

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I see the distinguished Senator from Arkansas on the floor. I suggest we go to him next, but I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized when he finishes his comments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Arkansas.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES A. ROSS

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, today I wish to recognize James A. Ross of Cotter as the Arkansan of the Week for exemplifying what it means to be a great Arkansan.

After serving in the U.S. Navy, Jim and his wife Mary Lou moved to Cotter in 1959 to raise their three boys because they saw Arkansas as a State that puts people first.

Jim worked as a carpenter and played a role in the construction of many buildings in Cotter, Mountain Home, and other areas in North Central Arkansas. Until his retirement, he worked tirelessly to ensure the success and stability of his family, his church, and his community.

Jim is a popular guy in Cotter. He has always been an active member of the community. He served as the Cotter school board secretary and worked to help build the current Cotter City Hall. Additionally, Jim has served as a deacon for First Baptist Church in Cotter for over 40 years.

Jim and Mary Lou have been married for over 64 years. Jim now spends his time enjoying his three children and a number of grandchildren and great-grandchildren. In fact, it was one of those grandkids, Cameron, who nominated Jim for Arkansan of the Week. In his nomination, Cameron wrote:

Jim's faith drives his every move, and at 86-years-old, he still gives as much back to the community as he possibly can. On any given day you can find him driving around town waving at passersby, or working in his garden in front of his green-and-brown house with sunflowers painted on it.

Cameron continued:

Jim Ross is a great Arkansan, not because he has done one major thing, but because he has done countless little things to further his city, his state, and his nation.

I couldn't agree more. Jim truly embodies what it means to be the Arkansan of the Week. We could all take a few lessons from him about commitment to faith, family, and community. Jim and Mary Lou came to Arkansas because they saw it as a State that puts people first, and it is people like Jim who make that recognition a reality.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, first, I should note how much I agree with

the senior Senator from New Hampshire and her comments about the appropriations process. I mentioned on the floor yesterday that in the Appropriations Committee, we reported 12 bills, including the State and foreign operations bill. It passed, 30 to 0. It and the other bills have now been put on a shelf to collect dust by the House Republican leadership. We will probably never get a chance to vote on them. By doing so, by deciding to put the government on autopilot and drafting another continuing resolution instead, they will reduce by almost \$500 million the amount that the Senate provided for fiscal year 2017 for the security of our diplomats and embassies abroad. It is very similar to what the House did when they refused to support the Senate's higher amount for embassy security prior to the Benghazi attack. They didn't want to admit it, as they spent tens of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money investigating the lack of security in Benghazi, blaming everyone but themselves. It will be interesting to see if they acknowledge that they are again cutting funds for embassy security.

PRESIDENT-ELECT'S BUSINESS DEALINGS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, on another matter, I have noted for months, actually for years, in the lead-up to the November 8 election, that congressional Republicans spent millions of taxpayers' dollars to air their unsubstantiated concerns about corruption at the highest levels of our government. If they were trying to get on television doing it, we might want to take a look at what they said. They said the Clinton Foundation should be dissolved, notwithstanding the amount of good work it is doing around the world. Every action, every meeting, every activity of the Clinton Foundation should be revealed, they said. We cannot allow such a foundation to run so close to the Oval Office, they said.

So it is ironic, sadly ironic, actually it is madly ironic, that since November 8, I have heard neither a shout nor a whisper from congressional Republicans echoing the same concerns about our President-elect's personal and profitable business dealings. No outrage that the President-elect's family may charge the American taxpayers millions of dollars to rent space for the Secret Service at Trump Tower. No demand that the President-elect—the chairman and president of The Trump Corporation—dissolve the interests he owns. Today we hear how the President-elect plans to address these conflicts of interest which he calls a “visual” problem rather than an ethical one. But unless he does what I and others have called for—divest his interest in and sever his relationship to the Trump Organization and put the proceeds in a true blind trust—it is nothing more than lipservice. Until we know more about what role his family

will have, both in his business interests and the government's operation under a Trump administration, no one should consider this serious concern as addressed.

