served as president pro tem of the board. He was also the university's "Outstanding Alumnus" for 1987-88. Garry was inducted into the Alabama

Academy of Honor in 1989, the Alabama Engineering Hall of Fame in 1997, the Alabama Business Hall of Fame in 2003, and the Birmingham Business Hall of Fame in 2010.

A dedicated civil servant, Garry served on the boards of the Big Oak Ranch, Inc., Boy Scouts of America Greater Alabama Council, the Business Council of Alabama, the Economic Development Partnership of Alabama, the Rotary Club of Birmingham, and Glenwood, Inc.

Largely due to Garry's steadfast leadership, Drummond Company today includes large coal mines in Alabama and Colombia, South America, a worldwide coal sales organization, ABC Coke—the largest merchant foundry coke producer in the United States—and a real estate division with major developments in Lakeland, FL, Palm Springs, CA, and Birmingham, AL.

Garry's many successes, accomplishments, and contributions to the State of Alabama and the coal and mining industries will not soon be forgotten. He was truly a remarkable businessman, an unwavering leader, a devoted civil servant, and a loyal friend.

I offer my deepest condolences to Garry's wife, Peggy Drummond, his four children, his large extended family, and countless friends as they celebrate his exceptional life and mourn this great loss.●

RECOGNIZING THE PURPLE ROSE THEATRE

● Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, today I wish to pay special tribute to the Purple Rose Theatre in Chelsea, MI, as the theatre celebrates its 25th season.

The Purple Rose is not just an extraordinary regional theatre; its world-class productions have inspired artists, performers, and audiences across our State and Nation.

The Purple Rose Theatre was founded in 1991 by actor and Michigan native, Jeff Daniels. Starting out in an old used car and bus garage, the theatre now features an intimate feel and authentic 1930s theatre decor.

Michigan is home to a vibrant performing arts community, and the Purple Rose is a unique gem and special part of Michigan's rich and diverse cultural fabric.

The theatre is a home for all types of artists, whether new and aspiring performers or experienced professionals. It provides new performers a place to grow and learn as they master their craft.

We are all fortunate to be able to enjoy the quality, professional productions of the Purple Rose at affordable prices.

The theatre has also been a great community partner. It offers readings and lectures through a partnership with the Chelsea District Library and has helped make Chelsea a thriving destination for the arts.

I am proud to join the theatre's leadership, sponsors, board members, art-

ists, and patrons on July 30, 2016, for the "Cue 25: Lights Up!" celebration and benefit to reflect on the past 25 years of memories and accomplishments and look forward to many more years of success.

Congratulations to Jeff Daniels, the theatre's staff, and countless others responsible for the Purple Rose's tremendous success and growth these past 25 years—and best wishes for many more years of continued success.●

TRIBUTE TO GARY BOOTH

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today, I wish to honor Gary Booth, a lifelong resident of Billings, Montana, and a decorated Vietnam veteran.

I ask that the remarks that I made in Montana at a ceremony honoring Gary Booth be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Gary, on behalf of myself, my fellow Montanans, and my fellow Americans, I would like to extend our deepest gratitude for your service to this nation.

Gary was born on July 25, 1944, in St. Anthony, Idaho, to Francis and Fern Booth. He was welcomed by his older brother Edwin, and joined by his younger brother William shortly thereafter. His father Francis bought, sold, and transported produce all across the west—an occupation that brought the family to Billings in 1948.

So Billings became the town that Gary grew up in, attending the Lockwood School from grades 1–9, before graduating from Billings Senior High in 1962.

After high school, he tried his hand at fanning and auto repair, before going back into the family trucking businesses. But he wasn't settled long before he got the call; it was September 30th of 1965 and he was being called for duty.

Gary answered the call, but stuck to his principles, enlisting as a conscientious objector. This meant he would protect and serve, while forgoing the aid of a firearm. So he was shipped off to Fort Sam Houston in San Antonio, Texas, where he went through basic training, as well as an additional 10 weeks of advance medic training. After that, he joined the Fourth Infantry Division at Fort Louis, in Tacoma, Washington, where he continued to train until his comrades shipped out from Seattle in June of 1966.

He and the rest of the Fourth Infantry Division reached the eastern coast of Vietnam about a month later, in late July, arriving at the Port of Qui Nhon (QUINN-YAWN). From there they trekked more than a hundred miles to the west-coast city of Pleiku (PLAY-COO), which would serve as their base of operations as they patrolled the dense jungle spanning the border between Cambodia and Vietnam.

This was in November, and for the next few months Gary and his fellow soldiers cycled through weeks of search and destroy missions in the jungles of Pleiku, punctuated by brief stints back at the larger artillery base, where they kept watch and took whatever opportunity they could to "rest."

It was towards the end of the day, during one of these search and destroy missions, when the sun was about to set, that Gary and his comrades came across an open clearing in the jungle where they decided to set up camp for the night.

It was now February, months had passed since their arrival, and they had fallen into a routine. Part of the company would stay back and set up camp for the night, while a

few soldiers—known as "OP's"—took up observation posts, and two patrol squads headed out to secure a 100-yard perimeter around the clearance.

Before the soldiers disbursed, Gary gave everyone a prodigious reminder. "If anyone needs me," he yelled, "holler 'Doc,' instead of 'Medic.'" This was because the North Vietnamese had figured out what "medic" meant, making the soldier who responded to that call instant high-value targets.

With that, the soldiers set off. But just minutes later, a familiar sound rang out. It was the click of a gun being chambered, the only warning the patrol squad received before being ambushed by a battalion four times their size.

The basecamp was soon under fire and as the machine gunners took up arms, the others soldiers sought cover behind a sparse line of trees. About 10 minutes into the firefight one of the machine gunners called for help; his weapon had been hit by enemy fire, dislocating the barrel of his gun and propelling shrapnel into his right shoulder.

Under heavy fire, Gary ran to the his fellow soldier's aid, bandaging his wounds as the gunner used his bare hand to hold the barrel of his broken gun in place and return enemy fire. After Gary had finished bandaging the gunner's shoulder, he tied another bandage around the gun to help steady the barrel and protect the gunner's hand from the intense heat.

Once Gary made his way back to the trees, another soldier began calling for help. This time it was an OP who had been shot in the lower back as he was returning from his observation post. Gary yelled at the man—who had stopped about 50 yards away from him—to take cover behind his tree, but the soldier was too injured to move.

So with bullets raining down and mortar bombs going off around him, Gary directed the nearest machine gunners to give him cover as he ran head first into the line of fire to retrieve his fallen comrade. Gary slung the injured man over his back and ran for cover. Once the pair was back behind the trees, Gary went to work bandaging the man's wounds and, once he got the bleeding to stop, called for help to get the man back to basecamp.

About 10 minutes later, Gary was called upon again. The machine gunner with the broken barrel had now taken a bullet to the foot. So Gary ran over and was tending to the wound when, all of a sudden, he felt a sharp pain pierce his left leg. He had taken a bullet directly to the femur. His leg was broken so, finding himself immobilized, Gary called for his fellow soldiers to get help.

There were a total of five medics dispersed among the platoon, so his comrades pulled him off to the perimeter of the basecamp while he waited for a fellow medic to arrive. The canopy was so dense that air support couldn't reach the camp by helicopter, so the medic put a splint around Gary's leg and covered him with a poncho. All he could do now was wait out the fight. When the fighting finally subsided the next morning, Gary's poncho was covered in shrapnel and debris, but he was still alive.

The U.S. had prevailed, but only after eight soldiers had died and 39 more were wounded. Even more would die if the wounded weren't evacuated quickly, so the soldiers went to work clearing space for air support to land. Every soldier carried with him a small amount of C-4, usually in the band of their sock. Each individual's piece was then collected and combined to make an explosive large enough to blow a hole through the jungle's thick canopy.

Finally, after surviving hours under siege—without ever setting hands on a firearm—Gary was air lifted out of the battle

zone to the nearest base. From there he was shipped off to the Philippines, where he was confined to a body cast for about a week before being transferred to an army hospital in Japan. Gary spent the next three months recovering in Japan, with the help of his younger brother who, in a twist of fate, had been stationed as a medic at the very same place.

Eventually, Gary returned to Fort Louis in Tacoma, Washington, where he spent almost a year learning how to walk again. Once he recovered, Gary was medically discharged from the army with 60% disability. He returned to Billings, went into business with his father, and spent the next 43 years in the trucking industry.

Gary has been married to his wife Ellen, a fellow Billings native, for 42 years and together they raised their son Christopher, who Gary adopted when he was just three years old. Christopher and his wife Gale now have two sons of their own, making Gary a proud grandfather to Christopher Murphree—who served in Afghanistan as a member of the National Guard—and Donovan Arnold, a boy scout whose troop conducted a beautiful flag ceremony here today.

The family all still lives in Billings, where Gary volunteers at his local VFW post—Mark Curtis #6774. He and a group of fellow veterans perform flag ceremonies and 21 Gun Salutes at military funerals throughout the county. Gary has performed at nearly two dozen military funerals since joining the group in January.

I now have the profound honor of presenting Gary with his own set of military honors. For his courage and valor in battle, Gary Booth received the:

Purple Heart
Bronze Star Medal
Good Conduct Medal
Combat Medic Badge 1st award
Republic of Vietnam Campaign Ribbon w/Service
Vietnamese Service Medal with 1 bronze service star
National Defense Service Medal

Gary, these medals serve as a small token of our country's appreciation for your incredible service and profound sacrifice.

You are a true American hero. Thank you so much for your service.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:27 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 2840. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to

authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds for active shooter training, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3394. An act to amend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to allow for the use of certain assets of foreign persons and entities to satisfy certain judgments against terrorist parties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4768. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission.

H.R. 5658. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 142. Concurrent resolution supporting the bid of Los Angeles, California, to bring the 2024 Summer Olympic Games back to the United States and pledging the cooperation of Congress with respect to that bid.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 4639. An act to reauthorize the Office of Special Counsel, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide modifications to authorities relating to the Office of Special Counsel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4768. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5421. An act to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5658. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 10. An act to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4465. An act to decrease the deficit by consolidating and selling Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4487. An act to reduce costs of Federal real estate, improve building security, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4901. An act to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

Report to accompany S. 2850, A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-301).

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

H.R. 1656. A bill to provide for additional resources for the Secret Service, and to improve protections for restricted areas (Rept. No. 114-302).

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. THUNE (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BURR, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3173. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a 90-day EHR reporting period for the determination of whether an eligible professional or eligible hospital is a meaningful EHR user and to remove the all-or-nothing approach to meaningful use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3174. A bill to establish an Interagency Council on Workforce Attachment to promote effective and coordinated workforce attachment strategies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable first-time homebuyer tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 3176. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance efforts to address antibiotic resistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3177. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax-exempt financing of certain government-owned buildings; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3178. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit hospitals in all-urban States to be considered Medicare dependent hospitals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3179. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and extend the credit for carbon dioxide sequestration; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 3180. A bill to improve hiring and human resources flexibilities for Federal agencies in geographic areas affected by unique situations or circumstances, including remoteness, that cause recruitment and retention challenges, and to provide agencies experiencing such challenges with a toolkit of resources to overcome those challenges; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 3181. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3182. A bill to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3183. A bill to prohibit the circumvention of control measures used by Internet ticket sellers to ensure equitable consumer access to tickets for any given event, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3184. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3185. A bill to provide that section 4108(5)(C)(iv) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 may be known as "Bree's Law"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3186. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide for active shooter and mass casualty incident response assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3187. A bill to increase the authorization of the National Transportation Safety Board through fiscal year 2020, to require the NTSB to investigate major oil and other hazardous materials derailments, to expand the Secretary of Transportation's emergency order authority, and to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a volatility standard for crude oil transported by rail; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3189. A bill to improve access to health care in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3190. A bill to enhance the rural health workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 3191. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to improve the quality of health care furnished in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 3192. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex

Diekmann Peak"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3193. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award competitive grants to enhance collaboration between State child welfare and juvenile justice systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3194. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote healthy eating and physical activity among children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3195. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve Medicare beneficiary access to ventilators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3196. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to transition the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to a 5-member board of directors; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3197. A bill to reestablish the Office of Noise Abatement and Control in the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3198. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. HATCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 3199. A bill to require the appropriation of funds to use a fee, fine, penalty, or proceeds from a settlement received by a Federal agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3200. A bill to prohibit mandatory or compulsory check-off programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3201. A bill to prohibit certain practices relating to certain commodity promotion programs, to require greater transparency by those programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3202. A bill to facilitate the transport of additional hydrocarbons to extend the life of the trans-Alaska oil pipeline, to further American energy security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3203. A bill to provide for economic development and access to resources in Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3204. A bill to provide for the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the

State of Alaska for the construction of a road between King Cove and Cold Bay; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 3205. A bill to allow local Federal officials to determine the manner in which non-motorized uses may be permitted in wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 3206. A bill to promote worldwide access to the Internet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3207. A bill to authorize the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide playback equipment in all formats; considered and passed.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit fully refundable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. KING):

S. 3209. A bill to require the use of prescription drug monitoring programs and to facilitate information sharing among States; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 530. A resolution supporting the termination of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives established pursuant to House Resolution 461, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS:

S. Res. 531. A resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program and recognizing the significant contributions of Albert Einstein Fellows; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. Res. 532. A resolution celebrating the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 533. A resolution designating July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day"; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 534. A resolution relative to the death of William L. Armstrong, former

United States Senator for the State of Colorado; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Con. Res. 47. A concurrent resolution expressing support for fostering closer economic and commercial ties between the United States and the United Kingdom following the decision of the people of the United Kingdom to withdraw from the European Union; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 366

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 366, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 772

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 772, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medi-

care program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1072, a bill to require the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics.

S. 1088

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1088, a bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for voter registration through the Internet, and for other purposes.

S. 1139

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1139, a bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require States to provide for same day registration.

S. 1176

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1176, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1400

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

S. 1520

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to protect victims of stalking from violence.

