

see some of these protections in the legislation I cosponsored, spearheaded by Senators MIKE LEE and PAT LEAHY. The Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2015 modernizes our Nation's electronic privacy laws and brings protections against warrantless searches into harmony with the technological realities of the 21st century.

The protections currently on the books may have been robust in 1986 when the ECPA was written, but they do not adequately defend our citizens against the mass data storage that currently exists. Nobody in 1986 would have ever envisioned where we are today as to the massive amount of data that is collected and stored today on the American people. This bill ensures that the Federal Government gives our law enforcement officials the tools they need, while ensuring that Montanans and the American people are not subjected to invasive and unwarranted searches.

Privacy and security both matter. I believe we can find a balance that protects both. I urge my colleagues to join me in finding reforms that stop cyber criminals from infiltrating our security networks and also preserve the privacy and the civil liberties that Montanans and Americans hold dear.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLEAN POWER PLAN AND COAL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I would like to shift gears for a moment and share some comments about President Obama's news that he made yesterday with the EPA. Yesterday, President Obama and the "Employment Prevention" Agency, the EPA, continued to wage their war on American energy, American families, and American jobs. As President Obama was announcing his plan to devastate Montana's coal industry and the good-paying jobs it provides, yet another coal company filed for bankruptcy.

At the same time, the J.E. Corette powerplant, in my home State of Montana in Billings, is being dismantled as we speak in the aftermath of President Obama's previous anti-coal regulation. In addition to supporting 30 jobs, the Corette powerplant has powered tens of thousands of Montana homes and contributed several million dollars in tax revenue to Montana and Yellowstone County every year.

Over the past year, Montanans have braced themselves for the release of the Obama administration's final regulations, which were already set to wreak havoc on our coal industry and make construction of any new coal-fired plant virtually impossible. The proposed rule was bad. The final rule is even more devastating to Montana jobs and to Montana families.

The final rule announced by the Obama administration makes the retirement of existing coal-fired powerplants inevitable within the next few decades.

The rules moved the goalposts and, I might add, to the wrong end of the field. These rules will most likely lead to the shuttering of Montana's Colstrip Power Plant and countless others across the Nation. It would be devastating for our economy and hard-working families across the State.

Energy rates will increase. Thousands of Montana family-wage jobs would be lost. Critical tax revenue for schools, for our teachers, roads, and our infrastructure would evaporate. In the Obama administration's final rule, they took an already bad rule and they made it worse.

The so-called Clean Power Plan forces Montana to achieve even more aggressive standards than originally proposed. According to POLITICO, in 2012 Montana produced 2,481 carbon pounds per megawatt hour.

Under the President's plan, by 2030, he wants Montana to produce only 1,305 carbon pounds per megawatt hour. That is a 47.4-percent reduction in Montana's carbon emissions because in Montana more than half of our electricity comes from coal. In fact, my mobile device is powered by coal. Coal also powers good-paying jobs for thousands of Montanans, including Montana tribal members and union workers, and generates nearly \$120 million in tax revenue every year.

America is poised to lead the world's energy needs, but this will be done through American innovation, through American ingenuity, not more regulations. The Obama administration's regulations are completely out of touch with global realities, and this is why: Global demand for coal-fired energy will not disappear, even if the United States shuts down every last coal mine and coal-fired powerplant.

Nations such as China, Korea, and Japan will continue using coal as it is reliable and it is affordable. These nations should be powered by cleaner Montana coal because the coal we produce in Montana is cleaner than Asian coal.

In terms of the environmental picture for the world, we are better off using American coal, Montana coal—not coal from Asia. Rather than dismissing this reality, the United States should be on the cutting edge of technological advances in energy development and leading the way in promoting the use of clean, affordable American energy.

In fact, according to the International Energy Agency's 2013 data, the world consumes about 6 billion metric tons of steam coal for power generation. Of that, the United States consumes 750 million metric tons.

