

State of Alaska are donating goods, services, airline miles, freight services, food, hand and foot warmers, first-aid kits, cold-weather gear—you name it. Everybody is pitching in to help. It is something that this body and this country should be particularly proud of.

Although I am not surprised by it, Casey's marine brothers have flown in from thousands of miles away, all across the country, to help in the search. They served with him in Afghanistan, and they have now come to Alaska from Texas, Pennsylvania, California, and as far away from Alaska as New York. There are 11 now and more on the way. In the Marines, we don't leave our brothers and sisters behind, and these marines are living up to that ethos.

I am asking for the thoughts and prayers of this body and Americans—any Americans all across this country who are watching—on this effort. I am asking that we pray to bring Casey home.

Semper fi to him, his father, his sisters, and to those proud marines who are making sure he makes it home.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 289, S. 2232.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 289, S. 2232, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 289, S. 2232, a bill to require a full audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the

Federal reserve banks by the Comptroller General of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Cory Gardner, David Vitter, Shelley Moore Capito, Rand Paul, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines, Patrick J. Toomey, John Boozman, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Rob Portman.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote occur at 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday, January 12.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE APPROPRIATIONS PROCESS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Republican leader and I are both long-time appropriators. I love the Appropriations Committee. But over time, the appropriations process has broken down.

There are differing opinions about the causes of the breakdown. Opinions typically vary depending on whether Senators serve in the majority or minority. But there is a bipartisan consensus that we can and must do better. I hope that in the coming session, both sides can work together to restore the appropriations process to what it once was—a thoroughly bipartisan process focused on governing, not a partisan process focused on scoring political points.

The need for bipartisanship should be obvious. After all, during the next session, we will continue to be a divided government. Republicans will be in charge of the legislative branch, and President Obama will continue to control the administration. Neither side can force the other to accept its preferred process or its preferred outcomes. The only way to make this work is for both sides to work together throughout the year and to make the compromises needed to get appropriations bills not just passed but signed into law.

Among other things, this means that both parties will have to be part of the decisionmaking process from the beginning, at both the committee and leadership levels. This doesn't just mean developing individual bills in a bipartisan way. It means reaching bipartisan agreements on the sequencing and packaging of legislation, so that one party's priorities are not pursued at the expense of the other's priorities.

True bipartisanship also requires both parties to resist the temptation to pursue poison pill riders that appeal to their own supporters but that are so strongly opposed by the other party that their inclusion in appropriations bills would grind the process to a halt. No doubt there will be many opportuni-

ties next year for both sides to score political points. But the appropriations process is not the place for that. And I hope Members in both parties will agree that it is more important to fund the government than to play politics.

I am convinced that if we can restore the appropriations process to one based on bipartisan cooperation at every stage, all Senators will benefit. It will give Members in both parties a meaningful opportunity for input, and it will avoid the need for invoking cloture on motions to proceed to appropriations bills. With some luck, it also will allow us to complete our work next year without a lameduck session and without another end of year crisis. And that is something everyone should be able to agree on.

In today's polarized environment, that may seem like wishful thinking. But there is no reason we can't make it happen. We should build upon the momentum created by adoption of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, which the Senate passed with a 64-to-35 vote on October 30. And the key is really quite simple—genuine bipartisan cooperation at every step of the process.

RECOGNIZING THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HERMANDAD MEXICANA TRANSNACIONAL, ORG.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 10th anniversary of Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional, Org.

Since it was established in 2005, Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional has been a strong advocate for the Latino community in southern Nevada. In working to fulfill its mission of promoting family unity and community empowerment, the organization ensures that Latinos in Nevada have the legal, social, educational, and economic support they need to thrive, regardless of their immigration status.

Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional provides the Latino community with essential immigration services including assistance with navigating the immigration system to become naturalized U.S. citizens; applying for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, program; renewing work permits and legal permanent resident cards; and filing U-Visa and Violence Against Women Act petitions.

Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional has formed important partnerships with other entities to enhance the resources it provides. These resources include supportive services for victims of violence and free tax preparation services, voter registration assistance for newly naturalized U.S. citizens, and attorney consultation services for immigration cases at no cost to the client. Furthermore, Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional offers a variety of literacy and education courses for English language learners through its adult education program. These courses include elementary and middle

school education classes and a preparation course for Spanish-speaking students to obtain a General Education diploma.

I applaud Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional for 10 years of dedicated service to the Latino community in southern Nevada. Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional is the only organization of its kind in the Silver State, and its work is truly appreciated and admired. I also commend the distinguished leadership of Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional, particularly Ms. Luz Marin Mosquera, Ms. Dora Lopez, and Ms. Kathia Pereira. Under their direction, Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional has assisted more than 45,000 people in southern Nevada with a variety of immigration-related issues. This includes 4,000 people who are now U.S. citizens and 5,300 people who are now DACA beneficiaries.