And here is the duplicity of congressional Republicans' double standard. After years of partisan witch hunts and millions of wasted taxpayer dollars investigating bogus allegations against Hillary Clinton, and by extension the Clinton Foundation, if they fail to demand the same of Donald Trump that they demanded of her, they will, as E.J. Dionne said so eloquently in his column in the Washington Post, “be fully implicated in any Trump scandal that results from a shameful and partisan double standard.”

Madam President, I am hearing from Vermonters. They are worried. They are uncertain. Some of them are scared. Congress could do a great service to all our constituents if it led by example, not just by convenient spoken platitudes that might give you a few seconds on the evening news. If my colleagues want to actually be the leaders that they claim they are, do not start by validating an offensive and dangerous double standard. Have the same standard for Republicans as you do for Democrats. You can't condemn Democrats on something but say it is perfectly okay if Republicans do it. It doesn't work that way.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the column from the Washington Post of November 27, 2016, by E.J. Dionne entitled “An ethical double standard for Trump—and the GOP?” be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 2016]

AN ETHICAL DOUBLE STANDARD FOR TRUMP—AND THE GOP?

(By E.J. Dionne Jr.)

Republicans are deeply concerned about ethics in government and the vast potential for corruption stemming from conflicts of interest. We know this because of the acute worries they expressed over how these issues could have cast a shadow over a Hillary Clinton presidency.

“If Hillary Clinton wins this election and they don't shut down the Clinton Foundation and come clean with all of its past activities, then there's no telling the kind of corruption that you might see out of the Clinton White House,” Sen. Tom Cotton (R-Ark.) told conservative talk show host Hugh Hewitt.

Presumably Cotton will take the lead in advising Donald Trump to “shut down” his business activities and “come clean” on what came before. Surely Cotton wants to be consistent.

The same must be true of Reince Priebus, the Republican National Committee chair whom Trump tapped as his chief of staff. “When that 3 a.m. phone call comes, Americans deserve to have a president on the line who is not compromised by foreign donations,” Priebus said earnestly in a statement on Aug. 18.

Priebus, you would think, believes this even more strongly about a president whose enterprises might reap direct profits for himself or members of his family from foreign businesses or governments. Priebus must

thus be hard at work right now on a plan for Trump to sell off his assets.

"The deals that she and her husband were pocketing—hundreds of thousands of foreign money," Rep. Darrell Issa (R-Calif.) told the Breitbart website, the right-wing outlet once led by the soon-to-be White House chief strategist, Stephen K. Bannon. Issa added that Clinton wanted her activities "to be behind closed doors" and "did that because she doesn't know where the line is."

We can assume that Issa will press the president-elect about the dangers of doing business deals "behind closed doors" and instruct him about where the ethical "line" should be.

And it would be truly heartening to know that Rep. Jason Chaffetz (R-Utah), a vociferous critic of the Clinton Foundation ("There's a connection between what the foundation is doing and what the secretary of state's office is doing"), plans to apply the same benchmarks to Trump.

After all, when the chairman of the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee was asked last August on CNN if Trump should release his tax returns, his answer was both colorful and unequivocal. "If you're going to run and try to become the president of the United States," Chaffetz replied, "you're going to have to open up your kimono and show everything, your tax returns, your medical records. You are . . . just going to have to do that."

I eagerly await Chaffetz's news conference reiterating his kimono policy, since he made very clear that he sees his role as non-partisan. "My job is not to be a cheerleader for the president," he said. "My job is to hold them accountable and to provide that oversight. That's what we do." Early, comprehensive hearings on the problems Trump's business dealings would pose to his independence and trustworthiness as our commander in chief would be a fine way to prove Chaffetz meant this.

Republicans did an extraordinary job raising doubts about Clinton—helped, we learned courtesy of The Post, by a Russian disinformation campaign. Does the GOP want to cast itself as a band of hypocrites who cared not at all about ethics and were simply trying to win an election?

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. I do not see anybody else seeking recognition, but let me just say just a little bit more on these issues. Yesterday I commended my Republican colleague, Senator MCCAIN. He complained about the decision of his own party to do away with regular order in our appropriations process. He's absolutely right. We should have debated and passed those bills the way we used to do. Ten months ago that's what the Republican leadership said they wanted to do, and they are in control here. And we worked hard in the Appropriations Committee, Republicans and Democrats together, and we reported out all our appropriations bills. Hundreds and hundreds of hours of work by members, even more by their staffs.

