

S. 1591

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Raoul Wallenberg, in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions during the Holocaust.

S. 1629

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1629, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 1680

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1680, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to protect and preserve access of Medicare beneficiaries in rural areas to health care providers under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1749

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1749, a bill to establish and operate a National Center for Campus Public Safety.

S. 1866

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1866, a bill to provide incentives for economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1872, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the tax treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1884

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1884, a bill to provide States with incentives to require elementary schools and secondary schools to maintain, and permit school personnel to administer epinephrine at schools.

S. 1896

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1896, a bill to eliminate the automatic inflation increases for discretionary programs built into the baseline projections and require budget estimates to be compared with the prior year's level.

S. 1925

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota

(Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1925, a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

S. 1954

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1954, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide for expedited security screenings for members of the Armed Forces.

S. 1959

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1959, a bill to require a report on the designation of the Haqqani Network as a foreign terrorist organization and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1961, a bill to provide level funding for the Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

AMENDMENT NO. 1209

At the request of Mr. NELSON of Florida, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1209 proposed to S. 1867, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2012 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1976. A bill to authorize educational assistance under the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program for pursuit of advanced degrees in physical therapy and occupational therapy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill to allow physical and occupational therapists to enroll in the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship Program. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by my colleague, Senator COONS of Delaware. Our legislation provides tuition assistance to critical health care professionals in exchange for service as a commissioned medical officer.

Unfortunately, while the need for physical therapists has grown during the last ten years of combat, neither the Department of Defense nor the military services have conducted a separate analysis of the current or future DoD workforce requirements for occupational and physical therapists, even

though such an analysis was required by last year's Defense authorization bill.

This legislation would allow the military services to extend the same kind of educational benefits to physical and occupational therapists that are already afforded to physicians, dentists, physician assistants, and even veterinarians.

Physical and occupational therapists at the military's major medical centers serve approximately 600 wounded warriors every day on their road to recovery. More than 32,000 service members have been wounded in Iraq and Afghanistan, including many who have suffered very serious injuries and amputations. Physical and occupational therapists play a critical role in the prevention of injury, rehabilitation, and recovery of wounded warriors. They not only serve in medical facilities, but are also embedded with combat brigade teams on the battlefield. They use their medical training and skill to overcome impairments, regardless of the cause to enable service members to overcome disability and succeed in all aspects of life.

The idea for this bill came directly from a visit I had with a wounded Marine from Maine at the National Military Medical Center in Bethesda, Maryland in November. He was severely wounded by an IED in Afghanistan. He lost part of one leg and his other leg contains shrapnel wounds. Both of his arms were wounded, and he has a traumatic brain injury as well. In short, he has very serious wounds that are going to require a very lengthy recovery period. But, his spirits are amazingly strong and upbeat.

However, when I asked him if he had any concerns, while he praised the care he was receiving, he said there was a severe shortage of physical therapists and other trained clinical personnel to help him in what is going to be a very long recovery. He is expected to be at Bethesda for another nine months. It troubles me that he believes there are not a sufficient number of physical therapists to help him and the other wounded warriors who are hospitalized at Bethesda.

While the Department of Defense reports that it does not face a shortage in these professions overall, both the Air Force and the Navy report shortages in physical therapists, physical therapy technicians, and occupational therapists. One out of every four physical therapist positions in the active duty Navy is currently unfilled. So including these medical professions in this existing educational program would help meet this need.

This bill is also endorsed by both the American Physical Therapy Association and the American Occupational Therapy Association, who agree this effort will help curtail a possible shortage of these valuable professionals in the future.

I wish to point out, we are not authorizing additional or new funding in

this bill, it is simply an important insurance policy against a shortfall of these medical professions that will help the Navy and the Air Force fill vacancies. After all, it is these talented and committed professionals who are helping our wounded warriors return to living full and independent lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN PHYSICAL
THERAPY ASSOCIATION.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the more than 77,000 members of the American Physical Therapy Association, I write to thank you for your amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act and your introduction of legislation to include physical therapists in the Health Professions Scholarship Program (HPSP).