S. 1536

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1536, a bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Regulatory Flexibility Act), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent,

nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 2031

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) 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. 2034

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

S. 2042

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2108

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2108, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an extension of certain long-term care hospital payment rules and the moratorium on the establishment of certain hospitals and facilities.

S. 2272

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 regarding proprietary institutions of higher education in order to protect students and taxpayers.

S. 2352

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2352, a bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to require mandatory reporting of incidents of child abuse or neglect, and for other purposes.

S. 2424

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2424, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

S. 2483

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

S. 2484

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2484, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XI of the Social Security Act to promote cost savings and quality care under the Medicare program through the use of telehealth and remote patient monitoring services, and for other purposes.

S. 2531

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2531, a bill to authorize State and local governments to divest from entities that engage in commerce-related or investment-related boycott, divestment, or sanctions activities targeting Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2590

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2590, a bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to improve access to, and the delivery of, children's health services through school-based health centers, and for other purposes.

S. 2595

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 2595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 2599

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2599, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of hotel room rates, and for other purposes.

S. 2612

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2612, a bill to ensure United States jurisdiction over offenses committed by United States personnel stationed in Canada in furtherance of border security initiatives.

S. 2763

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2763, a bill to provide the

victims of Holocaust-era persecution and their heirs a fair opportunity to recover works of art confiscated or misappropriated by the Nazis.

S. 2785

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2785, a bill to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country.

S. 2823

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the section 45 credit for refined coal from steel industry fuel, and for other purposes.

S. 2895

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

S. 2912

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2912, a bill to authorize the use of unapproved medical products by patients diagnosed with a terminal illness in accordance with State law, and for other purposes.

S. 2993

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2993, a bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to change the spill prevention, control, and countermeasure rule with respect to certain farms.

S. 3027

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3027, a bill to clarify the boundary of Acadia National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 3083

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3083, a bill to provide housing opportunities in the United States through modernization of various housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3127

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 3127, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to enhance protections of Native Amer-

ican cultural objects, and for other purposes.

S. 3129

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3129, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2016.

S. 3132

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3132, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide service dogs to certain veterans with severe post-traumatic stress disorder.

S. 3134

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3134, a bill to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation and gender identity in certain surveys, and for other purposes.

S. 3140

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3140, a bill to prevent a fiscal crisis by enacting legislation to balance the Federal budget through reductions of discretionary and mandatory spending.

S. 3155

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to amend chapter 97 of title 28, United States Code, to clarify the exception to foreign sovereign immunity set forth in section 1605(a)(3) of such title.

S. 3159

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3159, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax credits for energy storage technologies, and for other purposes.

S. 3160

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3160, a bill to require all Department of State employees to use Department-managed email accounts and telephonic systems for all work-related electronic communications, to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress on any security violations within the Department, to provide training to Department of State employees on the rules and procedures governing the appropriate handling of classified information, to reform the process for identifying and archiving classified information, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S.J. RES. 16

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 16, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors 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. CON. RES. 46

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 46, a concurrent resolution expressing support for the goal of ensuring that all Holocaust victims live with dignity, comfort, and security in their remaining years, and urging the Federal Republic of Germany to continue to reaffirm its commitment to comprehensively address the unique health and welfare needs of vulnerable Holocaust victims, including home care and other medically prescribed needs.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) 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. 515

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 515, a resolution welcoming Prime Minister Lee Hsien-Loong to the United States and reaffirming Singapore's strategic partnership with the

United States, encompassing broad and robust economic, military-to-military, law enforcement, and counterterrorism cooperation.

S. RES. 521

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 521, a resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2016 as National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month.

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3184. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday I had the privilege of attending a memorial service for the brave Dallas police officers who lost their lives almost a week ago. It was a fitting tribute to these courageous men who fought evil and who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Through such a sad and tumultuous time, the brave leadership of Mayor Mike Rawlings and Police Chief Brown has been a constant source of inspiration.

A number of people have stopped me in the hallway and said: Have you seen or heard this police chief in Dallas?

I said: Absolutely.

Have you seen the sort of leadership and the calming influence Mayor Rawlings has provided in a time where people are confused, distraught, angry? It has been very impressive. They have gone above and beyond the call to bring as much comfort to the city as they possibly can. While they have shown the world what poise under pressure looks like, I want to say how proud I am of their dedication to the people of Dallas and their steady and unwavering hand.

The events of last week serve as a terrible reminder that our law enforcement officers face multiple threats in their line of duty every day and that some twisted, deranged individuals will stop at nothing to target them.

Mayor Rawlings was right yesterday when he said that the officers in Dallas did nothing wrong. He is absolutely right. They were just doing their job.

Here is what I would like to hear a little bit more about from our leaders here in Washington and around the

country: There is no justification—zero, zip, nada—no justification for violence against police officers. There is none. You can't justify what happened in Dallas with something that happened in Ferguson, in Baltimore, or some other place around the country.

Chief Brown said that what we need to do is not paint with a broad brush the 99 percent of police officers who do what they should be doing in a brave and heroic sort of way because of the actions of the 1 percent or whatever the rogue individual might be. What he said we need to do is to hold the officers who do misbehave, who don't respect the communities they are serving, and who cross the line—we need to hold them accountable, and he is exactly right.

What I hope we will hear more about, as the President talked about yesterday, is the importance of having this national discussion about race, about law enforcement. What I hope we hear more of is some clarity from our national leaders. Our police officers in Dallas were doing nothing more than keeping order and protecting civilians in peaceful protests.

The supreme irony in Dallas is that the people protesting were part of Black Lives Matter. Who was protecting them? The very police officers targeted by this deranged shooter.

Actually, as President Obama acknowledged yesterday, the Dallas Police Department is a national model for how to deescalate conflict in communities and work with communities to reduce crime. Again, it is another irony that this terrible tragedy occurred there against that department.

In the aftermath of this great national tragedy, we do need to come together as a country and have some uncomfortable discussions, perhaps. We need to get beyond the talking points in our comfort zone. But the one thing we need to do absolutely is to come together to show our support for those who get up every morning, put on their badge, and walk out the door not knowing if they will come home at the end of the day. We can do that by sending a clear message that America will not tolerate those who seek to kill those who are duty-bound to defend us. We will not stand for it. This should go without saying.

In the aftermath of the Dallas attack, we have another chance to stand up for law enforcement and stand united for policies that better support them.

Today I am introducing legislation with our colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, and our colleague from Texas, Senator CRUZ, called the Back the Blue Act, which would do just that.

Many folks have seen the hashtag "Back the Blue" on social media, online. It is a small way for Americans to show their solidarity with our law enforcement officials and their families following this tragedy, and that is where this legislation gets its name.

The Back the Blue Act would create a new Federal crime for killing or attempting to kill a Federal judge, a law enforcement officer, or someone funded by Federal funds—a federally funded public safety officer. Under this bill, an offender would be subject to a range of penalties, from a minimum of a 30-year mandatory minimum sentence for murder ranging up to the death penalty.

I think it is more important than ever for us to make this kind of clear and unequivocal statement about our support for law enforcement. This is the very glue that holds our country together, and without the safety and security they provide, none of our other freedoms are really possible.

The Back the Blue Act would also create a new crime for assaulting a law enforcement official and create a new law prohibiting the fleeing to avoid punishment for assaulting a law enforcement official. As I said, there is no excuse, no justification—none whatsoever—for attacking a law enforcement officer. Most of us learned that from our parents while growing up, but apparently some people didn't learn that lesson, and we ought to make clear to those who did not get the memo, who did not learn that lesson, that assaulting a law enforcement officer is absolutely beyond the pale.

We need to show that we value the lives of our law enforcement, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out crimes against them accountable. The Back the Blue Act would do that.

The Back the Blue Act would also expedite court proceedings for cases that involve the death of a public safety officer.

It would make sure criminals aren't rewarded for committing a crime by recovering money damages from injuries they sustained while committing a felony or violent crime.

It would help strengthen our communities by allowing grant funding to be put toward efforts to foster more trust between police and those around them. This is something I am particularly proud of that has been happening in Dallas under Mayor Rawlings and Chief Brown. They make it absolutely clear that the responsibility of the law enforcement official is not to sit in their police car and wait for something to happen, to wait for someone to call; they believe in community policing, making sure law enforcement mixes and intermingles with the very people they are supposed to protect. Frequently, those same people can be the eyes and the ears that provide essential information to law enforcement so they can prevent criminal acts from occurring in the first place.

The final thing I would mention that this legislation would do is it would allow law enforcement officers to carry firearms in Federal facilities.

These are not expansive proposals; they are tailored measures that would better serve the men and women who serve our communities every day.

If now is not the time to show our support for law enforcement, when is? With the attention of the Nation riveted on events like those that occurred in Dallas, I think it is critically important that we take advantage of this opportunity to make this statement of solidarity.

Yesterday President Obama stressed the need to translate our words and prayers into action. This legislation is responsive to what the President said. It is one thing to offer people our best wishes and our thoughts and prayers; it is another thing to actually do something about it. This legislation does that.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation. We can do more for our police officers and their families, and we can start with the Back the Blue Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3184

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 "Back the Blue Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. PROTECTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1123. Killing of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the terms 'Federal law enforcement officer' and 'United States judge' have the meanings given those terms in section 115;

"(2) the term 'federally funded public safety officer' means a public safety officer or judicial officer for a public agency that—

"(A) receives Federal financial assistance; and

"(B) is an agency of an entity that is a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, or any territory or possession of the United States, an Indian tribe, or a unit of local government of that entity;

"(3) the term 'firefighter' includes an individual serving as an official recognized or designated member of a legally organized volunteer fire department and an officially recognized or designated public employee member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew;

"(4) the term 'judicial officer' means a judge or other officer or employee of a court, including prosecutors, court security, pretrial services officers, court reporters, and corrections, probation, and parole officers;

"(5) the term 'law enforcement officer' means an individual, with arrest powers, involved in crime or juvenile delinquency control or reduction or enforcement of the laws;

"(6) the term 'public agency' includes a court system, the National Guard of a State to the extent the personnel of that National Guard are not in Federal service, and the defense forces of a State authorized by section 109 of title 32; and

"(7) the term 'public safety officer' means an individual serving a public agency in an

official capacity, as a law enforcement officer, as a firefighter, as a chaplain, or as a member of a rescue squad or ambulance crew.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to—

"(1) kill, or attempt or conspire to kill—

"(A) a United States judge;

"(B) a Federal law enforcement officer; or

"(C) a federally funded public safety officer while that officer is engaged in official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties; or

"(2) kill a former United States judge, Federal law enforcement officer, or federally funded public safety officer on account of the past performance of official duties.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (b) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years or for life, or, if death results, shall be sentenced to not less than 30 years and not more than life, or may be punished by death."

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 51 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"1123. Killing of law enforcement officers."

(b) ASSAULT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 120. Assaults of law enforcement officers

"(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'federally funded State or local law enforcement officer' means an individual involved in crime and juvenile delinquency control or reduction, or enforcement of the laws (including a police, corrections, probation, or parole officer) who works for a public agency (that receives Federal financial assistance) of a State of the United States or the District of Columbia.

"(b) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful to assault a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer while engaged in or on account of the performance of official duties, or assaults any person who formerly served as a federally funded State or local law enforcement officer on account of the performance of such person's official duties during such service, or because of the actual or perceived status of the person as a Federally funded state or local law enforcement officer.

"(c) PENALTY.—Any person that violations subsection (b) shall be subject to a fine under this title and—

"(1) if the assault resulted in bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be imprisoned not less than 2 years and not more than 10 years;

"(2) if the assault resulted in substantial bodily injury (as defined in section 113), shall be imprisoned not less than 5 years and not more than 20 years;

"(3) if the assault resulted in serious bodily injury (as defined in section 1365), shall be imprisoned for not less than 10 years;

"(4) if a deadly or dangerous weapon was used during and in relation to the assault, shall be imprisoned for not less than 20 years; and

"(5) shall be imprisoned for not more than 1 year in any other case.

"(d) CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—No prosecution of any offense described in this section may be undertaken by the United States, except under the certification in writing of the Attorney General, or a designee, that—

"(A) the State does not have jurisdiction;

"(B) the State has requested that the Federal Government assume jurisdiction;

"(C) the verdict or sentence obtained pursuant to State charges left demonstratively

unvindicated the Federal interest in eradicating bias-motivated violence; or

“(D) a prosecution by the United States is in the public interest and necessary to secure substantial justice.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of Federal officers, or a Federal grand jury, to investigate possible violations of this section.

“(e) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

“(1) OFFENSES NOT RESULTING IN DEATH.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no person shall be prosecuted, tried, or punished for any offense under this section unless the indictment for such offense is found, or the information for such offense is instituted, not later than 7 years after the date on which the offense was committed.

“(2) OFFENSES RESULTING IN DEATH.—An indictment or information alleging that an offense under this section resulted in death may be found or instituted at any time without limitation.”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 7 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“120. Killing of law enforcement officers.”.

(c) FLIGHT TO AVOID PROSECUTION FOR KILLING LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS.—

(1) OFFENSE.—Chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any person to move or travel in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to avoid prosecution, or custody or confinement after conviction, under the laws of the place from which the person flees or under section 1114 or 1123, for a crime consisting of the killing, an attempted killing, or a conspiracy to kill a Federal judge or Federal law enforcement officer (as those terms are defined in section 115), or a federally funded public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1123).

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person that violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title and imprisoned for not less than 10 years, in addition to any other term of imprisonment for any other offense relating to the conduct described in subsection (a).”

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 49 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1075. Flight to avoid prosecution for killing law enforcement officials.”.

SEC. 3. SPECIFIC AGGRAVATING FACTOR FOR FEDERAL DEATH PENALTY KILLING OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER.

