

Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers.

S. 1406

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1406, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1476

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1476, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1533

At the request of Mr. LEVIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1533, a bill to end offshore tax abuses, to preserve our national defense and protect American families and businesses from devastating cuts, and for other purposes.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require transparency in the operation of American Health Benefit Exchanges.

S. 1697

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1697, a bill to support early learning.

S. 1726

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1726, a bill to prevent a taxpayer bailout of health insurance issuers.

S. 1737

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1737, a bill to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend increased expensing limitations and the treatment of certain real property as section 179 property.

S. 1739

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1739, a bill to modify the efficiency standards for grid-enabled water heaters.

S. 1846

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1846, a bill to delay the imple-

mentation of certain provisions of the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012, and for other purposes.

S. 1848

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1848, a bill to amend section 1303(b)(3) of Public Law 111-148 concerning the notice requirements regarding the extent of health plan coverage of abortion and abortion premium surcharges.

S. 1853

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1853, a bill to amend the Environmental Research, Development, and Demonstration Authorization Act of 1978 to provide for Scientific Advisory Board member qualifications, public participation, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1902

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1902, a bill to require notification of individuals of breaches of personally identifiable information through Exchanges under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 1907

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1907, a bill to amend a provision of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 regarding prohibitions on investments in certain funds to clarify that such provision shall not be construed to require the divestiture of certain collateralized debt obligations backed by trust-preferred securities or debt securities of collateralized loan obligations.

S. 1915

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1915, a bill to permit health insurance issuers to offer additional plan options to individuals.

S. RES. 330

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 330, a resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of "Smoking and Health: Report of the Advisory Committee to the Surgeon General of the United States" and the significant progress in reducing the public health burden of tobacco use, and supporting an end to tobacco-related death and disease.

AMENDMENT NO. 2603

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2603 intended to be proposed to S. 1845, a bill to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1916. A bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to provide for an application process for interested parties to apply for a county to be designated as a rural area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have spoken often on the floor about the challenges and opportunities for the future that the people of eastern Kentucky and rural parts of the Commonwealth face. Many of these challenges stem from this administration's regulatory overreach, whether it is a war on coal, ObamaCare or Dodd-Frank. Too many people are out of work, which has placed a drastic burden on the coal mining industry, and harshly cut the number of jobs available in the coal mining industry and related industries.

In spite of the challenges the people of eastern Kentucky face, I have great confidence we can overcome that and succeed. I was pleased to be able to assist the Kentucky Highlands Investment Corporation in receiving a Promise Zone designation, which was awarded just last week. That is why I wrote the administration in support of this designation last year. This economic initiative is just one way to help jumpstart the region's journey out of economic distress.

But we need more than that. My friend and colleague in the other Chamber, Representative HAL ROGERS, is leading an effort to identify ways to lift Appalachia out of the cycle of poverty and unemployment through the SOAR Initiative, and I applaud his efforts.

To offer yet another possibility for eastern Kentucky, my friend and colleague Senator RAND PAUL and I introduced the Economic Freedom Zones Act, to further enable eastern Kentucky to lift the burdens of some of the poorest families in the country. Our legislation would roll back government regulations and tax barriers to spur job creation and reform failed educational systems to aid disadvantaged children.

So continuing my efforts to find ways to assist these rural counties and give these communities a voice, I am pleased to introduce today, along with Senator PAUL, the Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act or simply the HELP Rural

Communities Act. My friend and colleague in the House, Representative ANDY BARR, introduced this legislation in that body, and I applaud his efforts to see it passed.

The HELP Rural Communities Act would give rural counties in Kentucky a voice when the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB, has incorrectly labeled them as “nonrural”—just another example of this administration’s one-size-fits-all, we-know-best approach to governing. Several counties in Kentucky, such as Bath County, have been labeled as “nonrural” and are therefore barred from certain rural lending practices helpful to farmers and small businesses.

If you have ever been to these counties, as I have, you would most certainly disagree with the CFPB’s ruling. But current law provides literally no opportunity to challenge the CFPB’s decision. My bill would allow counties which have been improperly designated as “nonrural” to petition the CFPB with additional local information to reconsider their status in order to ensure that rural communities, such as those in eastern Kentucky, have the access to credit they need to grow their economy.

