

Smart Transportation Caucus, I am committed to leading these important discussions on Capitol Hill. As a start, I would like to take a moment to highlight some of what I believe are the key aspects of DOT's four-part Federal policy. Safety, of course, is paramount, and the new safety assessment emphasizes consumer education and awareness. Just as prior generations had to adapt to the innovation of stoplights and the construction of interstate highways, Americans in the coming months and years will learn how to operate and share the road with automated vehicles.

To save lives, consumers must trust that the technology underpinning this revolution in transportation is completely safe. It will require public-private cooperation to improve consumer understanding and adoption of these technologies. We also cannot ignore the new threats facing modern vehicles, as they are increasingly connected to each other and to the infrastructure.

It is critical that the 15-point assessment promotes built-in cyber security from the very start of vehicle development lifecycle. I am encouraged that DOT is addressing data recording, data sharing, and data privacy. We need to know how these automated systems work and what happens when they don't. We also need to ensure that this data is shared and protected.

Finally, I support DOT's emphasis on continuing collaborative work among industry, government, academic, and R&D communities to advance automated vehicles. In Michigan, we have already seen the benefits of such collaborative work at the Mcity testing facility in Ann Arbor. Soon, joint advanced research will take place on a much larger scale at the American Center for Mobility in Ypsilanti, where we will be testing, validating, and certifying the vehicles that will be driving America in the coming years.

I look forward to the continued partnership with DOT to help advance the innovation that is driving the future of mobility, and I want to thank Secretary Foxx and Administrator Rosekind for their focus and hard work that made this week's historic announcement possible.

This guidance demonstrates that America will be the global leader in the development and deployment of advanced vehicle technologies. You know, just 8 years ago, people were predicting the financial ruin of the auto industry here in America. Today, not only have we had the auto industry come roaring back with record sales, but we are now working to produce some of the greatest and most important innovations in American manufacturing history.

(The remarks of Mr. PETERS pertaining to the introduction of S. 3381 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have put this poster up for Waste of the Week to address waste, fraud or abuse of taxpayers' hard-earned dollars, and this is week 51.

Today I am here to draw attention to the \$2.3 billion owed to the United States from uncollected anti-dumping and countervailing duties. These are nations that have violated our trade laws, that signed up through trade laws or trade agreements, and then violated those—or companies from those countries that have violated those. There are laws that prohibit that and enforce that, and this is what it ought to be.

Let me say at the outset here that I do support international trade. It bolsters our economy; the statistics show that. It creates new opportunities for American businesses overseas, and it enhances America's security and global roles.

Trade raises economic prosperity; it has been a proven fact. Just take my State of Indiana. In recent years, Indiana has exported over \$34 billion in goods and services. Hoosier manufacturers export automobiles, auto parts, industrial machinery, medical devices, and much more. Indiana is a national leader in pharmaceutical and agricultural exports. In 2014, our State had the highest share of manufacturing employment per capita and the highest manufacturing income share relevant to the total income of any State in our country.

According to statistics, more than one in four—actually one in five—jobs in Indiana are due to our ability to export overseas. That has a significant impact on our economy here in Indiana. It is vital for our State to have strong trade laws that prevent other countries from engaging in unfair trade so that Hoosier companies can compete with them on a level playing field.

Having said that, I support international trade for all of the benefits to my State and to our country. I also strongly support the use of our trade laws to protect American companies against dumped or subsidized imports from foreign countries, China in particular.

Under Federal law, anti-dumping duties are special fees that are placed on products shipped to the United States at unfairly low prices. Sometimes this occurs when a foreign manufacturer sells a product in the United States for less than it cost to even make that profit. They are not even trying to regain their costs. They want our market share, so they dump products into the

United States that undercut our American-made goods. I will not stand for that. I will not support that.

Some who support trade laws say that we shouldn't be enforcing these, that it will ultimately work itself out. I don't believe that. The law is the law. The agreements are the agreements. They need to be enforced. Countervailing duties are fees placed on products imported into the United States that are made in countries where the foreign government unfairly subsidizes the product to lower their sale price.