(a) AGGRAVATING FACTORS FOR HOMICIDE.—Section 3592(c) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) KILLING OF A LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER, PROSECUTOR, JUDGE, OR FIRST RESPONDER.—The defendant killed or attempted to kill a person who is authorized by law—

“(A) to engage in or supervise the prevention, detention, or investigation of any criminal violation of law;

“(B) to arrest, prosecute, or adjudicate an individual for any criminal violation of law; or

“(C) to be a firefighter or other first responder.”.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL HABEAS RELIEF FOR MURDERS OF LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) JUSTICE FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS AND THEIR FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2254 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(j)(1) For an application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court for a crime that involved the killing of a public safety officer (as that term is defined in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796b)) or judge, while the public safety officer or judge was engaged in the performance of official duties, or on account of the performance of official duties by or status as a public safety officer or judge of the public safety officer or judge—

“(A) the application shall be subject to the time limitations and other requirements under sections 2263, 2264, and 2266; and

“(B) the court shall not consider claims relating to sentencing that were adjudicated in a State court.

“(2) Sections 2251, 2262, and 2101 are the exclusive sources of authority for Federal courts to stay a sentence of death entered by a State court in a case described in paragraph (1).”

(2) RULES.—Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts is amended by adding at the end the following: “Rule 60(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall not apply to a proceeding under these rules in a case that is described in section 2254(j) of title 28, United States Code.”

(3) FINALITY OF DETERMINATION.—Section 2244(b)(3)(E) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking “the subject of a petition” and all that follows and inserting: “reheard in the court of appeals or reviewed by writ of certiorari.”

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE AND APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This paragraph and the amendments made by this paragraph shall apply to any case pending on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) TIME LIMITS.—In a case pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendments made by this paragraph impose a time limit for taking certain action, the period of which began before the date of enactment of this Act, the period of such time limit shall begin on the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) EXCEPTION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall not bar consideration under section 2266(b)(3)(B) of title 28, United States Code, of an amendment to an application for a writ of habeas corpus that is pending on the date of enactment of this Act, if the amendment to the petition was adjudicated by the court prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON RECOVERY OF CERTAIN DAMAGES FOR INDIVIDUALS ENGAGED IN FELONIES OR CRIMES OF VIOLENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by—

(1) striking “except that in any action” and all that follows through “relief was unavailable.” and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), a court may not award damages other than for

necessary out-of-pocket expenditures and other monetary loss.”; and

(2) indenting the last sentence as an undesignated paragraph.

(b) ATTORNEY'S FEES.—Section 722(b) of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1988(b)) is amended by striking “except that in any action” and all that follows and inserting the following: “except that—

“(1) in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in the judicial capacity of that officer, such officer shall not be held liable for any costs, including attorneys fees, unless such action was clearly in excess of the jurisdiction of that officer; and

“(2) in any action seeking redress for any deprivation that was incurred in the course of, or as a result of, or is related to, conduct by the injured party that, more likely than not, constituted a felony or a crime of violence (as that term is defined in section 16 of title 18, United States Code) (including any deprivation in the course of arrest or apprehension for, or the investigation, prosecution, or adjudication of, such an offense), the court may not allow such party to recover attorney's fees.”

SEC. 6. SELF-DEFENSE RIGHTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3053 the following:

“§ 3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms

“Any sworn officer, agent, or employee of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof, who is authorized by law to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of law, or to supervise or secure the safety of incarcerated inmates, may carry firearms if authorized by law to do so. Such authority to carry firearms, with respect to the lawful performance of the official duties of a sworn officer, agent, or employee of a State or a political subdivision thereof, shall include possession incident to depositing a firearm within a secure firearms storage area for use by all persons who are authorized to carry a firearm within any building or structure classified as a Federal facility or Federal court facility, as those terms are defined under section 930, and any grounds appurtenant to such a facility.”

(b) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926B(e)(2) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(c) CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED RETIRED LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS.—Section 926C(e)(1)(B) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “any magazine and” after “includes”.

(d) SCHOOL ZONES.—Section 922(q)(2)(B)(vi) title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting “or a qualified law enforcement officer (as defined in section 926B(c))” before the semicolon.

(e) REGULATIONS REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate regulations allowing persons described in section 3054 of title 18, United States Code, to possess firearms in a manner described by that section. With respect to Federal justices, judges, bankruptcy judges, and magistrate judges, such regulations shall be prescribed after consultation with the Judicial Conference of the United States.

(f) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 203 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3053 the following:

“3054. Authority of law enforcement officers to carry firearms.”.

SEC. 7. IMPROVING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE COMMUNITIES THEY SERVE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For each of fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Attorney General using covered amounts shall, using such amounts as are necessary not to exceed \$20,000,000, award grants to State, local, or tribal law enforcement agencies and appropriate non-governmental organizations to—

(1) promote trust and ensure legitimacy among law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve through procedural reforms, transparency, and accountability;

(2) develop comprehensive and responsive policies on key topics relevant to the relationship between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve;

(3) balance the embrace of technology and digital communications with local needs, privacy, assessments, and monitoring;

(4) encourage the implementation of policies that support community-based partnerships in the reduction of crime;

(5) emphasize the importance of high quality and effective training and education through partnerships with local and national training facilities; and

(6) endorse practices that support officer wellness and safety through the re-evaluation of officer shift hours, including data collection and analysis.

(b) COVERED AMOUNTS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered amounts” means—

(1) any unobligated balances made available under the heading “GENERAL ADMINISTRATION” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year;

(2) any amounts made available for an “Edward Byrne Memorial criminal justice innovation program” under the heading “STATE AND LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE” under the heading “OFFICE OF JUSTICE PROGRAMS” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE” in an appropriations Act in a fiscal year; or

(3) any combination of amounts described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the incentives for biodiesel; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have long been a champion of domestic biofuel production, including ethanol, biodiesel and cellulosic fuels. Domestic biodiesel production supports tens of thousands of jobs. Replacing traditional diesel with biodiesel reduces emissions and creates cleaner air. Homegrown biodiesel improves our energy security by diversifying our transportation fuels and reducing our dependence on foreign oil. Biodiesel itself is a very diverse fuel. It can be produced from a wide array of resources such as recycled cooking oil, soybean and other plant oils, and animal fats.

I am proud of the success of the American biodiesel industry, and I am glad to be introducing today the Biodiesel Tax Incentive Reform and Ex-

ension Act of 2016, which will ensure the continued success. I appreciate Senator CANTWELL’s leadership in joining this effort. I also appreciate the support of Senators ROBERTS, HEITKAMP, THUNE, WHITEHOUSE, KIRK, HEINRICH, ERNST, DONNELLY, BLUNT, HIRONO, FRANKEN and MURRAY. This bill will modify the biodiesel fuel blenders credit to a domestic production credit, and extend the credit through 2019.

Congress created the biodiesel tax incentive in 2005 when I was Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. As a result of this incentive, and the Renewable Fuel Standard, biodiesel is providing significant benefits to the nation.

Senator CANTWELL and I have been advocating since 2009 to modify the current incentive. We have proposed making the credit available for the domestic production of biodiesel, rather than a mixture credit available to the blender of the fuel.

The bill we are introducing today is similar to an amendment that I offered with Senator CANTWELL during consideration of the tax extenders package in the Senate Finance Committee in July of last year. Our biodiesel reform amendment passed unanimously by voice vote.

Converting to a producer credit improves the incentive in many ways. The blenders credit can be difficult to administer, because the blending of the fuel can occur at many different stages of the fuel distribution. This can make it difficult to ensure that only fuel that qualifies for the credit claims the incentive. It has been susceptible to abuse because of this.

A credit for domestic production will also ensure that we are incentivizing the domestic industry, rather than subsidizing imported biofuels. It is projected that imports from Argentina, Indonesia, Singapore, the European Union, South Korea and others could exceed 1.8 billion gallons over 2016 and 2017.

We should not provide a U.S. taxpayer benefit to imported biofuels. By restricting the credit to domestic production, we’ll also save taxpayer money. The amendment adopted in the Finance Committee was estimated by the Joint Committee on Taxation to reduce the cost of the extension by \$90 million.

Importantly, modifying the credit will have little to no impact on the consumer. Much of the credit will continue to be passed on to the blender and ultimately, the consumer. Additionally, the U.S. biodiesel industry is currently operating at approximately 55 percent of capacity. The domestic biodiesel industry has the capacity and access to affordable feedstocks to meet the demand of U.S. consumers.

The current biodiesel credit expires at the end of this year. It is my hope that when the Senate considers legislation to extend expiring tax provisions, that the Biodiesel Tax Incentive Re-

form and Extension Act of 2016, will be included. I strongly encourage the leadership of the House and Senate to include these biodiesel reform policies that were adopted in the Senate Finance Committee unanimously last year.

This modification will ensure that the credit is doing what Congress intended—incentivizing investment in domestic biodiesel production. Surely we can agree that we should not be providing a U.S. taxpayer subsidy to already heavily subsidized foreign biodiesel imports.

I therefore urge my colleagues to support the production of American biodiesel and this common-sense, cost reduction reform.

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

S. 3192. A bill to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as “Alex Diekmann Peak”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3192

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 “Alex Diekmann Peak Designation Act of 2016”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that Alex Diekmann—

(1) was a loving father of 2 and an adoring husband who lived in Bozeman, Montana, where he was a renowned conservationist who dedicated his career to protecting some of the most outstanding natural and scenic resource areas of the Northern Rockies;

(2) was responsible during his unique conservation career for the protection of more than 50 distinct areas in the States of Montana, Wyoming, and Idaho, conserving for the public over 100,000 acres of iconic mountains and valleys, rivers and creeks, ranches and farms, and historic sites and open spaces;

(3) played a central role in securing the future of an array of special landscapes, including—

(A) the spectacular Devil’s Canyon in the Craig Thomas Special Management Area in the State of Wyoming;

(B) crucial fish and wildlife habitat and recreation access land in the Sawtooth Mountains of Idaho, along the Salmon River, and near the Canadian border; and

(C) diverse and vitally important land all across the Crown of the Continent in the State of Montana, from the world-famous Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem to Glacier National Park to the Cabinet-Yaak Ecosystem, to the recreational trails, working forests and ranches, and critical drinking water supply for Whitefish, and beyond;

(4) made a particularly profound mark on the preservation of the natural wonders in and near the Madison Valley and the Madison Range, Montana, where more than 12 miles of the Madison River and much of the world-class scenery, fish and wildlife, and recreation opportunities of the area have become and shall remain conserved and available to the public because of his efforts;

(5) inspired others with his skill, passion, and spirit of partnership that brought together communities, landowners, sportsmen, and the public at large;

(6) lost a heroic battle with cancer on February 1, 2016, at the age of 52;

(7) is survived by his wife, Lisa, and their 2 sons, Logan and Liam; and

(8) leaves a lasting legacy across Montana and the Northern Rockies that will benefit all people of the United States in our time and in the generations to follow.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF ALEX DIEKMANN PEAK, MONTANA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The unnamed 9,765-foot peak located 2.2 miles west-northwest of Finger Mountain on the western boundary of the Lee Metcalf Wilderness, Montana (UTM coordinates Zone 12, 457966 E., 4982589 N.), shall be known and designated as “Alex Diekmann Peak”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, record, or other paper of the United States to the peak described in subsection (a) shall be considered to be a reference to “Alex Diekmann Peak”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 530—SUPPORTING THE TERMINATION OF THE SELECT INVESTIGATIVE PANEL OF THE COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ESTABLISHED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 461, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 530

Whereas Planned Parenthood provides high-quality, affordable health care for women, men, and young people, and is the nation's largest provider of sex education;

Whereas Planned Parenthood provides sexual and reproductive health care, education, information, and outreach to nearly 5,000,000 women, men, and adolescents worldwide in a single year;

Whereas officials in 13 States have concluded investigations into Planned Parenthood affiliates having found no wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood, and officials in additional eight States have declined to open investigations citing a lack of any evidence against Planned Parenthood to suggest wrongdoing;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has found no wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has recently authorized an additional \$490,000 in unnecessary spending, bringing the panel's total expenditures to \$790,000 thus far;

Whereas the Zika virus is a looming public health emergency across the United States that has been linked to severe birth defects, including microcephaly, in children of women infected during pregnancy;

Whereas the Zika virus is spreading rapidly across the Americas, with the Puerto Rican Department of Health reporting a one-week jump of 40 percent in the number of pregnant women on the island who were diagnosed with Zika;

Whereas family planning services and sex education are the primary tools currently available to directly prevent the devastating outcomes of the Zika virus;

Whereas the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives has turned their focus to investigating scientific researchers engaged in public health research, such as the Zika virus, using fetal tissue; and

Whereas scientific researchers have reported the diminishing availability of fetal tissue for their critical research to try to develop a vaccine for the Zika virus, Alzheimer's, and other diseases impacting Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the immediate termination of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives established pursuant to House Resolution 461, agreed to October 7, 2015; and

(2) supports rescinding any unspent funds and making those funds available to the Department of Health and Human Services for efforts to combat Zika for women and children.

SENATE RESOLUTION 531—CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ALBERT EINSTEIN DISTINGUISHED EDUCATOR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM AND RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALBERT EINSTEIN FELLOWS

Mr. TILLIS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 531

Whereas the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program was established in 1990 and formalized by law in 1994;

Whereas Einstein Fellows are selected through a highly competitive process from among the best science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers in the field and represent diverse geographic regions and communities;

Whereas the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program places exceptional teachers in positions within Federal agencies and on Capitol Hill where they contribute to advancing the fields of education, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and public policy;

Whereas the Department of Energy, through its Office of Workforce Development for Teachers & Scientists, and the Triangle Coalition for STEM Education have nurtured and developed the Einstein Fellowship Program;

Whereas over 270 Einstein Fellows have served professionally at the Department of Education, the Department of Energy, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administra-

tion (NOAA), the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the United States Senate, and the United States House of Representatives;

Whereas the Einstein Fellowship Program fosters a spirit of cooperation between Federal agencies by placing a network of fellows at different agencies;

Whereas Einstein Fellows provide practical perspectives on the application and impact of education policy;

Whereas Einstein Fellows have made invaluable contributions to the formulation of educational policy through advice to Members of Congress and officials in Federal agencies, the development of legislation, and the creation of innovative educational programs and interventions;

Whereas Einstein Fellows have experienced unique opportunities for professional growth and development that allow for the expansion of skills and knowledge;

Whereas Einstein Fellows learn valuable leadership skills to advance the fields of education, science, technology, engineering, mathematics, and public policy; and

Whereas Einstein Fellows, during their service and upon the continuation of their professional careers, serve as role models and examples of dedication and commitment for past, present, and future generations of educators and public servants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of the 25th anniversary of the Albert Einstein Distinguished Educator Fellowship Program;

(2) recognizes the value of having current science, technology, engineering, and mathematics teachers directly engaged in the policymaking process;

(3) recognizes the sacrifices made by teachers who interrupt their careers to serve as Einstein Fellows;

(4) supports the continuation of the Einstein Fellowship program;

(5) encourages Federal agencies and congressional offices to host Einstein Fellows and to leverage the expertise of former Einstein Fellows; and

(6) recognizes the contributions of past, present, and future Einstein Fellows.