This is an important step in the effort to renew hope for the future in rural Kentucky, especially eastern Kentucky. Given the bipartisan interest shown in recent weeks to get government out of the way and let the people of the region work, Congress and the President can come together to pass this legislation on behalf of eastern Kentuckians and rural communities. I look forward to working with my colleagues, Senator PAUL and Representative BARR, to see that we get this passed.

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. 1916

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 “Helping Expand Lending Practices in Rural Communities Act of 2014” or the “HELP Rural Communities Act of 2014”.

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF COUNTY AS A RURAL AREA.

Section 1022 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5512) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(e) DESIGNATION OF COUNTY AS A RURAL AREA.—

“(1) APPLICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the Bureau shall establish an application process under which a person who lives or does business in a State may, with respect to a county in such State that has not been designated by the Bureau as a rural area for purposes of a Federal consumer financial law, apply for such county to be so designated.

“(2) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—When evaluating an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Bureau shall take into consideration the following factors:

“(A) Criteria used by the Director of the Bureau of the Census for classifying geographical areas as rural or urban.

“(B) Criteria used by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to designate counties as metropolitan or micropolitan or neither.

“(C) Criteria used by the Secretary of Agriculture to determine property eligibility for rural development programs.

“(D) The Department of Agriculture rural-urban commuting area codes.

“(E) A written opinion provided by the State’s banking regulator.

“(F) Population density.

“(3) PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after receiving an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Bureau shall—

“(i) publish such application in the Federal Register; and

“(ii) make such application available for public comment for not fewer than 90 days.

“(B) LIMITATION ON ADDITIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require the Bureau, during the public comment period with respect to an application submitted under paragraph (1), to accept an additional application with respect to the county that is the subject of the initial application.

“(4) INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PUBLISHED.—The Bureau shall enter each application submitted under paragraph (1) in a sortable, downloadable database that is publicly accessible through the Web site of the Bureau.

“(5) DECISION ON DESIGNATION.—Not later than 90 days after the end of the public comment period under paragraph (3)(A) for an application, the Bureau shall—

“(A) grant or deny such application; and

“(B) publish such grant or denial in the Federal Register, along with an explanation of what factors the Bureau relied on in making such determination.

“(6) SUBSEQUENT APPLICATIONS.—A decision by the Bureau under paragraph (5) to deny an application for a county to be designated as a rural area shall not preclude the Bureau from accepting a subsequent application submitted under paragraph (1) for such county to be so designated, so long as such subsequent application is made after the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date that the Bureau denies the application under paragraph (5).”.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHANNES, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. HATCH, Mr. KING, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 1925. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for joining me this afternoon. Today we are introducing the Driver Privacy Act. I am very pleased to sponsor that legislation with the good Senator from Minnesota. We have a great group that has joined us as we introduce this bill today. This is all about protecting people’s privacy in regard to their automobile.

Every automobile that will be made going forward, over 90 percent, and something like 96 percent of the automobiles made now have a black box. This is actually silver, but we call it a black box because it is an event data recorder. It records information about your automobile. Ninety-six percent, I think, of automobiles made now have them, but the U.S. Department Of Transportation is requiring this year that every vehicle have an event data recorder in it.

The Senator from Minnesota and I believe that should be the owner’s information and that information should not be released without the owner’s consent. We already have a good group who have joined us in the endeavor, including an equal number of Republicans and Democrats: Senator JOHANNES from Nebraska, Senator ANGUS KING from Maine, Senator KIRK from Illinois, Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia, Senator SAXBY CHAMBLISS from Georgia, Senator MICHAEL BENNET from Colorado, Senator ROY BLUNT from Missouri, Senator MAZIE HIRONO from Hawaii, Senator JOHNNY ISAKSON from Georgia, Senator MARK BEGICH from Alaska, Senator ORRIN HATCH from Utah, and Senator RON WYDEN from Oregon.

It is absolutely an equal number of Republicans and Democrats from across the United States have joined together, recognizing people are concerned about their privacy and we need to make sure their privacy is protected.