We are a free enterprise system here in America. Yes, there have been some subsidies, and we should not be a violator of that in terms of unfairly breaking the laws, and we generally are not in that situation. But many countries, we have found and proven through a process, a judicial process, have unfairly subsidized their products, and we need to impose the fees and penalties against these countries and these companies.

Both anti-dumping and countervailing duties are how we fight the predatory practices of foreign nations that unfairly hurt American manufacturers by making American-made products more expensive than a foreign competitor's product. In order to level the playing field for American companies and their workers, the U.S. Department of Commerce calculates the duties that should be placed on the imported product to make up for these predatory trade practices. Once Congress calculates the money owed to the United States, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection agency—CBP, which oversees all imports into the United States—is responsible for collecting these fees that are imposed.

Even though CBP is legally directed to collect all of these fees, recently the Government Accountability Office discovered that from the years 2001 to 2014, the CBP failed to collect about \$2.3 billion in anti-dumping and countervailing duties. There are a number of reasons CBP has trouble collecting these fees, but one key reason the Government Accountability Office highlighted is that CBP simply does not assess the fees once the item is initially imported or once Commerce determines how much is owed. Basically, they are just behind the curve. So the agency that is responsible for collecting these fees simply is not doing its job successfully enough. CBP is supposed to collect the fees within the first 6 months of entry of the product or assessment, but in its accountability process, the GAO found that of the 41,000 uncollected bills—41,000 uncollected bills—the median age of the bills was 4.5 years, and they were supposed to do it in the first 6 months. Clearly, we have some dysfunction here. Clearly, we have some waste that needs to be corrected so that we can enforce these trade laws. Otherwise, we are sending a signal: Go ahead and do it. Chances are we will get away with it. Their assessment system is not

functional. We have a good chance of avoiding the fee altogether.

That is the signal which is being sent out to countries and manufacturers all around the world that are dumping or unfairly subsidizing their products and making our products—our competition less competitive.

As I said, GAO has found that out of the 41,000 uncollected bills, the median age is 4.5 years. We need to get them back to the 6-month standard.

Additionally, we have learned that nearly 1,000 of those uncollected bills were between 10 years and 13 years old. That is simply not acceptable. It is a dysfunction of government. It is a dysfunction of the bureaucratic processes we have to deal with in Washington. If it were somebody else's money, maybe we could make an excuse for this dysfunction, but this is taxpayer money. This money is from the hard-earned money each family takes home at the end of the week to pay the bills, to pay the mortgage, to save money for college. It is unacceptable to have this happening in Washington, DC, where this waste, fraud, and abuse continue to ramp up on our calculator.

American manufacturers work tirelessly to compete on a global market and sometimes against those who don't even play by the rules. Those who don't play by the rules have to have the rules enforced. So enforcement of our trade laws through the assessment of anti-dumping and countervailing duties is essential to ensure a level playing field for American workers and to show that predatory practices will not be tolerated. That is one reason I supported bipartisan legislation that was enacted earlier this year that would give the Customs and Border Patrol people the tools necessary to better enforce our trade laws, such as requiring CBP to better track which foreign companies may be less likely to pay fees owed to the United States.

Fortunately, CBP has agreed with the GAO's recommendations. Now that Congress has also provided the Customs and Border Patrol people with the tools to implement and enforce these recommendations, I am hopeful—but also watchful—that CBP will improve its track record in the near future.

We have a responsibility not only to sort out waste of taxpayers' dollars or misuse of taxpayers' dollars, we have a responsibility to try to correct the errors, to give the tools to the agencies to do their job as we have ordered them to do and then to oversee and make sure. It is one thing that the job is done. It is one thing to come to the floor and identify a problem. It is another thing to come down here with my colleagues and offer a solution. It is another thing to follow up and oversee that solution and see what we can do to make sure this doesn't happen again. We are far too short on oversight and far too long on rhetoric.