I wish Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional continued success as the organization continues its meaningful work.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT NOTIFICATION REQUEST

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to Senator MCCONNELL dated December 17, 2015, 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, December 17, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL: I request to be notified before any unanimous consent agreement is agreed to regarding the nomination of David Malcolm Robinson to be Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization. This request is intended to be made publicly and will be disclosed in the Congressional Record so my name need not be withheld.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,
Chairman,
Committee on the Judiciary.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am taking this opportunity to notice my objection to the Senate proceeding to the nomination of Janine Anne Davidson of Virginia to be Under Secretary of the Navy. My concern is not with Ms. Davidson's nomination, per se, but with a larger matter concerning the Navy and its policies and practices with regard to retaliation against whistleblowers.

On October 21, 2015, the Washington Post reported that the Navy plans to promote RDML Brian L. Losey, even though the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General, OIG, has found on multiple occasions that he retaliated against perceived whistle-

blowers in response to whistleblower complaints and, in some cases, simply the belief that such complaints had been made. According to the article, the OIG has reported that Rear Admiral Losey went so far as to make a list of suspected whistleblowers and intentionally target them for discipline, demotion, and internal investigation. In several instances, the OIG recommended personnel action be taken against Rear Admiral Losey for these actions. However, the Navy appears poised to ignore those findings and promote Rear Admiral Losey.

On November 13, 2015, I joined with seven other Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, in a request to Jon T. Rymer, the inspector general for the Department of Defense, for the OIG investigation reports related to Rear Admiral Losey's conduct. Those reports were provided to me and to the other Senators signing the November 13 letter just 3 days ago, on December 15, 2015, in redacted form.

Until I have had an opportunity to thoroughly review the inspector general's findings related to Rear Admiral Losey and until I have received assurances from the Navy that it will address those findings specifically and has policies in place to sanction retaliation against whistleblowers more broadly, I will object to the Senate proceeding with the Davidson nomination.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, on October 7, 2015, I was unable to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted yes.

Mr. President, on November 10, 2015, I was unable to vote on the motion to concur to the House Amendment to S. 1356, an Act to authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense. I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted yes. •

ARIZONA STATEHOOD AND ENABLING ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we wish to speak today about the Arizona Statehood and Enabling Act Amendments of 1999 concerning the investment allocation and distribution of revenues in the State of Arizona's permanent land endowment trust fund. This fund consists of moneys derived from the sale of State trust land that was conveyed to the State of Arizona on admission to the Union in 1912. The State of Arizona was granted approximately 10.9 million acres of land at statehood and today holds in trust over 9 million acres. Every year, revenues generated from trust land uses must be

deposited in the fund and used solely for the benefit of beneficiaries specified in the Constitution of the State of Arizona, predominately Arizona's K-12 public schools.

The Arizona Statehood and Enabling Act Amendments of 1999 repealed strict investment and distribution limitations imposed on the fund by the Congress in the State's enabling act. It also granted the voters of the State of Arizona the authority to adjust distributions to the fund beneficiaries. To accomplish that objective, Congress specifically amended section 28 of the Arizona Enabling Act of 1910 to read, "Distributions from the trust funds shall be made as provided in article 10, Section 7 of the Constitution of the state of Arizona."

The Congressional Budget Office estimate, which was included in the House of Representatives Committee report, indicated that "[e]nactment of this bill would give Arizona state officials greater flexibility in investing and distributing the assets of the state's permanent funds."

My understanding is that this reference to the Constitution of the State of Arizona, in section 28 of the enabling act, authorizes the voters of the State of Arizona to amend their constitution to authorize different distributions than those in place in 1999, including distributions that may pay out more funds to the beneficiaries. I ask the senior Senator from Alaska: Would she agree?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I want to thank the senior Senator from Arizona for his question. I am familiar with the enabling act's requirements that funds are held in trust for certain beneficiaries, including K-12 public schools, and that distributions are made from Arizona's permanent land endowment trust fund.

The 1910 Arizona Enabling Act specified the level of education-funding distributions that must be made from the State land trust fund. In 1999, Congress amended the 1910 act, eliminating the distribution requirement and providing that such distributions be made as provided for in the Arizona Constitution, specifically article 10, section 7. Thus, as I understand it, so long as changes to the education-funding distributions are accomplished by amendments to article 10, section 7 of the Arizona Constitution, and the funds are used for the beneficiaries of the enabling act, the changes to funding distribution amounts from the State land trust are proper.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for her answer. I have one further question. I believe, should the voters of the State of Arizona change the amounts distributed to the fund beneficiaries by amending article 10, section 7 of the Arizona Constitution, that the consent of Congress is not required prior to the change taking effect. Would the Senator agree?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Senator MCCAIN, because Congress specified that distributions may be made as determined