APTA commends your efforts to add physical therapists to the HPSP. This legislation will enable more of these highly qualified professionals to help treat our nation's wounded warriors and ensure that there will be no shortage in the future. There should never be any disruption in care for the reason of inadequate personnel.

As you know, physical therapists play a critical role in the prevention of injury, rehabilitation, and recovery of wounded warriors around the world. They not only serve at medical facilities like the Walter Reed National Military Medical Center (WRNMMC), but they are also found on the battlefield with the Army Medical Specialist Corps and are embedded with combat brigade teams. They aid in shortening the recovery time of soldiers so they can return to service, and are a necessary and integral part of the health care structure of the armed forces.

Thank you for your commitment to improving the rehabilitation and well being of our wounded warriors. Please contact Michael Hurlbut, Associate Director of Congressional Affairs, at michaelhurlbut@apta.org or 703-706-3160, if you have any questions or would like any additional information.

Sincerely,

R. SCOTT WARD, PT, PhD,
President.

THE AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL
THERAPY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Bethesda, MD, December 7, 2011.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the American Occupational Therapy Association (AOTA), the national professional association representing the interests of more than over 140,000 occupational therapists, occupational therapy assistants and students of occupational therapy, I am writing to thank you for sponsoring legislation to promote occupational therapy within the United States military. This legislation seeks to authorize educational assistance under the Armed Forces Health Professions Scholarship program for the pursuit of advanced degrees in occupational therapy and physical therapy.

Occupational therapy is a skilled health, wellness and rehabilitation service with the goal of improving function, independence and quality of life so that individuals can lead more productive and rewarding lives.

Occupational therapists work within the military from the frontlines in Combat Stress Control teams throughout the continuum of care to long-term rehabilitation and stateside community reintegration. While occupational therapists are present in every branch of the service the Army has the largest and most prominent role for occupational therapy; using the professions unique focus on overcoming impairments regardless of the cause to enable soldiers to overcome disability and succeed in all aspects of life.

The current wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have dramatically increased the demand for occupational therapy practitioners within the military. The signature injuries of these conflicts include traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder, traumatic amputation and poly-trauma. Within both the military and the Veterans Administration occupational therapists work as critical members of the treatment teams to address each of these conditions.

AOTA and our members in the civilian world and the military appreciate your leadership and vision in promoting occupational therapy education and training for service members so that they can go on to meet the needs of fellow soldiers and society as a whole. Both within the military and the private sector, demand for occupational therapy is expected to increase dramatically and your legislation can help meet those needs.

We look forward to working with you and your staff to enact this legislation during this session of Congress so that more occupational therapists are trained to meet the health care, rehabilitation and reintegration needs of our service members.

Sincerely,

TIM NANOF, MSW,
Director of Federal Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. BEGICH):

S.J. Res. 33. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to expressly exclude for-profit corporations from the rights given to natural persons by the Constitution of the United States, prohibit corporate spending in all elections, and affirm the authority of Congress and the States to regulate corporations and to regulate and set limits on all election contributions and expenditures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution to amend the U.S. Constitution. I do not do this lightly, nor have I ever done something such as this before. The U.S. Constitution is an extraordinary document which has served our country well for over 200 years and, in my view, it should not be amended often.

But in light of the disastrous Supreme Court's 5-to-4 decision in the Citizens United case, I see no alternative but a constitutional amendment. I should add that a similar resolution has been offered in the House by Congressman TED DEUTCH of Florida. This constitutional amendment is supported by such grassroots organizations as Public Citizen, People for the American Way, and the Center for Media and Democracy.

Let me go on record as strongly as I can, and as clearly as I can, in stating that I strongly disagree with the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision.

In my view, a corporation is not a person. In my view, a corporation does not have first amendment rights to spend as much money as it wants, without disclosure, on a political campaign. In my view, corporations should not be able to go into their treasuries and spend millions and millions of dollars on a campaign in order to buy elections.