Almost every one of these bills was bipartisan, and they passed usually by a unanimous vote or close to it. All that goes for naught. I commented about just one of these, and of course that is the State and foreign operations bill. Both before Benghazi and since Benghazi, the Republican chair-

man of the subcommittee and I have put in money, a considerable amount of money, for the security of our embassies and our personnel abroad. Rather than acknowledge their own responsibility for having cut funding for security prior to Benghazi, the House Republicans wasted tens of millions of dollars on hearings to blame the administration. Madam President, maybe double standards make for a sound bite on the evening news, especially if it sounds good and the people putting it on haven't done the research to find out what's really going on.

But it's no consolation to the men and women serving at our embassies and throughout the world to represent the American people. Oftentimes in danger, as we just saw within the last couple of days in the Philippines. It does them no good to see Congress spend tens of millions of dollars to decry the lack of security, tens of millions of taxpayers' dollars on hearings that proved nothing, to get on television for political purposes, and then scrapping the appropriations bills and supporting instead a continuing resolution that will cut funds for embassy security by half a billion dollars.

Madam President, 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. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— H.R. 5963

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, soon I will offer a unanimous consent request with regard to a bill that would reform and reauthorize Federal juvenile justice programs. This bill is known as the Supporting Youth Opportunity and Preventing Delinquency Act of 2016. It passed the other Chamber last month by a vote of 382-29.

The bipartisan House bill is modeled closely to one that I introduced over a year ago with the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE. That legislation was titled the "Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Reauthorization Act." It has 19 Senate cosponsors and cleared the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, without a single dissenting vote last year. The House companion before us today also won the unanimous approval of a committee in the other Chamber before passing the House with overwhelming support a few weeks ago.

The two bills are remarkably similar in most respects, indicating their objectives. One such objective is to extend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act for 5 more years. That Federal statute was last reauthorized in 2002, and it is long overdue for an update. Congress is still

funding juvenile justice programs that expired in 2007, nearly a decade ago.

I think my colleagues know of the hard work of Senator ENZI, chairman of the Budget Committee, and a program that he has of the hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer money we are spending that has not been authorized by the authorizing committees. So getting a lot of bills that have expired reauthorized is in the spirit of what Senator ENZI is trying to promote among the 15, 16, or however many committees we have in the Senate that don't do their work on a regular basis.

The centerpiece of the 1974 act is its core protections for youth. Over 40 years ago, Congress committed to making Federal grants available to States that observed these core protections, of which there are now four.

The first core protection discourages the detention of children and youth for extremely minor infractions, such as truancy, underage tobacco use, disobeying parents, and running away. No State would ever jail an adult; that is an important emphasis. No State would ever jail an adult for this same conduct. And research shows that nothing much positive comes out of locking up children for conduct that isn't even criminal.

The second core protection calls for juveniles to be kept out of adult facilities except in certain very rare instances. The third calls for juveniles to be separated from adults when they are held in adult facilities. And the fourth calls for States to try to reduce disproportionate minority contact in their juvenile justice system.

That is from 1974, and those goals are still legitimate goals. Under our proposed legislation, as under this current law, if a State commits to meeting these core protections for youth, it can expect to continue receiving Federal grant money to support its juvenile justice activities.

Our second objective for this legislation is to make reforms to current law so that taxpayer-supported juvenile justice programs will yield best possible outcomes. To that end, our bill reflects the latest research that works best with at-risk children and youth.

We added provisions to promote the rehabilitation of runaways who are at high risk of being trafficked. We included language to discourage shackling of pregnant juveniles during childbirth. After learning that a handful of States receiving Federal grant funds are locking up children as young as 8 or 9 for minor infractions, such as truancy, we called for a phaseout of valid court orders permitting that practice. Last but not least, we responded to concerns voiced by whistleblowers by adding accountability measures to protect the taxpayers and promote more oversight of justice reforms.

These accountability measures are something I have been working on both as ranking member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of that committee for a long period of time, not