With that, I am adding \$2.3 billion for uncollected anti-dumping and countervailing duties, bringing our taxpayer

price tag to over \$328-plus billion of waste, fraud, and abuse. Think what we could do with that \$328 billion—help our defense, help the National Institutes of Health produce lifesaving new medical techniques or therapies, pave some roads, pay for essential functions of the Federal Government, or even better, not have to take this money from the taxpayers and simply throw it away.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

#### WILLSEYE HOSPITAL

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk for a few minutes about a hospital in Pennsylvania, WillsEye Hospital. This is a hospital which is not only critically important to our State but to the Nation as well. It serves people from across our State and across the country.

WillsEye Hospital is a public trust that was gifted to the city of Philadelphia and founded in 1832. It was the first dedicated eye hospital in the country, providing care to the blind and the indigent—something they still do today. They still have that same mission.

Unfortunately, if the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—what we know as CMS—has its way, WillsEye Hospital will no longer be able to provide this kind of care. This is world-class care that so many Pennsylvanians and so many Americans can speak to personally. I had a personal experience when my daughter Julia had an eye problem years ago, and WillsEye did great work for her.

In this case, CMS is using an arbitrary ratio of the number of inpatients and outpatients to say that WillsEye Hospital is not a hospital and should be what is known as an ambulatory surgery center, which could have drastic implications and ultimately force WillsEye to close. Again, this was an institution founded almost 200 years ago.

Last week I went to WillsEye in Philadelphia to talk about this problem and had the opportunity to meet Joey Povio, whose picture is in this enlarged photograph. Joey is 6 years old, and he has retinoblastoma, a type of ocular cancer which, if left untreated, will lead to his death.

According to the American Cancer Society, there are 200 cases to 300 cases of retinoblastoma diagnosed each year. In the last fiscal year, WillsEye treated 110 unique individuals with a diagnosis of retinoblastoma, or almost 37 percent to 55 percent of the diagnosed cases in the country. So you can see the impact of just one hospital on a substantial problem that Joey and children across the country have. Fortunately for Joey, he is receiving first-rate treatment, but we have to have ask ourselves: What about the others who have retinoblastoma? What about the chil-

dren who will have retinoblastoma in the future? What will happen to them without WillsEye Hospital?

You can tell from this picture not just how dynamic Joey is—and I can attest to that personally, after having met him—but how focused he is on getting better and how confident he and his family are that he can, in fact, get better because of the great work done at WillsEye Hospital.

There are many who might think this is just a unique situation or simply an unfortunate situation, and certainly it is for Joey and his family and for others who have retinoblastoma or a number of other ailments or problems that center on their eyes. Thank God we have WillsEye to treat those problems. But there are other hospitals in the Nation that are dealing with some of these same issues and especially dealing with issues that relate to their interaction with CMS, and these are obviously some great hospitals that I will mention in a moment.

In this case, for whatever reason, I think CMS is treating WillsEye Hospital unfairly. I think that is an understatement. In this case, we have a number of institutions that have a bed ratio—that is the interplay between inpatient and outpatient that CMS is focused on in this circumstance—there are some hospitals that have a bed ratio that is lower than the one at WillsEye. Because those numbers are lower, that would mean those hospitals should be the subject of the same kind of action CMS is taking when it comes to WillsEye.

When WillsEye was first denied hospital status, their bed ratio was 17 percent. But according to the data provided by the American Hospital Association, the Cleveland Clinic, one of our great institutions, has a ratio of 6.14 percent, which is obviously lower than 17 percent, and Stanford Health Care, another great institution, has a ratio of 10.5 percent, which is again lower than the 17 percent at WillsEye Hospital. As I mentioned, these are the bed ratios. So it doesn't make much sense that CMS is focused on WillsEye and is not taking the same action or similar action as it relates to those other two institutions.

Now, no one would doubt that these two premier institutions—Cleveland Clinic and Stanford—are hospitals. There is no question they are hospitals. Yet CMS is focused on WillsEye in a determination they have made that it is not a hospital. It doesn't make any sense.

CMS does not even have a definite ratio that a facility needs to meet in order to have inpatient beds. They simply need to be "primarily engaged" in providing inpatient services. So there is no definite ratio, and yet they are taking action that is to the detriment of WillsEye Hospital, and I believe—and I think the evidence in the record is clear—to the detriment of a lot of people in Southeastern Pennsylvania, a