I would like to make a few further introductory comments with the help of these charts and then turn to my colleague from Minnesota for her comments as well. We have seen with the NSA, with the IRS, with the Affordable Care Act, and with a whole range of issues that people believe what is going on, not only in government but with technology, is that their privacy is at risk these days and it is very much a concern. Many people do not realize that this event data recorder is in their car. It records all kinds of information, and in fact the Federal Government is requiring that this device be in their car. Neither is there a limitation on the amount of data that the device can record nor is there a law that protects individuals’ privacy to make sure the owner of the car decides who gets that information, other than under very specific circumstances which I will take a minute to go through.

What kind of data gets recorded by your event data recorder, this black box that is included in your car? There are more than 45 different data points that are in fact recorded right now. Again, the manufacturer can change this—add to it. There are no limitations or restrictions or guidelines or requirements on what manufacturers can have the event data recorder do. Right now it records things like speed, braking, engine, seatbelt usage, driver information, passenger information, steering, airbags, and crash details. As

I say, at this point the manufacturer determines what goes into that black box in terms of what its capabilities are.

Just to give a sense, if you delve further, for example, engine—just pick one here: “Number of times engine was started since being manufactured prior to a crash.” Obviously the idea here with the event data recorder is that it provides information just like an event data recorder on an airplane. In the event of a crash, it provides information about the accident. It is recording this information in a loop on a continuous basis, and it retains it for a short period of time and constantly updates it.

For example, for your engine, it can record the number of times the engine was started since being manufactured prior to a crash. It can record the number of times the engine was started since being manufactured prior to the EDR data download that is taken in case the box is removed and the information is taken and there isn’t a crash. It can record how fast the engine was running. That is just 1 of the 45 data points, but it shows the kind of information that is recorded and can be extracted from the black box.

So what does our legislation do? It is very simple and very straightforward. The Driver Privacy Act provides that the data from your EDR in your car cannot be extracted or taken by another party other than under very specific circumstances, and that means it cannot be done without your consent unless it is authorized by a court of law or the information is retrieved pursuant to NHTSA, which is the National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, recall or the information is needed in the event of a medical emergency, essentially unless there is some kind of recall on the car—and then they can’t disclose any data about you as an individual. It is macrodata. But other than that, without your consent, that information can only be taken from you by a court of law or in the event of a medical emergency, and that is done, obviously, for the very reason you have the black box in the car—safety, right?

Law enforcement might be getting it pursuant to a court order. They can’t just take it; they have to have a court order. If you are in a car accident and they need that information because of a medical emergency, then there is a special condition to take it.

In developing these, we were very careful to work both with the organizations that advocate privacy as well as the automobile dealers, the insurance industry, and law enforcement. We consulted with stakeholders, such as the Electronic Privacy Information Center, Heritage, AAA, the Auto Alliance, the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Again, we wanted to make sure the law enforcement issues were covered as well as the ACLU. We have a broad and diverse group that has been consulted and that we have worked

with in putting together this information.

Fourteen States have their own laws on this issue. I have highlighted the 14 different States that have passed laws that, in fact, assure you that this information is your information and cannot be taken from you without your consent other than through a court order or in the case of a medical emergency. But when you leave your State and you are driving in another State, you are no longer protected. So even though 14 States have stepped up and said: Yes, this is something we need to do—in fact, it was something we did when I was Governor in my State. Not only are the other States not protected, but you are not protected either when you drive outside your State, which all of us do on many occasions. So that is why we need a Federal law.

The reality is this technology is evolving and developing. This technology is going to continue to develop with all kinds of other aspects—obviously now we have GPS—and all the different things that are being done with automobiles. In many cases these are things people want, but they need to know their privacy is protected, and that is what we are doing here. We are doing it in a way that we made sure we continue to assure law enforcement, first responders, and manufacturers that the safety issues are being dealt with, and at the same time assure American citizens and consumers that their privacy rights are being respected and protected as required under the Fourth Amendment of our Constitution.

With that, I will turn to my esteemed colleague from Minnesota and again thank her and her staff for the work they have done on this bill. With her background in law enforcement, she truly understands the issues and has been invaluable in putting this legislation together. Again, I thank her and ask her for her comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I am introducing this bill today with Senator HOEVEN, who has been a true leader on this issue. When he was Governor, he worked to pass a similar law in North Dakota.

