

National Intelligence a warning that doing this would in fact create a gap which could endanger our national security.

In May 2015, the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence wrote to the chairman of the defense authorization committee, and they shared his goal of replacing this Russian engine. But they warned the senior Senator from Arizona that if he followed his own plan, it could harm U.S. national security. They were alarmed, in this letter, of the proposed cutoff of access to Russian engines before an American replacement was ready. Secretary Carter and Director Clapper do not want to trade one launch monopoly, ULA, for another launch monopoly, SpaceX. They are encouraging and standing for competition. They want to keep them competing so they can have lower costs and options if one of the companies, for whatever reason, is unable to meet its obligations.

Also, our defense and intelligence satellites must not be dependent on one type of rocket. A SpaceX launch failed last summer, and it took 6 months before they could return to launches. With only one supplier of rockets, a crash could stop vital satellite launches for months, endangering America's national security.

The senior Senator from Arizona ignored the arguments being made by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence. After all, it is hard for a Senator to argue with the senior national security leader, Secretary Carter, whose doctorate is in theoretical physics, and it would be unconscionable to call our Nation's highest intelligence official—a former Air Force pilot and career civil servant—a “Putin crony.”

But I take warnings from our top national security experts seriously. My Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense has been working to address these issues the right way, the safe way. Rather than attack fellow Senators in the press, the senior Senator from Arizona should face the facts.

When the Defense appropriations bill was marked up in June of 2015, the bill included a bipartisan provision to allow the Department of Defense to conduct full and open competitions for rocket launches for 1 year. An amendment was offered by the Republican senior Senator from the State of South Carolina to strike that provision. But after a full debate, he withdrew his amendment when it was clear there was bipartisan support for the bill. The provision was modified in conference, but the effect of the provision remains the same—to make sure that the Department of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence have some answer to their concerns about a launch monopoly.

The senior Senator from Arizona has proposed another solution—that ULA offer another rocket called the Delta IV, which, of course, is not a Russian

engine. According to the Pentagon's top weapons buyer and ULA, each of those rockets endorsed by the senior Senator from Arizona costs about 30 percent more than the Atlas rockets with Russian engines. So if that figure is correct, the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona requires American taxpayers to pay approximately \$1 billion more in launch costs over the next 6 years. This Senator, who comes to the floor frequently telling us that he is such a budget hawk, is proposing a plan that will cost us at least \$1 billion more over the next 6 years. That figure could be higher. His plan could triple the cost of launches for some satellites that are too heavy to be launched on a single rocket.

Under the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona, the taxpayers would foot the bill for a new government-created monopoly. It is in fact a \$1 billion windfall and gift to one defense contractor in California if we follow the plan of the senior Senator from Arizona, and it would also put our national security at risk if there is a technical failure.

If spending \$1 billion of taxpayers' money to increase the risk that the United States won't be able to launch a satellite to keep track of Russia sounds like a counterproductive and questionable idea, you would be right. Last year, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee said many times that the Defense authorization bill isn't a budget bill. Now, as vice chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense—the subcommittee that has to make the math work—I can say that spending an extra \$1 billion at this moment in the history of the Department of Defense doesn't make sense.

There is another aspect to this. I don't know if the senior Senator from Arizona is going to look into it or attack it as well. When it comes to supplying the space station, we are reliant on Russian-made engines. If the senior Senator from Arizona wants to cut off access of NASA to these Russian-made engines, it will be a dangerous proposal. There are a variety of NASA missions ahead that rely on this Atlas rocket. These include multiple resupply missions to the International Space Station, a mission to take samples from a nearby asteroid, a new Mars lander, a probe to study the sun, and several weather satellites.

If there is the will to ignore the national security concerns of the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence about access to space for national security, we had best take care. The senior Senator from Arizona will now say that supplying the space station is somehow a sellout to Vladimir Putin.