Let's put that into apples-to-apples comparison. That means the United States consumes about 12 percent of the coal. The rest of the world consumes 88 percent. As the world sees an increased demand for power, it is clear we need to be leading the way in clean coal and energy innovation.

The United States should be leading. Let's be working toward clean coal,

clean energy, and leading the world as our 12 percent could have an influence on the other 88 percent.

America, we can and we should power the world, but we could only do it if the Obama administration steps back from its out-of-touch regulations and allows American innovation to thrive once again to not only lead America but to lead the world.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, last week I delivered my 19th "Waste of the Week" and we actually reached our goal of \$100 billion in savings for the taxpayer by identifying waste, fraud, and abuse. This was money spent by the Federal Government, money collected from hard-working earners who paid their taxes, sent them to Washington, and expected they would be used for essential purposes, such as providing for our national security, supporting research at NIH for medical advances that would provide lifesaving techniques and medicines to Americans, funding the rebuilding of crumbling bridges and highways, and any number of things the Federal Government is involved in that the American public agrees are essential functions that could be performed only by the Federal Government.

What we want you to do though, they are saying, is be as efficient as you can. If there is excess money wasted on programs that have no place in the Federal budget, let's identify those, let's eliminate those, and either return our tax money and lower our tax rates or use it for something more essential.

We have reached our goal of \$100 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse identified by nonpartisan agencies—not Republican agencies, not Democratic agencies or firms but nonpartisan agencies—that simply look at numbers, identify the projects, identify the spending, and ask the question: Do we truly need to do that?

Particularly at a time when the deficit clock keeps ticking, when we continue year after year after year to spend more than we take in, despite raising taxes, despite looking for ever more sources of income, it is clear we need to take the necessary steps not to spend more than is absolutely necessary to function on behalf of the American people.

So today I am on the floor for speech No. 20. We reached the goal. It is just the beginning of August. The Senate has many more weeks in front of it, but we are going to keep going because it is amazing the amount of waste, fraud, and abuse that has been identified by some of these nonpartisan groups looking at Federal expenditures. If we can add to our chart, I think we will have to add an extension to that chart or devise another one—

perhaps put another gauge over here—because we are going to keep doing this every week the Senate is in session.

Today, as I said, we are looking at No. 20. I looked at two agencies that exist in the Federal Government: the National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH, and the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA. These two agencies are engaged in cultural projects. Some of these are—people would deem—somewhat essential, but we have looked at two agencies that we think ought to be identified today.

The public probably will remember the 87th Academy Awards—better known as the Oscars—that took place in Hollywood a few months ago. Many Americans tune in and watch this high-profile event featuring America's rich and famous. As always, a parade of actors pull up in their stretch limousines and step into the bright lights of the entertainment industry's media—the flashing lights, the march down the red carpet, and stop to have their pictures taken. There, in tailored tuxes and designer gowns—some of which cost, amazingly, over \$100,000—everybody is trying to outdo everybody else.

The bottom line is Hollywood is not short of money. As Americans watch this, they see the Oscars that are being offered. Then we look at that and say: What in the world is a \$25,000 check from the Federal Government to Hollywood doing in this process?

It is hard to understand the concept that Hollywood needs support, needs a handout from the Federal Government, but they are developing an Academy Museum of Motion Pictures in Hollywood. Somehow they have applied for a \$25,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. Now, that is not a major amount compared to our budget problems here and the money we deal with, but the American public ought to be saying: Why in the world are we giving a penny to Hollywood to support the building of a museum?

It is simply because the process is open for anybody to submit for a grant. But who is reviewing these things? Who is looking at this? Does Hollywood truly need taxpayer money to construct a museum of motion pictures through the National Endowment for the Arts?

We also discovered that the National Endowment for the Humanities got engaged in one of these efforts, spending considerably more—\$914,000—to support a conference entitled “What is Love? Romance Fiction in the Digital Age.” The conference was full of speakers networking with each other and even giving the opportunity for adults to design and color their own title page.