As Senator HOEVEN just described, the Driver Privacy Act will strengthen safety and protect consumer privacy. I think the bipartisan support Senator HOEVEN has gathered for this bill—seven Republicans, seven Democrats, and people all over the country from Hawaii to Georgia to Oregon to Alaska, not to mention the two of us from the middle of the country—demonstrates the strong support and the concerns people have about emerging technology. We want this technology, but I figure our laws have to be as sophisticated as the technology we have out there. Right now our laws are lagging and this information is not protected. There is no roadmap on how it should be protected, and that is why we are introducing this bill.

I have long supported improving safety on the roadways. Too many people die on our highways, and we need to do something about it. In 2010, there were more than 30,000 fatal crashes and more than 1.5 million crashes that resulted in injuries. This is unacceptable. Rural road safety is a critical issue for my State, as well as for Senator HOEVEN’s State. Only 23 percent of the country’s population lives in rural areas, and yet 57 percent of all traffic fatalities occur in rural America.

As a Member of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, I have worked to advance efforts to improve safety for all drivers, especially on rural roads, and we have made some progress. The transportation bill, MAP-21, ensured strong funding for safety improvements at rail-highway grade crossings, and the allocation of Federal funding was improved to put resources into roadways that need attention the most.

My amendment in MAP-21, with Senator SESSIONS, required the Federal Highway Administration to work with State and local transportation officials to collect the best practices from around the country that are also cost-effective ways to increase safety on high-risk rural roads. The report was just released, and I am now looking for opportunities for how we can best address some of the challenges addressed in the study, but it is clear we have more work to do.

Vehicle technologies that assist drivers and prevent crashes have grown tremendously in recent years. From new sensors that identify unsafe conditions, to driverless cars, these emerging technologies could dramatically increase safety for drivers and passengers.

Event data recorders, which are the subject of our discussion today, hold similar promise in improving safety on our roadways. An EDR, as Senator HOEVEN described, is a device that records data on a loop it receives from vehicle sensors and safety systems. The data is constantly being replaced and it only records 5 seconds of technical safety information when a crash occurs, although I am sure that could change when the technology changes.

EDRs can be the only resource available to determine the cause of a crash by providing information about what a driver was doing in the seconds leading up to a crash, such as how fast the vehicle was going, whether the brake was activated in the seconds before the crash, if airbags were deployed, and whether the driver and passengers were wearing seatbelts.

As a former prosecutor, I know how useful this data can be. It can be very useful for investigators to put the pieces back together to more easily determine the cause of a crash for safety reasons and also determine who caused the crash.

The proven benefits to driving safety that EDRs provide are not new. In the summer of 2012, the Senate included in

its version of the Transportation bill, MAP-21, a requirement that the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, NHTSA, initiate a rule-making to require passenger vehicles and light-duty trucks to include EDRs.

At the same time, there were many legitimate questions regarding what impact expanding EDRs to all passenger vehicles would have on consumer privacy. Who owns the data? Who can access the data? It became clear that an effective EDR provision would need to strengthen driver and vehicle safety while protecting consumer privacy, and the EDR provision was removed from the final transportation bill.

Over the past 2 years, NHTSA has continued to work with law enforcement safety groups and the automobile manufacturers to ensure the safety benefits of EDRs, which could reach the most consumers. The auto manufacturers had already begun expanding the inclusion of EDR technology in more new vehicles each year. EDRs became so commonplace that 96 percent of 2013 cars and trucks had the EDR built in, and NHTSA and the industry it regulates, the automakers, were able to agree that all new cars and trucks should have an EDR in place in September 2014. I am not sure everyone who goes out and buys a car is aware of this, but by 2014 every single car and truck will have this capability.

However, NHTSA does not have the authority to address the consumer privacy concerns related to EDRs that have remained outstanding for 2 entire years. We have seen an enormous increase in new cars and trucks containing the EDRs, and that is where Senator HOEVEN comes in.