We have appropriated \$448 million to develop all-American engines, which is more than the Armed Services Committee has authorized. In a few years, we will have real competition for space launches that will help lower costs for a long time to come—but only if we lis-

ten to our top defense and intelligence leaders, who favor a responsible transition to the next rocket in the interest of national security and oppose the plans put forward by the senior Senator from Arizona.

One aspect of this article in the Wall Street Journal that troubles me the most is the suggestion that I take lightly the adventurism of Vladimir Putin and his bloody invasion of Ukraine. I am proud to be the cochair of the Ukrainian Caucus with Senator PORTMAN of Ohio. We have a large Ukrainian population in my State. I have spoken to them many times, and I have visited Ukraine many times to make it clear that I detest what Putin has done in invading their country and threatening their sovereignty. The irony is the senior Senator from Arizona personally invited me to accompany him to Ukraine, where we both protested Putin's actions. To suggest my position on these rocket engines is somehow a give-in to Putin is shameful and wrong. I think my statements—public and otherwise—have made it clear.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning at 11 a.m., the President released the budget, his final budget for his Presidency. Unfortunately, rather than something that sends a signal that he wants to work with Congress, it is basically more of the same—a \$4 trillion budget that is unserious, partisan, and contains reckless spending. In it, he does include several new proposals, proposals he knows will be dead on arrival here in the U.S. Congress.

From my perspective, coming from an energy State, one pretty astounding measure he suggested was putting a \$10 tax on each barrel of oil. What that would do is translate into 25 cents a gallon more for consumers at the pump. How in the world would that help American families who are suffering as a result of stagnant wages due to slow economic growth in this country as well as additional costs, such as ObamaCare, that have been imposed upon them by the administration? The simple fact is that it doesn't help the average American family get by. It is the opposite.

At a time when our country is producing more energy domestically than it ever has and just beginning to export that energy to our friends and allies around the world, the President's budget reveals that he has little interest in growing our energy independence and little interest in jump-starting our economy.

All he has to do is look at Texas, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and other places to see how our domestic energy production has helped create thousands of jobs and helped grow the economy. Instead, the President makes these job-

killing proposals, which will further burden hard-working American families, along with the tepid growth that we have seen here in our own economy—0.7 percent just this last quarter. The President's budget adds further insult to injury by adding to our national debt, which is already \$19 trillion.

Somebody is going to have to pay that back. In the meantime, what we will have to do is pay interest on that debt, which will continue to crowd out spending in other areas like national security where there is a national consensus. This is the number one priority for the American people.

Strangely, but unfortunately predictably, rather than deciding to work with Congress and to listen to the concerns that are raised by those hard-working American families, President Obama went ahead and submitted a budget with no apparent interest in finding any kind of common ground. It is a sad testament to his go-it-alone legacy, which has been more ideological than actually solution oriented.

We are here to try to solve problems, and the only way we do that is by working together to find consensus where we can. Understanding that there are people who serve in the Senate and the House from different points of view all across the ideological spectrum, it is only by working together—and that includes not just Congress but the President, too—that we can actually begin to help grow the economy to help create jobs, to help make America more secure.

Given the fact that the President has decided to take the tack he has, I hope that Congress will lead the charge against this request for irresponsible spending and try to help get our economy back on track, to begin the process of reducing our debt and strengthening the hand of the American family.

MENTAL HEALTH REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, I wish to spend a few minutes talking about a very important hearing that we will be having tomorrow in the Senate Judiciary Committee, something that I feel very passionately about, and that is finding a way forward on mental health reform. As shocking as it is, our jails and our streets have become places where people suffering from mental illness basically are left without treatment and without recourse.

Tomorrow I will have the honor of chairing that hearing where we will discuss the intersection of our mental health system such as it is and our criminal justice system, and hopefully we will be able to find a way forward to push toward real reform. The goal of the hearing is to better understand how to bring help and support for those who struggle with mental illness.

This is an area where we can and we must do better. Too often, after the fact, we find out that families faced with the choice of allowing their loved

ones' mental health to continue deteriorating, letting their illness spiral out of control until they become a danger to themselves or others—there are very few choices available to families whose loved ones are becoming more and more ill. True, they could go to court and seek a court order, seeking a temporary commitment to a mental institution, but that frequently exacerbates frayed relations among family members, and it stigmatizes the individual who is suffering from mental illness issues.

We need to give those families more and better choices on how to deal with their loved ones, hopefully to keep them from becoming a danger to themselves and to the community. Thanks to the marvels of modern medicine, for many people suffering from mental illness, if they will just follow doctors' orders and take the medication that has been prescribed for them—frequently under some doctor's supervision—many of them can get much better and become more productive in society.

One of our witnesses tomorrow will be Pete Earley who wrote a book called "Crazy." He is not talking about a person. He is talking about our so-called system of mental health treatment. Pete Earley wrote this book because, as an accomplished journalist and writer, he knew of no other way than to write about the issue to help his very own son who had encounter after encounter with the criminal justice system because he had untreated mental illness.

Sadly, the failure to adequately address mental health in the United States has led to a drastic increase in the number of mentally ill individuals being locked up in prisons and jails, still without adequate treatment. I don't think anyone would support the idea of turning our prisons and our jails into warehouses for the mentally ill, but that is what has happened by default.

We need to provide better choices to law enforcement officials, to families, and to the individuals who suffer from mental illness. So often many of them will self-medicate with drugs and alcohol, compounding their problems, creating more and more of this turnstile effect within the criminal justice system where no one ever gets better and the illness never gets treated.

As criminologists and mental health experts will tell you, locking up people with mental illness without treatment will make them only more dangerous and increase the risk of crisis, but unfortunately this is an all-too-common practice across our country.

This is a shocking number to me when I read it, but one estimate suggests there are as many as 400,000 current inmates in our prisons across America who suffer from some form of mental illness. That is because, at least in part, the United States has witnessed a rapid decline in psychiatric and mental health hospitals over the

past decades. The idea was that you couldn't institutionalize people so you had to let them out. Unfortunately, just letting them out without finding a way forward to help them deal with their mental illness resulted in many of them becoming homeless, living on our streets or in our jails and our prisons when they commit petty crimes such as trespassing and the like.

Since 1960, more than 90 percent of State psychiatric beds have been eliminated—90 percent. But prison is a poor and often very harmful replacement for a treatment facility. Our goal in the hearing tomorrow is to work toward another solution, one that would give families greater flexibility, including actual treatment options for the people they love.

A bill I introduced, the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act, offers one proven approach to treating mental illness. It borrows from a successful model of reform, put into place in my hometown in Bexar County, TX, more than a decade ago.

Let me say a word about borrowing from these successful local and State models as opposed to imposing a one-size-fits-all approach at the national level, not knowing whether it would actually work in this big and diverse country we live in. I believe that taking successful examples of best practices at the local and State level—those are the best subject matter for us to look at in terms of scaling these up on a national level where appropriate.

The Bexar County sheriff, Susan Pamerleau, a champion of mental health reform in San Antonio, will testify tomorrow about the San Antonio story. Bexar County's mental health program focuses on treatment of the mentally ill instead of just putting them behind bars and leaving them untreated. The results have been very impressive.

These reforms have reduced the size of our overcrowded jails, which has been a perennial problem. It has saved tax dollars, and it has improved the lives of people who otherwise would be put behind bars and left to their own devices.

I look forward to hearing from Sheriff Pamerleau tomorrow. I bet other members of the Senate Judiciary Committee and anyone else who cares to listen will learn a lot about how we can bring these reforms to the rest of the country.

Another part of this is to help equip law enforcement, teachers, judges, and people who work in the courts with the knowledge and skill set they need to spot mental illness early on. Wouldn't it be more helpful if teachers, parents, and counselors were empowered to help identify people who need help early on in school? Doesn't it make sense to train our law enforcement officials how to deal with a person suffering from a mental health crisis? Do you slap the cuffs on them? Do you get engaged in a violent confrontation? Or do you try to deescalate the incident in a way that is