I do not believe that is what American democracy is supposed to be about. I do not believe that is what the bravest of the brave from our country, fighting for democracy, fought and died to preserve. Almost 2 years ago, in its now infamous Citizens United decision, the United States Supreme Court upended over a century of precedent, taking a somewhat narrow legal question and using it as an opportunity to radically change our political landscape, unleashing a tsunami of corporate spending on campaign ads that has just begun. Make no mistake, the Citizens United ruling has radically changed the nature of our democracy, further tilting the balance of power toward the rich and the powerful at a time when already the wealthiest people in this country have never had it so good.

In my view, history will record that the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision is one of the worst decisions ever made by a Supreme Court in the history of our country. While there is no way of knowing for sure, since there are no disclosure requirements in place to track what was spent, it is no secret that already in the 2010 midterm elections, corporations and some very wealthy individuals spent a huge and unprecedented amount of money to further their political goals. There is no question this is just the beginning of their efforts. At a time when corporations have over \$2 trillion in cash in their bank accounts and are making recordbreaking profits, the American people should be concerned when the Supreme Court says these corporations have a constitutionally protected right to spend, spend, spend shareholders' money to dominate an election as if they were real live persons. There will be no end to the impact corporate interests can have on our campaigns and our democracy if we do not end this Citizens United decision and its impact on our Nation.

All of us in the Senate share one common characteristic. We all run for elections. We all live in the real political world. Let me speak for a moment what I think many of my colleagues in their heart of hearts know to be true; that is, that while the campaign finance system we had before Citizens United was, in my view, a disaster—there is no question it is a disastrous situation where candidates, Members of the Senate, spend huge amounts of time having to raise money, and I know that is distasteful not just for Democrats, it is distasteful to Republicans, it is distasteful for an Independent; that is what we do—now, as a result of Citizens United, that bad situation has become much worse because

infinitely more money is going to come into the political process through non-disclosed donations suddenly appearing on TV screens in our States.

According to an October 10, 2011, article in *Politico*:

The billionaire industrialist brothers David and Charles Koch plan to steer more than \$200 million—potentially much more—to conservative groups ahead of Election Day [2012].

What do we think? Do we think American democracy is about a couple of wealthy billionaires putting hundreds of millions of dollars into campaigns without disclosure? Is that the democracy Americans fought and died for in war after war? I think not.

It clearly is not just Republican operatives. There will be Democrats doing the same. So more and more money comes into the system. We do not know where it comes from, and in order to defend ourselves candidates are going to have to raise more money and become more and more dependent on big money interests. Does anybody believe that is what American democracy is supposed to be about?

Let's talk about the practical impacts. What happens on the floor of the Senate? The six largest banks on Wall Street have assets equal to over 65 percent of our GDP, over \$9 trillion—six banks. When an issue comes up that impacts Wall Street—some of us, for example, think it might be a good idea to break up these huge banks. Members walk to the desk up there and they have to decide am I going to vote for this, am I going to vote against it—with full knowledge that if they vote against the interests of Wall Street, 2 weeks later, there may be ads coming down into their State attacking them. Every Member of the Senate, every Member of the House, in the back of their minds, will be thinking: Gee, if I cast a vote this way, if I take on some big money interests, am I going to be punished for that? Will a huge amount of money be unleashed in my State?

Everybody here understands that is true. It is not just taking on Wall Street, maybe it is taking on the drug companies, maybe it is taking on the private insurance companies, maybe it is taking on the military-industrial complex. But whatever powerful and wealthy special interest we are prepared to take on, on behalf of the interest of the middle-class and working families of this country, when we walk to that desk and we cast that vote, we know in the back of our mind we may be unleashing a tsunami of money coming into our State, and we are going to think twice about how we cast that vote.

I am a proud sponsor of a number of bills that would respond to Citizens United and begin to get a handle on the problem. I would like to acknowledge them very briefly. One is the Disclose Act, sponsored by Senator SCHUMER, which would force corporations spending money on campaign ads to disclose their identity, as candidates have to do. That is a good thing. I support it.

Another is the Fair Elections Now Act, sponsored by Senator DURBIN, which would move us to publicly financed elections. I think that is a very good idea. I support that.

The third piece of legislation is a recent resolution for a campaign finance constitutional amendment, introduced by Senator TOM UDALL of New Mexico, that would make it clear that Congress and the States have the authority to write laws to regulate campaign spending across the country and make sure our State and Federal elections are about what is right for our democracy, and I support Senator UDALL's resolution. But even these excellent pieces of legislation are not enough.

The Constitution of this country has served us well for more than 200 years. But when the Supreme Court says—for purposes of the first amendment—corporations are people, that writing checks from the company's bank account is constitutionally protected speech, and that even attempts by the Federal Government and States to impose reasonable restrictions on campaign ads are unconstitutional, when that occurs, our democracy is in grave danger. Something more needs to be done. There needs to be something more fundamental and indisputable, something that cannot be turned on its head by a 5-to-4 Supreme Court decision.

We have to send a constitutional amendment to the States that says simply and straightforwardly what everyone—except five members of the U.S. Supreme Court—seems to understand; that is, corporations are not people. Bank of America is not a person. ExxonMobil is not a person.

The resolution I am offering calls for an amendment to be sent to the States that would do that. It would make perfectly clear, No. 1, corporations are not persons with equal constitutional rights as real-life, flesh-and-blood human beings; No. 2, corporations are subject to regulation by the people; No. 3, corporations may not make campaign contributions, which has been the law of the land for the last century; No. 4, Congress and States have the power to regulate campaign finance as Senator UDALL's amendment would also say.

This amendment is cosponsored by Senator BEGICH of Alaska, and I would urge all my colleagues to cosponsor this amendment which, in fact, does what its title suggests, saves American democracy.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 346—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE GOVERNMENT OF ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA AND ITS ACTIONS RELATING TO THE STANFORD FINANCIAL GROUP FRAUD

Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. WICKER)

submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 346

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda has committed numerous acts against the interests of United States citizens and operated the financial sector and judicial system of Antigua and Barbuda in a manner that is manifestly contrary to the public policy of the United States;

Whereas 20,000 investors, including many United States citizens, lost \$7,200,000,000 in an alleged Ponzi scheme involving fictitious certificates of deposit from Stanford International Bank, an offshore bank chartered in Antigua and Barbuda;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda violated the order of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas regarding the receivership proceeding initiated at the request of the United States Securities and Exchange Commission (referred to in this preamble as the "Securities and Exchange Commission"), in which the court took exclusive control of all the assets owned by Allen Stanford and Stanford-affiliated entities around the world and documents relating to those assets;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda challenged the authority of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas by—

(1) initiating a separate and competing liquidation proceeding for Stanford International Bank; and

(2) appointing liquidators who have defied the orders of the court in multiple jurisdictions around the world by litigating for control of hundreds of millions of dollars in bank accounts in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Canada;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda challenged the authority of the United States Department of Justice by seeking to obtain control of hundreds of millions of dollars in bank accounts in the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Canada that had been frozen at the request of the Department of Justice in accordance with multilateral criminal asset forfeiture treaties;

Whereas the courts of Antigua and Barbuda have denied recognition of the United States district court-appointed receiver for all assets of Allen Stanford and Stanford-affiliated entities;

Whereas the Stanford International Bank liquidators appointed by the Eastern Caribbean Court of Appeals now seek recognition of the Antigua and Barbuda liquidation proceeding as a foreign insolvency proceeding under chapter 15 of title 11, United States Code, in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas;

Whereas the Government of Antigua and Barbuda acknowledged in a statement in March 2010 that—

(1) Stanford International Bank "was operating in Antigua as a transit point and for purposes of registration and regulation"; and

(2) "[t]he business of Stanford International Bank, Ltd. was run from Houston, Texas, and its books maintained in Memphis, Tennessee";

Whereas Allen Stanford, the Stanford Financial Group, and the Government of Antigua and Barbuda enjoyed a mutually beneficial business relationship involving numerous economic development projects and loans to the government of at least \$85,000,000, and forensic accounting reports have identified those loans as having been made from Stanford International Bank certificate of deposit funds;

Whereas, in June 2010, the Securities and Exchange Commission alleged that Allen