Congress does have the authority to clarify ownership of EDR data, and that is why we are introducing the Driver Privacy Act, along with 12 other Senators. Our bill makes crystal clear that the owner of the vehicle is the rightful owner of the data collected by that vehicle's EDR, and it may not be retrieved unless a court authorizes retrieval of the data, the vehicle owner or lessee consents to the data retrieval, the information is retrieved to determine the need for emergency medical response following a crash, or the information is retrieved for traffic safety research, in which case personally identifiable information is not disclosed. So that is where you have it.

We have worked hard with safety groups and law enforcement to make sure this would work for them. You would need a court authorization or you would need a consent or you would need a determination that it is needed to determine the cause of a crash or it is needed for research, and in that case, no identifiable data.

This was really important for me, as a former prosecutor, that we made this work for law enforcement and our safety groups, but, most importantly, our goal was to make it work for the individual consumers, the citizens of the

United States of America. We realize while all of this was done for good intentions, no one had taken the broom behind and made sure the American people were protected.

Having just left a judiciary hearing this afternoon about NSA and data collection and privacy and civil liberties, it was very timely that I came over here. While this may not quite have the huge ramifications of that hearing, I do think to myself that maybe if people thought ahead a little bit, we wouldn't have been sitting in that hearing. That is what we are trying to do with this bill. We are trying to think ahead so we can keep up with the technology so it doesn't beat us out and it doesn't beat our constitutional rights out.

I have seen firsthand the devastating effects automobile crashes can have on families as they are forced to say goodbye to a loved one much too early. Oftentimes families just want answers. They want to know what happened and why. EDRs can help provide those answers. Our bill accounts for those needs of law enforcement and these families. You don't have to take my word for it. The International Association of Chiefs of Police has concluded that the Data Privacy Act will not cause any additional burden to law enforcement agencies in accessing the data they need.

Advancements in technology oftentimes force us to take a look at related laws to ensure they remain in sync. Senator HOEVEN and I are introducing the Driver Privacy Act to do just that. Our bill strikes that balance between strengthening consumer privacy protections while recognizing that EDR data will be required to aid law enforcement, advance vehicle safety objectives, or to determine the need for emergency medical response following a crash.

I thank Senator HOEVEN for his leadership. He is a true bipartisan leader. We have worked together on many bills. When we work together, I always say the Red River may technically divide our States, but it actually brings us together, whether it is about flood protection measures or important bills such as this. I appreciate the opportunity to work with him on this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I thank Senator KLOBUCHAR for joining me on this legislation and working to develop a great group of 14 original cosponsors.

Senator KLOBUCHAR brings such a great background as a prosecutor in the law enforcement industry and truly understands law enforcement issues, safety issues, and the informational benefits there are with not only event data recorders, but also understands the need to protect individual privacy.

As I think we both said very clearly here on the Senate floor, this is a technology that is new and evolving. It is not just that this is a new and evolving

technology where new capabilities are being added all the time, we don't know what additional capabilities will be added.

But now the Federal Government is requiring that this device be in every single automobile made. So when the Federal Government—the U.S. Department of Transportation, NHTSA, the safety branch—steps up and says: OK, we are going to require this device to be in every single car, we need to make sure we are also providing the privacy that goes with it that assures our citizens that their Fourth Amendment rights will be protected.

Again, I think the Senator from Minnesota makes a really great point that when we look at some of these areas in terms of whether it is NSA, IRS, or other areas, people feel there wasn't enough work done on the front end to protect their personal privacy, so we are in a catchup situation. Let's not do that when every single citizen across this country owns or their family owns or has access to some type of automobile. That is what we are trying to do.

Again, as the technology develops we need to understand what the ramifications are and how to protect privacy. I think, on behalf of both of us, we are appreciative that we have 14 Senators engaged already, and we look to add, and we are open to ideas on making sure this is the right kind of legislation that addresses safety but ultimately protects the privacy of our citizens.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2649. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2650. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2631 proposed by Mr. REID (for Mr. REED) to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2651. Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COATS, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2649. Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. MCCAIN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BURR, and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1845, to provide for the extension of certain unemployment benefits, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SEC. 10. ENDING UNEMPLOYMENT PAYMENTS TO JOBLESS MILLIONAIRES AND BILLIONAIRES.

(a) PROHIBITION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds may