

to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the Health Coverage Tax Credit.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 539, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. HATCH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 582, a bill to prohibit taxpayer funded abortions.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. PAUL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of

medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention and control of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce the Prevention of Antibiotic Resistance Act, along with my colleague Senator SUSAN COLLINS. This bill will help to prevent the rise of antibiotic resistant pathogens by ensuring that antibiotics are used prudently and judiciously in the agriculture industry.

Antibiotic resistance is a growing public health threat. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, estimate that antibiotic-resistant bacteria cause at least 23,000 deaths and 2 million infections each year in the United States. The CDC also estimates that antibiotic resistance costs the United States \$20 billion in excess health costs each year. These statistics will only worsen if we do not take meaningful steps to reduce inappropriate and unnecessary antibiotic use.

The agriculture industry has long used antibiotics to increase and maintain animal weight gain and feed efficiency. The industry has also relied on administering antibiotics to stave off infections associated with poor biosecurity or sanitation in barns and feedlots. However, based on what we know now about antibiotic resistance, these practices no longer make sense.

I am particularly concerned about the rise of antibiotic resistance in foodborne pathogens. Foodborne illness is already a pressing public health problem, and the United States must ensure that agricultural antibiotic use practices do not lead to antibiotic resistance in foodborne bacteria.

Already, the CDC estimates that 410,000 antibiotic resistant Salmonella and Campylobacter infections occur each year. In fact, nearly 1 in 4 Campylobacter infections analyzed by the CDC is drug-resistant.

The CDC has also discovered that multidrug-resistant Salmonella results in more virulent infections, causing higher rates of hospitalization and bloodstream infections than normally expected with Salmonella infections. Clearly, more needs to be done to fight antibiotic resistance. This legislation will ensure that all medically important antibiotics approved for use in livestock feed and water pose no risk to human health due to the development of antibiotic resistance.

In 2013, the Food and Drug Administration, FDA, took a critically important first step by issuing Guidance for Industry 213, a policy that will eliminate the use of antibiotics for feed efficiency or weight gain uses in food-animal production. I am glad that the pharmaceutical and agriculture industries plan to adopt FDA's policy. This is a victory for public health, and I am eager to see this policy fully implemented.

However, FDA's judicious antibiotic use policy has a gap that must be addressed in order to fully protect public health. You see, many of the antibiotics previously approved for disease prevention and control are at high risk of abuse or misuse.

Some of these approved uses are at similar low doses as the production uses being phased out by FDA judicious use policies. Other uses do not have a defined duration of use or aren't approved at a therapeutic dose expected to treat a specific bacterial pathogen.

In fact, the FDA has informed my staff that there are likely 107 antibiotics approved for disease prevention or control that fall into these categories. This is a problem as some producers may rely on these drugs far too often as a way to maintain animal production or to prevent recurrent infections when these important issues could be solved with better sanitation, biosecurity, and animal husbandry.

This legislation would require pharmaceutical companies to submit additional information to the FDA to demonstrate that a disease prevention or control use of the drug does not pose a risk to human health due to the development of antibiotic resistance. It would apply only to antibiotics approved for disease prevention or control that are at high risk of overuse.

If there is no risk to human health, the drug sponsor would also have to provide evidence to revise the conditions of using an antibiotic for disease prevention or control to ensure the drug is only used judiciously and sparingly. These revised drug approvals would be required to specify a therapeutic dose, be shown to control a specific bacterial infection, be targeted only to the group of animals at risk of developing a specific infection, and specify a defined duration of use.

The bill also includes a sense of the Senate that all medically important antibiotics should be used only on the order of a licensed veterinarian who has a valid veterinarian-client-patient relationship with a producer.

This means that the veterinarian is familiar with the animals to which he or she is prescribing an antibiotic. Veterinary oversight is a key component of ensuring that antibiotics are not used inappropriately or unnecessarily.

This legislation, therefore, would allow for medically important antibiotics to be used to prevent or control infections when absolutely necessary and when it does not pose a risk to human health. In addition to protecting human health, this legislation will help to preserve the efficacy of antibiotic for veterinarians, so that the drugs will continue to be effective for treating livestock and poultry when no other alternatives to these drugs exist.

Antibiotic resistance is a growing public health threat. If we do not act now, many more Americans will suffer and, in some cases, die from infections that are no longer treatable. This legislation will protect public health while

allowing the agriculture sector to use antibiotics when absolutely necessary to preserve animal health. I ask my colleagues to work with me to enact this important bipartisan bill.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 622. A bill to strengthen families' engagement in the education of their children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I introduce the Family Engagement in Education Act with my colleagues Senator COONS and Senator WHITEHOUSE. I thank Representatives THOMPSON and DESAULNIER for introducing the House companion of this bipartisan bill.

Research demonstrates that family engagement in a child's education increases student achievement, improves attendance, and reduces dropout rates. A study by Anne Seitsinger and Steven Brand at the University of Rhode Island's Center for School Improvement and Educational Policy found that students whose parents support their education through learning activities at home and discuss the importance of education perform better in school. The importance of family engagement begins even before a child enters school. For example, Scholastic's recent Kids and Family Reading Report found that among children ages 6–11, 60 percent of frequent readers, those who read 5–7 days per week for fun, were read to aloud by a parent 5–7 times per week before they entered kindergarten.

Too often, however, family engagement is not built into our school improvement efforts in a systematic way. The Family Engagement in Education Act will promote and strengthen meaningful family engagement policies and programs at the national, State, and local levels to ensure that all students are on track to be career and college-ready.

Our legislation will empower parents by increasing school district resources dedicated to family engagement activities from one percent to 2 percent of the district's Title I allocation. It will also improve the quality of family engagement practices at the school level by requiring school districts to develop and implement standards-based policies and practices for family-school partnerships. It will build State and local capacity for effective family engagement in education by setting aside at least 0.3 percent of the State Title I allocation for statewide family engagement in education activities, such as establishing statewide family engagement centers to continue and enhance the work that had been supported through the Parent Information Resource Centers. For States with Title I-A allocations above \$60 million, grants will be provided to at least one local family engagement in education center to provide innovative programming and services, such as leadership training and family literacy, to local families and to remove barriers to family

engagement, and to support activities in the highest need areas of the State. Finally, at the national level, our legislation will require the Secretary of Education to convene practitioners, researchers, and other experts in the field of family engagement in education to develop recommended metrics for measuring the quality and outcomes of family engagement in a child's education.

This legislation builds on my successful efforts in the last reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act, to incorporate provisions throughout the law to strengthen and boost parental involvement. Developed with the National Family, School, and Community Engagement Working Group, which includes organizations such as National PTA, United Way Worldwide, Harvard Family Research Project, and National Council of La Raza, and endorsed by hundreds of local, State, and national organizations, this legislation represents the broad consensus that we must do a better job of engaging families in all aspects of their children's education.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Family Engagement in Education Act, and to work for its inclusion in forthcoming legislation to reauthorize and renew the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 93—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE COURAGEOUS WORK AND LIFE OF RUSSIAN OPPOSITION LEADER BORIS NEMTSOV, AND CALLING FOR A SWIFT AND TRANSPARENT INVESTIGATION INTO HIS TRAGIC MURDER IN MOSCOW ON FEBRUARY 27, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. COTTON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CORNER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 93

Whereas, on February 27, 2015, former deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov was shot four times in the back within view of the Kremlin and a few short blocks from FSB headquarters in Russia's capital city Moscow;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov dedicated his life to the cause of freedom and human rights for the Russian people and sought to rid Russia's government of the corruption that fuels authoritarianism;

Whereas President Barack Obama called Mr. Nemtsov a "tireless advocate" for the rights of Russian citizens;

Whereas Prime Minister David Cameron said Mr. Nemtsov's "life was dedicated to

speaking up tirelessly for the Russian people, to demanding their right to democracy and liberty under the rule of law, and to an end to corruption. He did so without fear, and never gave in to intimidation";

Whereas, on March 1, 2015, over 50,000 people representing a wide range of political parties and movements marched solemnly through Moscow to honor Mr. Nemtsov's life, many holding signs saying "I am not afraid";

Whereas, before his death, Mr. Nemtsov planned to lead a Spring March on March 1, 2015, against the Russian military's presence in Ukraine;

Whereas, in the weeks prior to his death, Mr. Nemtsov had reportedly been meeting with the families of Russian soldiers killed during Russia's military operations in Ukraine;

Whereas Ukrainian President Petro Poroshenko said Mr. Nemtsov planned to release an investigative report showing proof of Russia's role in the Ukraine crisis;

Whereas, two years ago, Mr. Nemtsov led the release of a report titled, "Winter Olympics in the Sub-Tropics: Corruption and Abuse in Sochi", which implicated Russian President Vladimir Putin in the estimated \$26,000,000,000 frittered away in "embezzlement and kickbacks";

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov said on Ekho Moskv radio hours before his murder that President Putin was inserting Russia into the ongoing conflict by his "mad, aggressive and deadly policy of war against Ukraine," and asserted "when power is concentrated in the hands of one person and this person rules forever, this will lead to absolute catastrophe, absolute";

Whereas, according to Mr. Nemtsov's lawyer, Vadim Prokhorov, the activist reported threats to his safety to police authorities who failed to provide him with protection;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov's associates, such as leading opposition figure Alexei Navalny, stated that Mr. Nemtsov would have been under clear state surveillance as he walked toward the Kremlin shortly before his murder;

Whereas Mr. Nemtsov was murdered in one of the most heavily-secured areas of Moscow;

Whereas opposition activist Ilya Yashin, commenting on the murder of Nemtsov, stated that "the atmosphere of hatred toward alternative thinkers that has formed over the past year, since the annexation of Crimea, may have played its role," referring to the surge of intense and officially endorsed nationalist discourse in Russia since it annexed Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula;

Whereas President Putin called critics of his government policy "a fifth column" and "national traitors," inviting violent attacks upon them;

Whereas President Putin warned publicly in 2012, shortly after returning to the Presidency, that his opponents were planning to stage a murder of their own as a "provocation";

Whereas several prominent critics of President Putin and his government have died gruesomely since he came to power as head of the Russian National Security Service and through his current office of President;

Whereas, on September 21, 2000, Iskandar Khatloni, a reporter for the Tajik-language service of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty who had been working on stories about human rights abuses in Chechnya, was killed in his apartment by an ax-wielding assailant;

Whereas, on August 21, 2002, Vladimir Golovlyov, leader of the Liberal Russia faction in the lower house of parliament, was shot to death in a Moscow park while walking his dog after accusing President Putin of autocratic governance;