SENATE RESOLUTION 532—CELEBRATING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 532

Whereas Colorado joined the Union as the 38th State on August 1, 1876, when President Ulysses S. Grant signed a statehood proclamation;

Whereas statehood was granted to Colorado after Colorado became a territory in 1861 and Jerome Chaffee, a Representative for the territory, convinced Congress that the population had increased enough for statehood to be approved;

Whereas the United States Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs, Colorado, educates and trains brave men and women in the Air Force;

Whereas Colorado has 6 military bases that are home to the honorable men and women who serve the United States;

Whereas there are more than 36,000 farms in Colorado, located on more than 31,000,000 acres, which grow a variety of crops, including barley, grapes, sunflowers, and beans;

Whereas Colorado ranks fifth in the United States for potato production and produces 2,000,000,000 pounds of potatoes;

Whereas Colorado produces 8,000,000 bushels of barley each year and ranks third in the United States in breweries per capita with a total of 285 breweries;

Whereas Golden, Colorado, is home to the National Renewable Energy Laboratory (commonly referred to as “NREL”), which is transforming the ways the people of the United States use and develop energy through research;

Whereas Colorado is ranked twelfth in the United States for installed solar energy capacity and eighth in the United States for the number of wind turbines located within the State;

Whereas, with an average of more than 300 days of sunshine per year, Colorado is one of the sunniest States in the United States;

Whereas Colorado is home to the Southern Ute Tribe and the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe;

Whereas Colorado is home to 58 mountain peaks rising 14,000 feet above sea level;

Whereas Colorado has world renowned skiing and snowboarding, with 25 resorts for Coloradans and out-of-State visitors to enjoy;

Whereas Colorado has 4 National Parks, including the Black Canyon of the Gunnison National Park, the Great Sand Dunes National Park and Preserve, Mesa Verde National Park, and Rocky Mountain National Park;

Whereas Colorado is also home to numerous monuments, wilderness areas, recreation areas, and historic trails, all of which ensure that beautiful landscapes are preserved and provide recreation opportunities for all;

Whereas Colorado is a national leader in aerospace, where companies develop cutting edge technology to propel the United States into the future; and

Whereas Colorado is a symbol of the beauty and opportunity America has to offer, and Katherine Lee Bates wrote the poem “America the Beautiful” after being inspired during a hike up Pikes Peak: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends and celebrates Colorado and the people of Colorado on the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado.

SENATE RESOLUTION 533—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2016, AS “UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY”

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 533

Whereas on July 26, 1908, Attorney General Charles Bonaparte ordered newly-hired Federal investigators to report to the Office of the Chief Examiner of the Department of Justice, which subsequently was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas on July 26, 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), creating the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thereby laying the foundation for today’s intelligence community;

Whereas the National Security Act of 1947, which appears in title 50 of the United States Code, governs the definition, composition,

responsibilities, authorities, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas the intelligence community is defined by section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)) to include the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, other offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national intelligence through reconnaissance programs, the intelligence elements of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the elements of the Department of Homeland Security concerned with the analysis of intelligence information, and other elements as may be designated;

Whereas July 26, 2016, is the 69th anniversary of the signing of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

Whereas the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3638) created the position of the Director of National Intelligence to serve as the head of the intelligence community and to ensure that national intelligence be timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based upon all sources available;

Whereas Congress has previously passed joint resolutions, signed by the President, to designate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15, Patriot Day on September 11, and other commemorative occasions, to honor the sacrifices of law enforcement officers and of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States has increasingly relied upon the men and women of the intelligence community to protect and defend the security of the United States in the years since the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community, both civilian and military, have been increasingly called upon to deploy to theaters of war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere since September 11, 2001;

Whereas numerous intelligence officers of the elements of the intelligence community have been injured or killed in the line of duty;

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States are routinely called upon to accept personal hardship and sacrifice in the furtherance of their mission to protect the United States, to undertake dangerous assignments in the defense of the interests of the United States, to collect reliable information within prescribed legal authorities upon which the leaders of the United States rely in life-and-death situations, and to “speak truth to power” by providing their best assessments to decision makers, regardless of political and policy considerations;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community have on numerous occasions succeeded in preventing attacks upon the United States and allies of the United States, saving numerous innocent lives; and

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States must of necessity often remain unknown and unrecognized for their substantial achievements and successes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2016, as “United States Intelligence Professionals Day”;

(2) acknowledges the courage, fidelity, sacrifice, and professionalism of the men and women of the intelligence community of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 534—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 534

Whereas William L. Armstrong (in this preamble referred to as “Bill Armstrong”) was born in Fremont, Nebraska, and attended Tulane University and the University of Minnesota;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a broadcaster and owner of media outlets, such as radio stations and newspapers;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served in the Army National Guard of the United States from 1957 to 1963, which brought him to Colorado;

Whereas at age 25 Bill Armstrong was elected to the Colorado House of Representatives, where he served from 1963 to 1964;

Whereas Bill Armstrong then served in the Colorado Senate from 1965 to 1972, where he became Majority Leader after only 4 years of service;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served the people of Colorado in the United States House of Representatives from 1973 to 1979 and in the United States Senate from 1979 to 1991;

Whereas Bill Armstrong served honorably as the Chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee from 1985 to 1991;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a strong conservative who consistently advocated for such matters as fiscal discipline and tax reform, pay and benefits for military service members, and the support of small businesses;

Whereas Bill Armstrong worked to pass the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 (Public Law 97-34, 95 Stat. 172) and was recognized multiple times with the “Taxpayers’ Friend” award by the National Taxpayers Union;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was named the “military pay champion” of the Senate by the *Army Times*;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was an ardent champion of small business;

Whereas Bill Armstrong earned the “Guardian of Small Business” award from the National Federation of Independent Business, and the Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry Public Service Award in 1982 for his distinguished service to the people of Colorado;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was instrumental to the passage of title I of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3265) (commonly known as the “Colorado National Forest Wilderness Act of 1980”), which preserved 1,400,000 acres of land;

Whereas Bill Armstrong continued to serve the people of Colorado for the last 10 years as president of Colorado Christian University;

Whereas Bill Armstrong possessed a strong faith and lived his life accordingly;

Whereas Bill Armstrong led hundreds of prayer breakfasts and served on the board of Campus Crusade for Christ and Christian Businessmen’s Committee USA;

Whereas Bill Armstrong was a person of firm principle, worked towards meaningful

solutions, and described himself as “relatively inflexible on principles, but flexible on the details”;

Whereas, throughout his life, Bill Armstrong demonstrated great integrity and remarkable leadership; and

Whereas Bill Armstrong touched the lives of all those he served and helped families across Colorado through his devotion to public service: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable William L. Armstrong, former member of the United States Senate;

(2) the Senate instructs the Secretary of the Senate to communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of William L. Armstrong; and

(3) when the Senate adjourns on the date of adoption of this resolution, it stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable William L. Armstrong.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 47—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR FOSTERING CLOSER ECONOMIC AND COMMERCIAL TIES BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED KINGDOM FOLLOWING THE DECISION OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO WITHDRAW FROM THE EUROPEAN UNION

Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. CON. RES. 47

Whereas the United States and the United Kingdom are allies with a long tradition of working in close cooperation to support one another’s mutual interests;

Whereas the United Kingdom is the world’s fifth largest economy and one of the most important trading and economic partners of the United States;

Whereas expanding United States trade with the United Kingdom has the potential to benefit American businesses, farmers, ranchers, workers, and consumers;

Whereas a strong and economically vibrant United Kingdom capable of supporting global economic growth and promoting shared Anglo-American economic principles is in the national interest of the United States;

Whereas the voluntary exchange of goods and services among citizens of nations helps provide global economic stability, especially in times of economic uncertainty;

Whereas the United States also continues to support the member states of the European Union and seeks the further enhancement of economic and commercial ties between the United States and the European Union, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership; and

Whereas orderly and cooperative negotiations between the United Kingdom and the European Union that uphold the fundamental bases for trade and investment between the United Kingdom and the European Union are in the mutual interest of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the member states of the European Union: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) calls upon the President to consult with the Senate and the House of Representatives to consider opportunities to promote further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between the United States and the United Kingdom, including by way of a trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom;

(2) calls upon the President to invite the United Kingdom to begin discussions towards establishing the basis for negotiations for a trade agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom;

(3) recalls that section 103(d) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4202(d)) directs the President to commence negotiations covering tariff and nontariff barriers to United States trade where the President determines that such negotiations are feasible and timely and would benefit the United States;

(4) recalls further that section 102 of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (19 U.S.C. 4201) sets forth the negotiating objectives of the United States, and that the Senate and the House of Representatives expect that these congressionally-mandated negotiating objectives will be achieved in any United States trade agreement;

(5) urges the President, throughout discussions with the United Kingdom and in close consultation with the Senate and the House of Representatives, to determine whether negotiation of a trade agreement with the United Kingdom would be likely to achieve the negotiating objectives established by the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 and, if such negotiation would be likely to achieve such objectives, to commence negotiations towards a trade agreement with the United Kingdom as soon as appropriate;

(6) expresses support for enhanced economic and commercial ties between the United States and the European Union, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership;

(7) notes that the continued movement of goods, services, and capital between the United Kingdom and the European Union is important to American businesses invested in Europe and the United States economy generally; and

(8) calls upon the European Union and the United Kingdom to work constructively to achieve a climate for trade and investment that is mutually beneficial and productive.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I would like to take a few minutes to talk about a resolution that I am submitting today regarding the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. I also would like to discuss our Nation’s international trade policy more broadly, including our interest in negotiating and entering into trade agreements that satisfy the high standards that the Congress outlined in the Trade Promotion Authority, or TPA, statute we enacted last year.

Last month, the U.K. voted to withdraw from the European Union. The formal withdrawal process is at its beginning stages, and the U.K. and the EU have many issues to resolve as they work out their future political and economic relationship. I am optimistic that these issues will be resolved con-

structively, and that the U.K. and the EU will achieve a trade and investment climate that is mutually beneficial and productive and that supports the continuation of the United States’ close diplomatic, economic, and commercial ties with both the U.K. and the EU.

Throughout this process, the U.S. must continue to show strong support for the important and longstanding relationship that our country enjoys with the U.K. That relationship is rooted in democratic principles, a similar culture and a common language, a strong commitment to peace and security, and close and open economic and commercial ties. The U.S. and the U.K. have a long tradition of working together to support one another’s mutual interests, and the U.K.’s decision to withdraw from the EU should not jeopardize that tradition. In fact, the special relationship between our two countries must be fortified as the U.K. navigates the process of withdrawing from the EU.

It is in that spirit that I propose this resolution, which highlights the importance of the political, economic, and commercial relationship between the U.S. and the U.K., and calls upon the administration to consult with the Congress to examine ways to promote further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between our two countries, including through the negotiation of a high-standard trade agreement at the appropriate time.

The U.K. is the world’s fifth largest economy and one of the United States’ most important economic partners. Expanding U.S. trade with the U.K. would result in major benefits to both American and British businesses, workers, producers, and consumers. Furthermore, a strengthened economic partnership between the U.S. and the U.K. would produce important geopolitical benefits that are in our national interest.

As such, the resolution calls upon the President to consult with the Congress regarding opportunities to further economic and commercial activity and cooperation between the U.S. and the U.K., including considering a trade agreement between our two countries. However—and let me emphasize this point—as with any trade agreement negotiated by this administration or the next, any future trade agreement between the U.S. and the U.K. must adhere to the high standards outlined in the recently enacted TPA law, which established very specific objectives regarding the negotiation of trade agreements. Any future trade agreement with the U.K. needs to satisfy those objectives in order to qualify for TPA procedures.

Now that I have spoken about the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the U.S. and the U.K., I would like to speak about the importance of the trade and investment relationship between the United States and the European Union. While this resolution proposes stronger economic and commercial ties with the

U.K., it does the same for the EU. To be clear, the U.K.'s decision to withdraw from the EU should not jeopardize or weaken our country's relationship with the U.K., nor should it jeopardize or weaken our country's relationship with the EU. Both the U.K. and the EU are important diplomatic and economic partners of the United States.

As such, the resolution proposes stronger economic and commercial ties between the U.S. and the EU, including through the conclusion of a high-standard Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, T-TIP, agreement. Coincidentally, our trade negotiators are in Europe this week for the 14th round of T-TIP negotiations.

I would like to take a few moments to discuss Congress's expectations for T-TIP and to highlight areas of particular concern.

T-TIP presents an excellent opportunity for both the U.S. and the EU—the world's two largest economies—to strengthen our already robust economic relationship. That relationship is one of the most extensive and complex in the world. Together, our economies account for approximately half of world GDP and nearly one third of worldwide trade. Annual U.S.-EU trade amounts to hundreds of billions of dollars, and our two markets already are deeply integrated and relatively open. Nonetheless, opportunities exist for the U.S. and the EU to expand trade and investment by further reducing barriers and modernizing the rules that govern such trade and investment. But in order for T-TIP or any similar trade agreement to reach its full potential, it must reflect an unprecedented level of commitment—by both the EU and the Obama administration.

T-TIP also presents an excellent opportunity for the U.S. and the EU to work together to help set high standards for the world. If the agreement does not meet a high standard, then the rest of the world will take notice. In order to qualify as a high-standard agreement, T-TIP—just like any potential trade agreement between the U.S. and the U.K.—must satisfy the standards outlined in the TPA statute. If the agreement does not satisfy those standards, then it will face enormous difficulty in the Congress.

To do this, T-TIP must address several difficult areas. I will highlight only a few such areas and issues today, while noting that many others exist.

First, the agreement must have provisions that provide strong market access for agricultural products, including through the elimination of discriminatory geographical indication practices and unjustified sanitary and phytosanitary standards.

Second, the agreement must be comprehensive and not exclude any products or economic sectors from the negotiations. Of particular concern are services. The agreement should not broadly exempt future services or specifically exempt other types of services, including audiovisual services or

financial services. In particular, both the market access and the regulatory scope of the agreement should address financial services.

Third, a valid and passable T-TIP agreement must reflect the highest standards of protection for intellectual property rights. Moreover, any outcome on intellectual property must not jeopardize our country's ability to achieve high levels of intellectual property protection in other markets or in other negotiations.

Finally, T-TIP must address barriers to digital trade, including discriminatory treatment of digital products and barriers that inhibit the free flow of digital data, such as forced data localization policies. In short, the agreement must ensure that all products, services, and technologies are given the chance to compete in the marketplace.

T-TIP is intended to be a model for the world, so we must get it right.

The resolution that I'm introducing today notes the importance of economic cooperation among the U.S., the U.K., and the EU, and highlights the mutual benefits to be achieved through such cooperation. In particular, the resolution calls upon the EU and the U.K. to work constructively to achieve a climate for trade and investment that is mutually beneficial and productive; and it notes that the continued movement of goods, services, and capital between the U.K. and the EU is important not only to the U.K. and the EU, but also to American businesses invested in Europe and the U.S. economy generally. The U.S., the U.K., and the EU will all benefit as our countries work together to become economically stronger and more geopolitically secure.

Finally, I would like to say a few words regarding the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, agreement. I fought hard to secure TPA, in large part, so that this administration would have the ability to secure a strong TPP agreement. However, in a few important areas, TPP falls short. I am committed to working with the administration to help to improve on those shortcomings. In the meantime, it is essential that the administration begin to work with our TPP partners to develop meaningful country-specific implementation commitments.

During a hearing held by the Senate Finance Committee earlier this year, members of the Committee heard assessments from American exporters and stakeholders about the implementation of past free trade agreements. It is an unfortunate fact that the Obama administration has allowed free trade agreements to enter into force before ensuring that our partners have taken all steps necessary to comply with their obligations under the agreements. It is clear that more confidence regarding effective implementation of trade agreements will be necessary before the Congress approves TPP.

Moreover, as our TPP partners begin their domestic implementation proc-

esses, concerns are growing that the measures that our trading partners intend to take to implement TPP fall short of what is required by the agreement. Failure by our trading partners to fully and faithfully implement their TPP obligations threatens to reduce the value of the agreement for U.S. businesses, workers, farmers, ranchers, and consumers.

That is why it is essential that the Obama administration now work to reach country-specific plans identifying the changes that our trading partners must and will make to their laws, regulations, and practices in order to meet their key TPP obligations. These country-specific implementation commitments would provide a valuable tool for resolving shortcomings and ambiguities in the agreement, while helping to build confidence in the Congress that TPP will be implemented fully and faithfully by our trading partners. Put simply, these country-specific implementation commitments can be an essential component to developing the political support necessary for the Congress to pass TPP implementing legislation.

During the 114th Congress, we have successfully enacted a number of strong trade policies that reflect and advance our national interest. T-TIP and TPP negotiations represent important opportunities for the administration to use the tools provided by Congress to help American businesses, workers, and consumers to benefit from trade. We must remain vigilant to ensure that our trade objectives are met and hold the administration accountable for achieving the goals that the Congress has established. At the same time, we need to look toward the future.

The resolution that we are submitting today is designed to reinforce our support for strong, market-opening agreements and to remind this and future administrations that the Congress is, and will remain, an active participant in formulating U.S. trade policy.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this important resolution.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 4973. Mr. BLUNT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2893, to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 4973. Mr. BLUNT proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2893, to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, line 9, strike "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a Subcommittee hearing entitled "NASA at a Crossroads: Reasserting American Leadership in Space Exploration."

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015: Ensuring Successful Implementation of Physician Payment Reforms."

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:45 p.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Campus Safety: Improving Prevention and Response Efforts."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10 a.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME AND TERRORISM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in Room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Researching the Potential Medical Benefits and Risks of Marijuana."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH CARE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Health Care of the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Alzheimer's Disease: The Struggle for Families, a Looming Crisis for Medicare."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "U.S. Policy Options in the South China Sea."

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 13, 2016, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Zika in the Western Hemisphere: Risks and Response."

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Warren Ponto, the committee's detailee from the FAA, be allowed privileges of the floor.

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

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Alexandra Bratton, an intern on the Energy Committee, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session of the Senate.

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

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sydney Jones, Macon Sheppard, William Aulgar, and Jemel Green-Harris, of my office, be granted the privilege of the floor for the remainder of today's legislative session.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 2943

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the prayer and pledge on Thursday July 14, the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying S. 2943, and Senator MCCONNELL be recognized to make a compound motion to go to conference on S. 2943; further, that after cloture is filed on the compound motion, the time until 11:30 a.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that at 11:30 a.m. the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the compound motion to go to conference; further, that if cloture is invoked, the Senate agree to the compound motion to go to conference and there be two motions to instruct in order made by Senator SHAHEEN and Senator SULLIVAN; further, that Senator SHAHEEN be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and that there be up to 4 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the Shaheen motion; that following the disposition of the Shaheen motion, Senator SULLIVAN be recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees and that there be up to 4 minutes of debate equally divided on the motion and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote in relation to the Sullivan motion without any intervening action or debate.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 659 through 678 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Christian D. Becker

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (Ih) Bruce L. Gillingham

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Troy M. McClelland

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under article II, section 2, clause 2, of the United States Constitution:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Ronny L. Jackson

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Navy Reserve and appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5143:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Luke M. McCollum

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Steven M. Shepro

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Tammy S. Smith

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Brian E. Alvin

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard J. Heitkamp

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Miles A. Davis

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Fletcher V. Washington

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Nikki L. Griffin Olive

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Darius Banaji

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Tina A. Davidson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Gayle D. Shaffer

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Frank D. Whitworth

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Stephanie T. Keck

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David A. Goggins

Capt. Douglas W. Small

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Richard D. Heinz

Capt. John T. Palmer

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Capt. Carl P. Chebi

Capt. Blake L. Converse

Capt. Charles B. Cooper, II

Capt. Paul T. Druggan

Capt. Donald D. Gabrielson

Capt. Alvin Holsey

Capt. Jeffrey T. Jablon

Capt. Gary A. Mayes

Capt. John F. Meier

Capt. James E. Pitts

Capt. Charles W. Rock

Capt. John B. Skillman

Capt. Murray J. Tynch, III

Capt. John F. Wade

Capt. Michael A. Wettlaufer

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S

DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1469 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning WALTER W. BEAN, and ending SCOTT L. RUMMAGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2016.

PN1470 AIR FORCE nominations (53) beginning JENNIFER D. BANKSTON, and ending WILLIAM F. WOLFE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 18, 2016.

PN1579 AIR FORCE nominations (18) beginning RICHARD D. BETZOLD, and ending JENNIFER E. TONNESON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1580 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning STEFANIE L. SHAVER, and ending WILLIAM J. BRIDGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1613 AIR FORCE nomination of Erol Agi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

IN THE ARMY

PN1321 ARMY nomination of Joshua D. Wright, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 7, 2016.

PN1339 ARMY nomination of Phillip W. Neal, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 14, 2016.

PN1581 ARMY nomination of Nathan D. Schroeder, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1582 ARMY nomination of Renee V. Scott, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1583 ARMY nomination of Keith D. Blodgett, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1584 ARMY nominations (10) beginning JEFFREY M. ALSTON, and ending MICHAEL J. TURLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1585 ARMY nomination of Steven C. Loos, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1586 ARMY nomination of Daniel W. M. Mackle, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2016.

PN1609 ARMY nomination of Michael P. Lindsay, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

PN1610 ARMY nomination of Brando S. Jobity, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

PN1611 ARMY nomination of David C. Martin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

IN THE NAVY

PN1612 NAVY nominations (5) beginning GREGORY A. VERLINDE, and ending DAVID T. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 7, 2016.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS SOUND RECORDING AND FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2016

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be discharged from further consideration of S. 2893 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2893) to reauthorize the sound recording and film preservation programs of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will pass the bipartisan Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2016, which authorizes two important cultural preservation programs through 2027. Senator GRASSLEY and I worked together on this legislation to help ensure that the films and

recordings that play vital roles in shaping and recording the American experience are preserved for future generations.

Advances in digital technology have opened up new avenues for creativity, allowing Americans to engage in artistic expression in innovative ways. As we embrace these new developments, we must also ensure that the records of our past are preserved. Films and sound recordings created by previous generations tell us who we are, and who we were, as a society; yet the passage of time has taken its toll on these historical works, erasing artifacts of our shared history and culture.

The legislation that will be passed today by the Senate continues Congress's long recognition of the importance of cultural preservation, reauthorizing both the National Film Preservation Program, which began in 1988, and the National Sound Recording Preservation Program, which began in 2000. These programs, operated within the Library of Congress, help preserve historical and cultural artifacts that would otherwise disappear or be destroyed through the passage of time. Through the preservation programs, the Library of Congress has created the National Film and National Recording Registries, to recognize the most essential artistic works our Nation has produced.

This legislation also reauthorizes the federally chartered National Film and National Recording Preservation Foundations. These foundations play a critical role in preservation efforts by providing grants to a wide array of educational and nonprofit organizations to preserve films and sound recordings. To date, the National Film Preservation Foundation has given grants to more than 270 organizations in all 50 States.

By reauthorizing these important programs, this legislation will allow the Library of Congress and the Foundations to continue their important work in preserving America's fading treasures, as well as providing grants that will help libraries, museums, and archives preserve these works and make them available for study and research. I look forward to prompt consideration of the bill by the House and to the President signing it into law.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Blunt amendment at the desk be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 4973) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To increase the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated to the National Recording Preservation Foundation)

On page 2, line 9, strike "\$750,000" and insert "\$1,000,000".

The bill (S. 2893), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2893

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 "Library of Congress Sound Recording and Film Preservation Programs Reauthorization Act of 2016".

SEC. 2. SOUND RECORDING PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION BOARD.—Section 133 of the National Recording Preservation Act of 2000 (2 U.S.C. 1743) is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026".

(b) NATIONAL RECORDING PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—

(1) REAUTHORIZATION.—Section 152411(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016 an amount not to exceed" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026 an amount not to exceed the lesser of \$1,000,000 or".

(2) NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—Section 152403(b)(2) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "nine directors" and inserting "12 directors"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking "six directors" each place it appears and inserting "8 directors".

SEC. 3. FILM PRESERVATION PROGRAMS.

(a) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION BOARD.—Section 112 of the National Film Preservation Act of 1996 (2 U.S.C. 179v) is amended by striking "through fiscal year 2016" and inserting "through fiscal year 2026".

(b) NATIONAL FILM PRESERVATION FOUNDATION.—Section 151711(a)(1)(C) of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking "through 2016" and inserting "through 2026".

AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TO PROVIDE PLAYBACK EQUIPMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3207, introduced earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3207) to authorize the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped to provide playback equipment in all formats.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 3207) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3207

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED TO PROVIDE PLAYBACK EQUIPMENT IN ALL FORMATS.

The first sentence of the Act entitled "An Act to provide books for the adult blind", approved March 3, 1931 (2 U.S.C. 135a), is amended by striking "and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for such sound-reproduction recordings" and inserting "and for purchase, maintenance, and replacement of reproducers for any such forms".

FILIPINO VETERANS OF WORLD WAR II CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT OF 2015

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1555 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1555) to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 1555) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1555

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 "Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The First Philippine Republic was founded as a result of the Spanish-American War in which Filipino revolutionaries and the United States Armed Forces fought to overthrow Spanish colonial rule. On June 12, 1898, Filipinos declared the Philippines to be an independent and sovereign nation. The Treaty of Paris negotiated between the United States and Spain ignored this declaration of independence, and the United States paid Spain \$20,000,000 to cede control of the Philippines to the United States. Filipino nationalists who sought independence rather than a change in colonial rulers clashed with forces of the United States in the Islands. The Philippine-American War, which officially lasted for 3 years from 1899 to 1902, led to the establishment of the United States civil government in the Philippines.

(2) In 1901, units of Filipino soldiers who fought for the United States against the nationalist insurrection were formally incorporated into the United States Army as the Philippine Scouts.

(3) In 1934, the Philippine Independence Act (Public Law 73-127; 48 Stat. 456) established a timetable for ending colonial rule of the United States. Between 1934 and Philippine independence in 1946, the United States retained sovereignty over Philippine foreign policy and reserved the right to call Filipinos into the service of the United States Armed Forces.

(4) On December 21 1935, President of the Philippine Commonwealth, Manuel Quezon, signed the National Defense Act, passed by the Philippine Assembly. General Douglas MacArthur set upon the task of creating an independent army in the Philippines, consisting of a small regular force, the Philippine Constabulary, a police force created during the colonial period of the United States, and reservists. By July 1941, the Philippine army had 130,000 reservists and 6,000 officers.

(5) On July 26, 1941, as tensions with Japan rose in the Pacific, President Franklin D. Roosevelt used his authority vested in the Constitution of the United States and the Philippine Independence Act to "call into service of the United States . . . all of the organized military forces of the Government of the Philippines." On July 27th, 1941, in accordance with a War Department directive received a day earlier, the United States Forces in the Far East (USAFFE) was established, and Manila was designated as the command headquarters. Commander of the USAFFE, General Douglas MacArthur, planned to absorb the entire Philippine army into the USAFFE in phases. The first phase, which began on September 1, 1941, included 25,000 men and 4,000 officers.

(6) Filipinos who served in the USAFFE included—

(A) the Philippine Scouts, who comprised half of the 22,532 soldiers in the Philippine Department, or United States Army garrison stationed in the Islands at the start of the war;

(B) the Philippine Commonwealth Army;

(C) the new Philippine Scouts, or Filipinos who volunteered to serve with the United States Army when the United States Armed Forces returned to the island;

(D) Filipino civilians who volunteered to serve in the United States Armed Forces in 1945 and 1946, and who became "attached" to various units of the United States Army; and

(E) the "Guerrilla Services" who had fought behind enemy lines throughout the war.

(7) Even after hostilities ceased, wartime service of the new Philippine Scouts continued as a matter of law until the end of 1946, and the force gradually disbanded until it was disestablished in 1950.

(8) On December 8th, 1941, not even 24 hours after the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Japanese Imperial forces attacked bases of the United States Army in the Philippines.

(9) In the spring of 1942, the Japanese 14th Army overran the Bataan Peninsula, and, after a heroic but futile defense, more than 78,000 members of the United States Armed Forces were captured, specifically 66,000 Filipinos and 12,000 service members from the United States. The Japanese transferred the captured soldiers from Bataan to Camp O'Donnell, in what is now known as the infamous Bataan Death March. Forced to march the 70-mile distance in 1 week, without adequate food, water, or medicine, nearly 700 members of the United States Armed Forces and an estimated 6,000 to 10,000 Filipinos perished during the journey.

(10) After the fall of the Bataan Peninsula, the Japanese Army turned its sights on Corregidor. The estimated forces in defense of Corregidor totaled 13,000, and were comprised of members of the United States Armed Forces and Filipino troops. Of this number,

800 were killed, 1,000 were wounded, and 11,000 were captured and forced to march through the city of Manila, after which the captured troops were distributed to various POW camps. The rest of the captured troops escaped to organize or join an underground guerrilla army.

(11) Even before the fall of Corregidor, Philippine resistance, in the form of guerrilla armies, began to wage warfare on the Japanese invaders. Guerrilla armies, from Northern Luzon to Mindanao—

(A) raided Japanese camps, stealing weapons and supplies;

(B) sabotaged and ambushed Japanese troops on the move; and

(C) with little weaponry, and severely out-matched in numbers, began to extract victories.

(12) Japanese intelligence reports reveal that from the time the Japanese invaded until the return of the United States Armed Forces in the summer of 1944, an estimated 300,000 Filipinos continued to fight against Japanese forces. Filipino resistance against the Japanese was so strong that, in 1942, the Imperial Army formed the Morista Butai, a unit designated to suppress guerrillas.

(13) Because Philippine guerrillas worked to restore communication with United States forces in the Pacific, General MacArthur was able to use the guerrillas in advance of a conventional operation and provided the headquarters of General MacArthur with valuable information. Guerrillas captured and transmitted to the headquarters of General MacArthur Japanese naval plans for the Central Pacific, including defense plans for the Mariana Islands. Intelligence derived from guerrillas relating to aircraft, ship, and troop movements allowed for Allied forces to attack Japanese supply lines and guerrillas and even directed United States submarines where to land agents and cargo on the Philippine coast.

(14) On December 20, 1941, President Roosevelt signed the Selective Training and Service Amendments Act (Public Law 77-360; 55 Stat. 844) which, among other things, allowed Filipinos in the United States to enlist in the United States Armed Forces. In February 1942, President Roosevelt issued the Second War Powers Act (Public Law 77-507; 56 Stat. 176), promising a simplified naturalization process for Filipinos who served in the United States Armed Forces. Subsequently, 16,000 Filipinos in California alone decided to enlist.

(15) The mobilization of forces included the activation and assumption of command of the First Filipino Infantry Battalion on April 1, 1942, at Camp San Luis Obispo, California. Orders were issued to activate the First Filipino Infantry Regiment and Band at Salinas, California, effective July 13, 1942. The activation of the Second Filipino Infantry Regiment occurred at Fort Ord, California, on November 21, 1942. Nearly 9,000 Filipinos and Filipino Americans fought in the United States Army 1st and 2nd Filipino Infantry Regiments.

(16) Soldiers of the 1st and 2nd Infantry Regiments participated in the bloody combat and mop-up operations at New Guinea, Leyte, Samar, Luzon, and the Southern Philippines. In 1943, 800 men were selected from the 1st and 2nd Regiments and shipped to Australia to receive training in intelligence gathering, sabotage, and demolition. Reorganized as part of the 1st Reconnaissance Battalion, this group was sent to the Philippines to coordinate with major guerrilla armies in the Islands. Members of the 1st Regiment were also attached to the United States 6th Army "Alamo Scouts", a reconnaissance group that traveled 30 miles behind enemy lines to free Allied prisoners from the Cabanatuan death camp on January 30, 1945. In

addition, in 1945, according to the 441st Counter Intelligence Unit of the United States Armed Forces, Philippine guerrillas provided "very important information and sketches of enemy positions and installations" for the liberation of the Santo Tomas prisoner of war camp, an event that made front page news across the United States.

(17) In March 1944, members of the 2nd Filipino Infantry Regiment were selected for special assignments, including intelligence missions, and reorganized as the 2nd Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate). The 2nd Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate) contributed to mop-up operations as a civil affairs unit.

(18) Filipinos participated in the war out of national pride, as well as out of a commitment to the Allied forces struggle against fascism. 57,000 Filipinos in uniform died in the war effort. Estimates of civilian deaths range from 700,000 to upwards of 1,000,000, or between 4.38 to 6.25 percent of the prewar population of 16,000,000.

(19) Because Filipinos who served in the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines were originally considered a part of the Allied struggle, the military order issued by President Roosevelt on July 26, 1941, stated that Filipinos who served in the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines were entitled to full veterans benefits. The guarantee to pay back the service of Filipinos through veterans benefits was reversed by the Rescission Acts of 1946 (Public Laws 79-301 and 79-391; 60 Stat. 6 and 60 Stat. 221), which deemed that the wartime service of the Commonwealth Army of the Philippines and the new Philippine Scouts was not considered active and, therefore, did not qualify for benefits.

(20) The loyal and valiant Filipino Veterans of World War II fought, suffered, and, in many instances, died in the same manner and under the same commander as other members of the United States Armed Forces during World War II.

(21) The Filipino Veterans of World War II fought alongside, and as an integral part of, the United States Armed Forces. The Philippines remained a territory of the United States for the duration of the war and, accordingly, the United States maintained sovereignty over Philippine foreign relations, including Philippine laws enacted by the Philippine Government. Filipinos who fought in the Philippines were not only defending or fighting for the Philippines, but also defending, and ultimately liberating, sovereign territory held by the United States Government.

(22) The United States remains forever indebted to the bravery, valor, and dedication that the Filipino Veterans of World War II displayed. Their commitment and sacrifice demonstrates a highly uncommon and commendable sense of patriotism and honor.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(a) the term "Filipino Veterans of World War II" includes any individual who served—

(1) honorably at any time during the period beginning on July 26, 1941, and ending on December 31, 1946;

(2) in an active-duty status under the command of the United States Armed Forces in the Far East; and

(3)(A) within the Philippine Commonwealth Army, the Philippine Scouts, the Philippine Constabulary, Recognized Guerrilla units, the New Philippine Scouts, the First Filipino Infantry Regiment, the Second Filipino Infantry Battalion (Separate), or the First Reconnaissance Battalion; or

(B) commanding or serving in a unit described in paragraph (3)(A) as a United States military officer or enlisted soldier; and

(b) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 4. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall make appropriate arrangements for the award, on behalf of Congress, of a single gold medal of appropriate design to the Filipino Veterans of World War II in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purposes of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary shall strike the Gold Medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Following the award of the gold medal in honor of the Filipino Veterans of World War II, the gold medal shall be given to the Smithsonian Institution, where it will be available for display as appropriate and made available for research.

(2) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Smithsonian Institution should make the gold medal received under paragraph (1) available for display elsewhere, particularly at other appropriate locations associated with the Filipino Veterans of World War II.

(d) DUPLICATE MEDALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under regulations that the Secretary may promulgate, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under this Act, at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses.

(2) SALE OF DUPLICATE MEDALS.—The amounts received from the sale of duplicate medals under paragraph (1) shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—Medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

CELEBRATING THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 532, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 532) celebrating the 140th anniversary of the State of Colorado.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 532) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 533, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 533) designating July 26, 2016, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day."

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 533) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 534, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 534) relative to the death of William L. Armstrong, former United States Senator for the State of Colorado.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 534) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 10, H.R. 4465, H.R. 4487, AND H.R. 4901

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I understand that there are four bills that have been received from the House and are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title en bloc for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 10) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4465) to decrease the deficit by consolidating and selling Federal buildings and other civilian real property, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4487) to reduce costs of Federal real estate, improve building security, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 4901) to reauthorize the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 14, 2016

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, July 14; 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 the prayer and pledge, the majority leader be recognized as under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Senators should expect four rollcall votes at 11:30 tomorrow morning as well as one additional vote after lunch.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order under the provisions of S. Res. 534 as a further mark of respect to William L. Armstrong, former United States Senator from Colorado.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:04 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

GRANT T. HARRIS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOHN A. LANCASTER, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

BENJAMIN OSORIO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, TERM EXPIRING.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

MARY ELLEN BARBERA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2018, VICE JONATHAN LIPPMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

JOHN D. MINTON, JR., OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2016, VICE JAMES R. HANNAH.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

JANNETTE LAKE DATES, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2022. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOSEPH R. DONOVAN JR., OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CONSTANCE SMITH BARKER, OF ALABAMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

JOHN A. HERRERA, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 10, 2021, VICE DEBORAH MATZ, RESIGNED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. AUNDRE F. PIGGEE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. CHARLES A. RICHARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. PHILIP G. HOWE

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

STEVEN S. ALEXANDER
BRIAN RANSOM BACKUS
MARTIN ANDREW BAIN
ELIZABETH L. BARKER
DAVID W. BENNETT
MARGARET HELEN BLAIS
ROBERT LESTER BLOODWORTH
JEFFREY M. BONNER
KENNETH A. BORCHERS
BRETT BOSSELMANN
KARL SMITH BOWERS, JR.
DANIEL D. BOYACK
STEVE LAURENCE BRADLEY
RODNEY C. BRICKELL
DIANA MARIA BROWN
JOHN BRYK
ANDREW J. BURDA
MATTHEW D. CALHOUN
IRA STANLEY CAMPBELL
MICHAEL DAVID CHASE
JASON S. CHRISTMAN
JOHN A. CLUCK
JOHN ROBERT CONNOLLY
RONALD WAYNE CROUCH
JOHN JAMES DABBY
NANCY M. DAKIN
DANIEL ANDREW DANCZYK
CHRISTOPHER D. DAVIS
ROSS PATRICK DICKINSON
LEON JOSEPH DODROE
JON D. DRIELING
CHRISTOPHER M. DUNLAP
DANIEL M. FESLER
FRANK T. GIAMBATTISTA
IAN J. M. GILLIS
LISA ANN GODSEY
TODD M. GRAHAM
DARREN F. GRAY
MATTHEW M. GROVES
MARK TERRELL GUILLORY
JAMES MARTIN HAGAR
KENNETH M. HALTOM
THOMAS C. HANNON
TROY D. HAVENER
JAMES P. HENDREN
KAREN L. HENDRICKSON
JOHN S. HENNESSEE
MATTHEW ELLIS HENRY
CHRISTOPHER L. HESSE
BRIAN L. HOLLEY
SHAYNA M. HOLMAN

MICHAEL D. HOLMES
ALBEN N. HOPKINS, JR.
GREGORY E. HOPKINS
DAVID MICHAEL HOUGHLAND
TOMMY W. HOWARD
HAYLEY HUGHES
KEVIN EARL JACOBS
JOHN W. JOHNSTON, JR.
DAVID CALDWELL JONES
SAMUEL CALLAHAN KEENER
PAUL M. KELL
DAVID E. KIMPEL
KURT K. KINDSCHUH
STANLEY JOSEPH KRASOVIC, JR.
STEVEN SCOTT LAMBRECHT
CHRISTOPHER E. LANTAGNE
DAVID A. LARSEN
LARRY DEAN LAYNE
ANDREW M. LEGEAR
GRACE LINK
RODDY S. LOCHALA
LORETTA JEAN LOMBARD
KENNETH LOZANO
VICTOR R. MACIAS
JODY CHRISTOPHER MAHLER
BERNADETTE MALDONADO
DAVID WAYNE MANSON
MICHAEL A. MATHEWS
WILLIAM G. MAYLES, SR.
GREGORY E. MCDONALD
TARA D. MCKENNIE
ROBERT DANIEL MICHALAK, JR.

ALLISON C. MILLER
JAMES D. MITCHELL
SCOTT A. MORRIS
TIMOTHY P. MURPHY
TODD W. NADEAU
ROBERT K. NASH
MITCHELL ALAN NEFF
DAVID M. NELSON
WILLIAM A. NERI
BYRON B. NEWELL
JOHN R. NEWMAN
DEBORAH SUE OWENS
JAMES R. PARRY
TIMOTHY E. PERTUIS
STEVEN L. POULOS, JR.
JOSEPH ANTEZANA QUINN
ILEANA RAMIREZ-PEREZ
HENRY HORMIDAS RENAUD III
ZERRICK RICHEY
MATTHEW GEORGE RIPPEN
EDWIN RIVERA ANGELL
JORI A. ROBINSON
JASON BENEDICT RUDD
ROBERT MITCHELL SAGE
CHRISTIAN ERIC SANDER
JENNIFER L. SCHMIDT
JOSE L. SERRANO
RICHARD O. SEYMOUR
KEVIN S. SLAUGHTER
DAVID JOHN SMITH
DAVID JOSEPH SPEHAR
RONALD N. SPEIR, JR.
STANLEY LOUIS STEFANCIC III
KEVIN BRYAN STJOHN
KENNETH L. STONE
SEAN S. SULLIVAN
ROBERT BRANDON TAYLOR
DANIEL NELS TESTER
STEVEN RALPH THOMAS
JOHN RICHARD TROVATO
CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER TUMILOWICZ
DAVID N. UNRUH
RUSTY JAY VAIRA
ERIC DARREN WADE
DAVID M. WARNICK
STACEY SCOTT ZDANAVAGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ANDRELL J. HARDY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

HECTOR I. MARTINEZPINEIRO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

SUZANNE L. HOPKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KENRIC T. ABAN
SHANNON P. ADAMS
BRYAN T. ALVAREZ
RYAN D. ARNOLD
JAMES R. BAILEY
SHAWN A. BELVERUD
SHANNON R. BLACKMER
MARK E. BOMIA
MATTHEW J. BRADLEY

APRIL L. BREEDEN
DAREN R. BROOKS
KRISTIN M. BROWSKE
TIMOTHY M. BURKHART
JEREMIAH D. BURNETT
MELISSA A. BURYK
JACOB J. CARMICHAEL
ALDEN V. CHIU
FRANCESCA M. CIMINO
WILLIAM T. COBB II
PETER M. COLE
DERRICK H. COLMENAR
SEAN P. CONLEY
BRADLEY K. DRAPENBAUGH
ADAM C. DEISING
KRISTINA M. DELAROSA
CHADWICK J. DONALDSON
THOMAS J. DOUGLAS III
JONATHAN D. ERPENBACH
TODD A. FELLARS
DOMINICK R. FERNANDEZ
JOSEPH D. FITZPATRICK
MICHAEL A. FORTUNATO
DAVID T. FOSTER
MATTHEW E. GAFFIGAN
ROBERT M. GALLAGHER
TERREL L. GALLOWAY
SHAWN M. S. GARCIA
JOSHUA A. GARLAND
GREGORY A. GATES
JAMES T. GILSON
TIFANI L. GLEESON
CAVIN H. GLENN
RYAN T. GOCKE
SARA C. GONZALEZ
MARIA L. GRAUERHOLZ
TODD E. GREGORY
STACY S. GRIFFIN
ERIK T. GROSSGOLD
COREY G. GUSTAFSON
JAMES E. HANFORD
ROBERT B. HANSEN
REED M. HECKERTEL
VIJAY G. HEGDE
JASON L. HENRY
MARYJO J. HESSERT
INGRID E. HODEN
JAMES W. HODGES III
ROY A. HOFFMAN
EDWARD S. HURD
SHERRY J. ILLINSKI
CHRISTOPHER S. JOAS
MELANIE D. JOHANSSON
MICHAEL B. KIM
JOSEPH G. KOTORA
MATTHEW A. KUETTTEL
JUSTIN P. LAPRENIERE
JOHN E. LAIRD
RICHARD S. LANGTON
ROBERT D. LAWSON
LANCE E. LECLERE
JESSICA J. LEE
JASON R. LEFRINGHOUSE
ANDREW G. LETIZIA
STEPHEN L. LEWIS
JAMES M. LIANG
THUY K. LIN
RHONDA A. LIZEWSKI
DAYNA T. LOBRAICO
ROBERT E. LOVERK
TAKMAN E. MACK
GAVIN C. MCEWAN
NANCY L. MILLER
LISA M. MONDZELEWSKI
DEEPTI S. MOON
JEREMY P. MOORE
TOD A. MORRIS
CHRISTOPHER D. NGUYEN
DANA J. ONIFEL
EAMON B. OREILLY
JASON P. PALMER
SANGHEE D. PARK
GRETCHEN E. PATTISON
ADAM D. PERRY
ANDREW J. PHILIP
CALEB J. PODRAZA
MICHAEL PRUDHOMME
KRISTA M. PUTTLER
ERIK L. RAMEY
JOHN J. ROBERTS
GLENDA B. ROBLES
DAVID M. ROGERS
ELLIOT M. ROSS
C. C. SCHULTHEISS
AMANDA R. SELF
PETER J. SILVESTRI
MARVIN J. SKLAR
MICHAEL R. SMILEY
ASHER O. SMITH
LINDA C. D. SMITH
MICHAEL IS. STARSIAK
TODD H. STERLING
KRISTIN A. STEVENS
BRADLEY M. TAYLOR
SCOTT M. TINTLE
ROBERT W. TRACEY
MARK P. TSCHANZ
SAMUEL D. TURNER
JAMES C. VALENTINE, JR.
TERRIN W. VELAZQUEZ
ROBERT A. WALTZ
TYLER E. WARKENTIEN
SCOTT A. WELCH
JANET M. WEST
ADDISON G. WILSON, JR.
ERIC H. YEUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRENT N. ADAMS
ROMAN G. ALLEN
KATHRYN A. BARBARA
DAVID G. BENTLEY
CARLIS W. BROWN
JUSTIN S. CAMPBELL
COLEMAN C. CHANDLER, JR.
LAKESHA A. CHEEVES
ROLLIN S. CLAYTON
TIFFANY F. CLINE
TIMOTHY J. COKER
DARLA M. DIETRICH
ERICH J. DIETRICH
BRIAN D. ENGESSER
BENJAMIN J. ESPINOSA
JOHN P. EVANS
TIMOTHY W. FERRELL
THOMAS C. FOSTER
AARON J. FRANK
ROBERT D. GOAD
VINCENT J. GRIMM
BRIAN M. HOWER
THOMAS C. JONES
MATTHEW R. KASPER
KYLE E. KEE
JO M. KITCHENS
STACY L. KWAK
JAMES C. LONG
SUSAN MALBOEUF
MATTHEW P. MARCINKIEWICZ
STEPHEN A. MARTY
DARION MCCULLOUGH
RONNIE R. MCGILLVERY
JARED A. MCKENDALL
ALICE P. MOSS
KIMBERLY A. MUSA
TATIANA M. OLSON
ERIC R. PARSONS
JOSHUA M. PORTON
JEREMY S. PYLES
LINH H. QUACH
TINSIKA I. RIGGS
LARRY J. SCHMIEGE
JASON P. SCHMITTSCHMITT
TIFFANY L. SCOTT
EMILY J. SPRAGUE
RICHARD C. STACEY
JEFFREY E. SUBA
KAREN M. SUPTKO
BOBBIE J. TURNER
STACIE L. TURNER
DAVID A. VEENHUIS
DAREN A. VERHULST
JENNIFER C. WALLINGER
CHRISTY A. C. WEIMER
WILFRED H. WELLS
ARCELIA WICKER
CHARLES R. WILHITE
MAYA WILLIAMS
MARJORIE A. WYTZKA
EMILY L. ZYWICKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

TERESITA ALSTON
CASEY J. BURNS
MITCHELL R. CHECCHI
MICHAEL B. FLANNERY
JOSEPH J. FRANZKE
FREDERIC GIAUQUE
BRACKEN R. GODFREY
KEVIN W. HAVEMAN
JEREMY D. HAYES
JOSHUA F. HENSON
JEFFREY W. HILLEY
MONSERRAT JORDEN
GREGORY L. KOONTZ
SARAH T. LAWSON
MAX P. MONCAYO
SCOTT A. PASIETA
ANGELA M. ROLDANWHITAKER
JENNIFER L. SMITH
RAYMOND F. TINUCCI
VINH T. TON
NICOLE G. WARD
KIRSTIN C. WIER
LING YE
ERIN K. ZIZAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DYLAN T. BURCH
DEREK BUTLER
LIAM A. CONNELL
SARA R. DINGROOT
TIMOTHY M. FLINTOFT
JONATHAN T. FLYNN
TREVOR J. GRANT
JUSTIN L. HAWKS
MATTHEW W. IVEY
BARBARA A. KAGLE
CHRISTOPHER P. KIMBALL
JAMES H. KIRBY
TRACY D. KIRBY
PATRICK L. LAHIFF
CHARLES M. LAYNE

GEORGE W. LUCIER
JUSTIN MCEWEN
DONALD R. OSTROM
GERALDO PADILLA
BRADLEY S. PARKER
EDWARD M. PIERCE
JUSTIN PILLING
ERIN C. QUAY
MICHELE V. ROSEN
MARYANN M. STAMPFLI
SEAN M. SULLIVAN
CHAD C. TEMPLE
JAMES M. TOOHEY
LUKE A. WHITTEMORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BROOKE M. BASFORD
ARIC V. BAUDEK
TROY J. BAUMANNFREUND
BRIAN B. BEALE
CONSTANCE BEALE
VAVADEE V. BELKO
GLENN A. BRADFORD
KATHLEEN M. CAFFREY
KEITH G. DOBBINS
KRISTIN L. EDGAR
NEVA R. FUENTES
DAVID R. GOODRICH
JOHN B. GORE
JERRI M. GRAY
JAMES L. HAPFNER, JR.
PAULO M. HERNANDEZ
KYLE D. HINDS
ERIC M. HOYER
FREDERICK L. HUSS, JR.
PATRIELLE R. JOHNSON
MELISSA M. KENNEDY
ERIC J. KULHAN
CASSANDRA M. LEATE
JASON S. LITCHFIELD
CHRISTINA B. LUMBA
CATHERINE A. LUNA
TRACY M. MCCULLOUGH
TARA N. MCGINNIS
DAVID J. MCINTIRE
CHRISTIAN T. MELENDEZ
JENNIFER L. MILLER
MERIDETH L. MILLER
SUSAN L. MOJICA
MARY R. MORTIMER
ANDREW R. ODEA
CARLA A. PAPPALARDO
REMY R. PASCUAL
SHAWN R. PASSONS
HOLLY M. PEREZ
RICHARD A. POZNIAK, JR.
ANGELICA M. PUCHA
KENNETT D. RADFORD
MARDDI J. RAHN
ANN M. RANIEWSKI
JAMES M. REILLY
RODOLFO G. SANJUAN
EDGAR O. SANLUIS
MISTY D. SCHEEL
HEATHER A. SHATTUCK
ELIZABETH J. SHAUBELL
JOHN SINCLAIR
DENITA J. SKEET
JAMES C. SPRADLING
KATHRYN M. R. STEWART
AMY M. STONE
CHRISTINA L. TELLEZ
JAMES C. TESSIER
TONY TORRES
CRAIG A. TYSON, SR.
TIFFANY A. URANGA
TARAIL VERNON
TRACY L. VINCENT
RIVKA L. WEISS
EDUARDO C. WELDON
MALISSA D. WICKERSHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RYAN P. ANDERSON
MICHAEL AUGUSTINE
ANTHONY P. BANNISTER
BISHOYE A. BOLARINWA
CHRISTIAN K. BOOTH
BRADLEY C. CARRILL
CHRISTIN E. CROWLEY
STEPHEN A. DARRING
DEBORAH K. DAVISREID
RODECE L. DEAN
JERETTA R. DILLON
RUSTIN J. DOZEMAN
RUSSELL L. ELLIS
JOSH A. ELSTON
AMY A. EVANGELISTA
PAUL E. FOX
TIMOTHY R. FREEMAN
JOHN A. FRENCH
PETER F. HARRINGTON
JASON E. HASIS
JOSHUA M. HEIVLY
JOHN M. HENSON
ANDREW E. HENWOOD
DANA M. HERBERT
JOSHUA R. HILL
DOUGLAS R. JENKINS

BARI J. JONES
DAVID K. JONES, JR.
ALEXANDER P. KACZUR
FRANK D. KIM
ROBERT G. KOVACK, JR.
WALTER W. KULZY
JOSHUA T. LANCASTER
EVELYN C. LEE
SCOTT J. LEWIS
ALVARO LUNA
APRIL E. MALVEO
LLAHN A. MCGHIE
ALLEN H. MCKIBBEN II
KEVIN S. MCNULTY
CHARLES M. MIELKIE III
MARK D. MILLIUS
JAMES M. NEWTON
ANDREW J. OSWALD
JAMES T. PERRY, JR.
BRUCE M. REILLY II
PAMELA R. SAUCEDO
FRANK W. SHERMAN
MONICA R. TATE
DANIEL J. VETSCH
LARRY S. WALLACE
RACHELE A. WHARTON
SCOTT A. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JENNIFER D. BOWDEN
ALLEN K. BROOKS
JOHN A. CARTER
CHRISTOPHER S. CAUBLE
DAVID J. CULLEN III
JAISEN E. FUSON
MARK A. GIRALMO
FERGUSON L. HARRIS
CHRIS E. HESTER
BRIAN L. JACOBSON
CYNTHIA L. KANE
JAY J. KERSTEN
KURT A. MICHAELIS
ALFRED V. PENA
JAMES M. PEUGH
JEFFREY QUINN
STEVEN L. ROBERTS
MARK A. ROGERS
PAUL N. RUMERY
CLIFFORD P. RUTLEDGE
LESLIE K. SIAS
DAVID L. SLATER
WILLIAM N. SOLOMON
THOMAS J. STATLER
WILLIAM M. STEWART, JR.
STEVEN E. STOUARD
DAVID A. STROUD
GARRY R. THORNTON, JR.
MATTHEW S. WEEMS
ARTHUR L. WIGGINS, JR.
ROBERT B. WILLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRADLEY M. BAER
JOHN H. BEATTIE
SCOTT N. BEYER
BEAU BROOKS
JOHN C. BROWN
MICHAEL W. CARR II
KENDALL C. CHAPMAN
RICHARD R. CONTRERAS, JR.
JASON P. FAHY
BRIAN L. FOSTER
JOHN D. HERRIN
JONATHAN L. HIGDON
KENNETH F. HONEK
MICHAEL M. JAROSZ
JARED A. JASINSKI
CHRIS D. KIM
DEBRA E. KING
JASON H. LOCKHART
DAVID M. MAT'VAY, JR.
JONATHAN D. NIEMAN
STEPHEN T. PADHI
ADAM S. PERRINS
RICHARD J. POCHOLSKI
MATTHEW A. RICHARDSON
WALTER C. SIBLEY
KENT R. SIMODYNES
MICHAEL S. SINGLETON
JAMES R. SULLIVAN
MATTHEW C. TOLHURST
AARON M. TURKE
ROBERT A. WADSWORTH
BENJAMIN V. WAINWRIGHT
GRANT H. WATANABE
MATTHEW T. WILLIAMS
WILLIAM W. WOHREAD
GREGORY J. WOODS

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

DIANA ISABEL ACOSTA, OF NEW YORK
REBECCA REYES ACUNA, OF TEXAS
JACK M. ADRIEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ALEXANDER JOSEPH ALBERTINE, OF OREGON
 FATIMA ALI-KARAGOL, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL ASHKOURI, OF VIRGINIA
 LUIS AZURDUY, OF FLORIDA
 COURTNEY WELLS BABCOCK, OF NEW YORK
 MONICA BANSAL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ROBERT A. BEADLE, OF MARYLAND
 KAI AYANNA ISOM BEARD, OF GEORGIA
 AMBER BECHTE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 KATHRYN BEGEAL, OF FLORIDA
 BEYOLA BELZLAIRE, OF FLORIDA
 JOHN F. BERNON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SARAH J. BERRY, OF VIRGINIA
 SARAH BIEBER, OF CALIFORNIA
 MARY GRAHAM BLISS, OF VIRGINIA
 NYA KWAI STERLING BOAYUE, OF GEORGIA
 MICHAEL BRADOW, OF VIRGINIA
 CLINTON JAMES BRANAM, OF MARYLAND
 ESTHER BROBESONG, OF CALIFORNIA
 ELIZABETH LEIGH BROWN, OF CALIFORNIA
 DAVID BROWNE, OF ILLINOIS
 ANAFRIDA NESTORY BWENGE, OF FLORIDA
 BRYAN THOMAS BYRNE, OF ILLINOIS
 GINA MARIE CADY, OF FLORIDA
 SHERI L. CAHILL, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 ALBERT E. CARRERA, OF CALIFORNIA
 JAVIER O. CASTANO, OF FLORIDA
 JORGE A. CASTRO, OF NEW JERSEY
 ROBERT HOWARD CLAUSSEN, OF NEVADA
 ELIZABETH M. COLARIK, OF FLORIDA
 BEATRICE MARIE CONDE, OF FLORIDA
 PETER M. CRONIN, OF FLORIDA
 HEATHER APRIL D'AGNES, OF ALABAMA
 DIANA NIMEH DAIBES, OF OREGON
 CHARLES AASGAARD DAVIS, OF MINNESOTA
 CHRISTOPHER JOHN DEGE, OF WASHINGTON
 AMY QUINN DIALLO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 MICHAEL A. DILLARD, OF TENNESSEE
 WHITNEY ALENA DUBINSKY, OF VIRGINIA
 SUZANNE KAY EBERT, OF NEBRASKA
 BOJANILE ADIETOKUNBO EBEPE, OF NEW YORK
 BRYAN J. ENSLEIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 REBECCA B. FERTZIGER, OF CALIFORNIA
 SIENA B. C. FLEISCHER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 JOSEPHINE E. V. FRANCISCO, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANNE MARIE O. FRERE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ASHLEY E. FROST, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 SHAMENNA KAIEHUMANUOKALANIOKEALOHA GALL, OF HAWAII
 FELICIA GENET, OF CALIFORNIA
 JASON J. GILPIN, OF FLORIDA
 LAURA ELAINE GONZALES, OF CALIFORNIA
 PATRICK WINFELD GODWIN, OF FLORIDA
 NICHOLE R. GRABER-SIMMONS, OF CALIFORNIA
 PHILLIP P. GREENE, OF MINNESOTA
 MIGUEL EDGAR SINEWING GUARDIAN, OF NEVADA
 BETH A. HAIN, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM K. HALL, OF VIRGINIA
 CATHERINE CYBELLE HAMLIN, OF TENNESSEE
 DANIEL I. HANDEL, OF NEW JERSEY
 KALIM HANNA, OF FLORIDA
 ELIZABETH ANNE HAYTMANEK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 CARTER ARMSTRONG HEMPHILL, OF TEXAS
 MAYCHIN HO, OF WISCONSIN
 CHRISTOPHER M. HYNAK, OF VIRGINIA
 GEZIM HYSENAGOLLI, OF NEW YORK
 SUZIE LUCILLE JACINTHE, OF NEW YORK
 MIRANDA GEORGIA JOLICOEUR, OF RHODE ISLAND
 ALEXIS JONES, OF VIRGINIA
 JESSE B. JOSEPH, OF VIRGINIA
 HANNA JUNG, OF WASHINGTON
 LEAH KAPLAN, OF TENNESSEE
 MERAL KARAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 NICHOLAS D. KAUFMAN, OF OREGON
 SAMBA ANSUMANA KAWA, OF MARYLAND
 MARK CHRISTOPHER KELLY, OF TEXAS
 LEVLA S. KESTER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 SAMUEL DESRIE KOUAME, OF NEW YORK
 MANISH ANDREW KUMAR, OF COLORADO
 MEGAN ERIN KYLES, OF CALIFORNIA
 MICHELLE M. LANG-ALLI, OF TEXAS
 CHRISTINA M. L. LANG, OF HAWAII
 JANET K. LAWSON, OF ILLINOIS
 VERONICA E. LEE, OF NEW JERSEY
 WARREN DENNIS LEISHMAN, OF WASHINGTON
 JUDE SUSAN LEITTEN, OF FLORIDA
 AUDRA DEGESYS LYKOS, OF OHIO
 REGINA BURNS MACKENZIE, OF VIRGINIA
 RUTH N. MADISON, OF VIRGINIA
 SIDI JILALI MAGHRAOUTI, OF FLORIDA
 ANDERS J. MANTTIUS, OF FLORIDA
 TAMIKA LEE MARTIN, OF TEXAS
 GUY MARTORANA, OF TEXAS
 DARYL MARTYRIS, OF VIRGINIA
 SHAYONNA M. MAXWELL, OF NEW YORK
 MELODY R. MCNEIL, OF TEXAS
 LORRI ANNE MELLIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 GAGIL MELKUMYAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 ALEFIA A. MERCHANT, OF CALIFORNIA
 RAPHAEL METZGER, OF CALIFORNIA
 SEBASTIAN J. MILARDO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 FAIGE LYNN MILLER, OF WISCONSIN
 AUSTAN MOGHARABI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LINDSEY MOORE, OF NEW YORK
 JESSICA REENE MORRISON, OF TENNESSEE
 JACOB MICHAEL MUELLER, OF FLORIDA
 GABRIEL ERIC NARANJO, OF TEXAS
 JENNIFER MARIE NIKLAEFF, OF TEXAS
 MAGGIE NORTHMAN, OF CALIFORNIA
 ENID ALEIDA NUNEZ, OF FLORIDA
 MAURA ANNE O'BRIEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 TARA NICHOLE O'DAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MARIKA ANNE OLSON, OF NEW MEXICO
 APRIL A. O'NEILL, OF WASHINGTON
 YASSIN CHALIF OSMAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 KAIL M. PADGITT, OF VIRGINIA

MICHELLE STEPHANIE PARKER, OF FLORIDA
 LISA PATEL, OF CALIFORNIA
 BROOKE NORTH PATTERSON, OF WASHINGTON
 R. CLARK PEARSON, OF FLORIDA
 ANH NGUYEN PHAM, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNIFER PIKE, OF FLORIDA
 EWA PIOTROWSKA, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER POWERS, OF FLORIDA
 PRZEMEK PRASZCZALEK, OF TEXAS
 C. XAVIER PRECIADO, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANTHONY RIVERA RANESSES, OF VIRGINIA
 KRISTIN MICHELLE RAY, OF MARYLAND
 R. ANDREW READ, OF MISSOURI
 LAUREEN DIANE REAGAN, OF WASHINGTON
 KERRY S. REEVES, OF TEXAS
 RASHEENA ANN REID, OF TEXAS
 KARLA KAYE ROBERTS CAMP, OF TEXAS
 OMAR ROBLES, OF PUERTO RICO
 WILLIAM S. RODEN III, OF ALABAMA
 ERICA ROUNSEFELL, OF OREGON
 CHRISTOPHER JOHN RUDOLPH, OF TEXAS
 STEVEN JAMES RYNECKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JOHN GATES SAHN, OF ILLINOIS
 JEAN WESNEL CAMILLEN SAINT-CYR, OF NEW YORK
 KEVIN T. SARSO, OF ILLINOIS
 CAEL H. SAVAGE, OF OREGON
 TRISHA SAVAGE, OF OREGON
 HOLLY SUE SCHIPPERS, OF MICHIGAN
 LYNN M. SCHNEIDER, OF WASHINGTON
 WILLIAM ANTHONY SEDLAK, OF WASHINGTON
 KEN ANTHONY SEIFERT, OF TEXAS
 JASON ROBERT SEUC, OF FLORIDA
 PATRICIA GORLAND SIASO, OF FLORIDA
 JARROD ZEBULON SIMPSON, OF TEXAS
 KAREN TRACY SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNIFER JILL SNELL, OF ARIZONA
 MARK G. SORENSEN, OF VIRGINIA
 RACHEL ELIZABETH SOREY, OF VIRGINIA
 CRISTINA E. VELEZ SRINIVASAN, OF TEXAS
 NANCY RHEA STEEDLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 DAVID ISAAC STONEHILL, OF CALIFORNIA
 ANTOINETTE MARIA SULLIVAN, OF LOUISIANA
 KIPP FREEMAN SUTTON, OF CALIFORNIA
 JENNA ROSE TAJCHMAN, OF KANSAS
 ETHAN N. TAKAHASHI, OF TEXAS
 MARK H. TEGENFELDT, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL TESKE, OF FLORIDA
 KIMBERLY A. THOMPSON, OF OREGON
 DANIEL G. THOMSON, OF WASHINGTON
 MARTIN ALEXANDER THURN, OF FLORIDA
 TROY J. TILLIS, OF ILLINOIS
 KATHY M. TIN, OF CALIFORNIA
 THAO PHUONG MAI TRAN, OF TEXAS
 WILLIAM EDWARD THOMAS TRIGG, OF NEVADA
 SAMUEL A. R. TURANO, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 BERT C. UBAMADU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LAURA GETTA UHL, OF NEW YORK
 PATRICIA A. VARGAS, OF FLORIDA
 ELIZABETH ANNE WAGER, OF OREGON
 ELIZABETH LEE WALKER, OF FLORIDA
 LISA MICHELLE WALKER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 GREGORY S. WANG, OF MISSOURI
 EMILY DANIELLE WAYTOTI, OF FLORIDA
 DAVID WESTERLING, OF MISSOURI
 JEREMY TILDEN WILLIAMMEE, OF VIRGINIA
 GARTH MICHAEL WILLIS, OF MINNESOTA
 ELIZABETH MEGAN WILLIS, OF CALIFORNIA
 MONICA P. WISNER, OF TENNESSEE
 MICHELLE DAPRA WITTENBERGER, OF FLORIDA
 BRIAN K. WITTNEBEL, OF NEW YORK
 PUI MAN WONG, OF CALIFORNIA
 SHAWN J. WOZNAK, OF MICHIGAN
 ASTA M. ZINBO, OF FLORIDA
 ELISA JOELLE ZOGBI, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JENNISA PAREDES, OF FLORIDA
 EDWARD PEAY, OF NEW JERSEY
 LAURA ROUSSEAU, OF VIRGINIA
 JACOB RUTZ, OF MINNESOTA
 JAMORAL TWINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 13, 2016:

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

CARLA D. HAYDEN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS FOR A TERM OF TEN YEARS.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTIAN D. BECKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRUCE L. GILLINGHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TROY M. MCCLELLAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RONNY L. JACKSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5143:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. LUKE M. MCCOLLUM

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. STEVEN M. SHEPRO

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TAMMY S. SMITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BRIAN E. ALVIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. RICHARD J. HEITKAMP

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MILES A. DAVIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. FLETCHER V. WASHINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. NIKKI L. GRIFFIN OLIVE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DARIUS BANAJI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TINA A. DAVIDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GAYLE D. SHAFFER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. FRANK D. WHITWORTH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. STEPHANIE T. KECK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID A. GOGGINS

CAPT. DOUGLAS W. SMALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. RICHARD D. HEINZ
 CAPT. JOHN T. PALMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CARL P. CHEBI
 CAPT. BLAKE L. CONVERSE
 CAPT. CHARLES B. COOPER II
 CAPT. PAUL T. DRUGGAN
 CAPT. DONALD D. GABRIELSON
 CAPT. ALVIN HOLSEY
 CAPT. JEFFREY T. JABLON
 CAPT. GARY A. MAYES
 CAPT. JOHN F. MEIER
 CAPT. JAMES E. PITTS
 CAPT. CHARLES W. ROCK
 CAPT. JOHN B. SKILLMAN
 CAPT. MURRAY J. TYNCH III
 CAPT. JOHN F. WADE
 CAPT. MICHAEL A. WETTLAUFER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WALTER W.
 BEAN AND ENDING WITH SCOTT L. RUMMAGE, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 18,
 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER
 D. BANKSTON AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM F. WOLFE,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 MAY 18, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD D.
 BETZOLD AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER E. TONNESON,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 JUNE 28, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEFANIE
 L. SHAVER AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM J. BRIDGHAM,
 WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE
 AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON
 JUNE 28, 2016.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF EROL AGI, TO BE LIEUTEN-
 ANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSHUA D. WRIGHT, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF PHILLIP W. NEAL, TO BE LIEU-
 TENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NATHAN D. SCHROEDER, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RENEE V. SCOTT, TO BE MAJOR.
 ARMY NOMINATION OF KEITH D. BLODGETT, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY M. AL-
 STON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. TURLEY, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28,
 2016.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEVEN C. LOOS, TO BE MAJOR.
 ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL W. M. MACKLE, TO BE
 COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL P. LINDSAY, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRANDO S. JOBITY, TO BE
 MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DAVID C. MARTIN, TO BE
 MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY A.
 VERLINDE AND ENDING WITH DAVID T. WRIGHT, WHICH
 NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-
 PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 7,
 2016.