Again, I am asking why. Why, given our \$18.5 trillion debt growing every day, do we have to give away a nearly \$1 million grant to support a conference on how in the digital age to develop romantic books?

While it might be fun to go deeper into this and examine just exactly

what goes on at this conference, that is not really why I am speaking on the floor today. I am simply here to ask why. Is this necessary? Is this the kind of thing we need to be supporting and doing with hard-earned taxpayer dollars that are sent to Washington, not for these purposes?

So today, the cumulative runs close to \$1 million—\$939,000—of taxpayer savings that would go onto our gauge, and we add yet another increment to the gauge in determining how tax dollars are spent.

We are going to continue doing this. This is a small one today. You can see we had some major chunks and major dysfunctions in the Federal Government, but I think it is important for every Senator to be able to go home, talk to their people, and say: We are making every possible effort we can to be efficient and effective with the money you sent to Washington, and we are looking into every dollar to make sure it is spent on essential functions of the Federal Government.

It is astounding how much is being sent, used, and wasted, how much fraud and waste takes place. We will continue to identify that each week.

That is our waste of the week. We will be back each week after our August recess when the Senate is in session to continue to identify ways in which we can save the taxpayers' money.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

#### FOR-PROFIT SCHOOLS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor many times to talk about for-profit colleges and universities. This is a problem and a challenge we face. What you need to know are three numbers to understand the for-profit college and university industry in America.

By way of preface, this is the most heavily subsidized private business in the United States of America. What are we talking about? The largest, the University of Phoenix; Kaplan University; DeVry University; Rasmussen; Corinthian—you have heard all the names because they advertise constantly, and the money they use to advertise comes from Federal taxpayers.

There are three numbers—and if I were a college professor or law school professor, I would say this is going to

be on the final—on for-profit colleges and universities. Ten percent of high school graduates attend for-profit colleges and universities—10 percent. Twenty percent of all the Federal aid to education goes to for-profit colleges and universities. Why so much? They charge so much. Their tuition is so high. Ten percent of the students; 20 percent of the Federal aid to education; 44 percent of all the student loan defaults in America are at for-profit colleges and universities. Ten percent of the students, 44 percent of the defaults. Why? They charge so much that the students can't finish their education or they end up with a worthless diploma. That is the reality.

There is a second reality. This industry is in serious economic trouble. Last week we had news of another Federal investigation of a for-profit college. In a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the University of Phoenix—the largest for-profit college and university—revealed it is under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission for unfair and deceptive practices.

This news comes just weeks after the Center for Investigative Reporting published a story about the University of Phoenix's thinly veiled, dubious marketing and recruiting efforts on military bases—exploitation of our men and women in uniform. Over the past several years, the University of Phoenix has spent millions of dollars to sponsor events, including dances, parties, and concerts, on military bases. Is it because they love our men and women in uniform? No. It is because they want to sign them up. To the University of Phoenix, these sponsorships were simply advertising and marketing events to enroll more men and women in uniform.

When you serve our country, we show our appreciation by saying there is a GI bill waiting for you at the end of your service—in fact, in some cases, while you are still serving—and for your family, too, so that you will be prepared after you have served our country to have a good life with good education and training and job opportunities.

These for-profit colleges and universities can smell an opportunity to make even more money. The University of Phoenix is after these men and women in uniform. They are after tuition assistance dollars. TA is a program that provides up to \$4,500 a year, so servicemembers can use it toward a postsecondary education. And guess what. The money isn't counted in the Federal 90/10 calculation that caps the amount of money these for-profit schools can receive from the Federal Government. Did you hear that? Ninety percent of their revenue comes from the Federal Government. That is why for-profit colleges and universities are the most heavily subsidized private for-profit businesses in America. To for-profit colleges, the money from servicemembers and veterans is unlimited