

will be required to respond fully to Russia's interference need to be a wide-ranging endeavor that can only be done by a select committee.

I have spoken with Leader McCONNELL. I have told him that we will let the committee organizing resolution go forward, but I did put the majority leader on notice that if the work of the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees is deemed insufficient or incomplete or taking too long, this matter may well need to be revisited before the committee funding resolution comes up in February.

Also, I understand additional information with respect to Russia's interference in our election will be released in the coming days, and that could also change our view as to the way we ought to proceed.

I have spoken to the majority leader about these concerns. He carefully listened, and we will keep a careful eye on how things are going in the Intelligence and Armed Services Committees with regard to Russia's interference in the election.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the Democratic leader.

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

COMMITTEE FUNDING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in the 112th Congress the Senate adopted a new funding allocation for Senate committees. This approach has served the Senate well for the past three Congresses. I believe this approach will continue to serve the interests of the Senate and the public, regardless of which party is in the majority, by helping to retain core committee staff with institutional knowledge. This funding allocation is based on the party division of the Senate, with 10 percent of the total majority and minority salary baseline going to the majority for administrative expenses. However, regardless of the party division of the Senate, the minority share of the majority and minority salary baseline will never be less than 40 percent, and the majority share will not exceed 60 percent. It is my intent that this approach will continue to serve the Senate for this Congress and future Congresses.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this approach met our needs for the last three Congresses, and I too would like to see it continue. In addition, special reserves have been restored to its historic purpose. We should continue to fund special reserves to the extent possible in order to be able to assist committees that face urgent, unanticipated, nonrecurring needs. Recognizing the tight budgets we will face for the foreseeable future, it is necessary to continue to bring funding authorizations more in line with our actual resources while ensuring that committees are able to fulfill their responsibilities.

I look forward to continuing to work with the majority leader to accomplish this.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint leadership letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT LEADERSHIP LETTER

We mutually commit to the following for the 115th Congress:

The Rules Committee is to determine the budgets of the committees of the Senate. The budgets of the committees, including joint and special committees, and all other subgroups, shall be apportioned to reflect the ratio of the Senate as of this date, including an additional ten percent (10%) from the majority and minority salary baseline to be allocated to the chairman for administrative expenses.

Special Reserves has been restored to its historic purpose. Requests for funding will only be considered when submitted by a committee chairman and ranking member for unanticipated, non-recurring needs. Such requests shall be granted only upon the approval of the chairman and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Funds for committee expenses shall be available to each chairman consistent with the Senate rules and practices of the 114th Congress.

The division of committee office space shall be commensurate with this funding agreement.

The chairman and ranking member of any committee may, by mutual agreement, modify the apportionment of committee funding and office space.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

AMENDMENT NO. 19

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 19, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to setting aside the pending amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] proposes an amendment numbered 19.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prevent the Senate from breaking Donald Trump's promise that "there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid")

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD BREAK DONALD TRUMP'S PROMISE NOT TO CUT SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, OR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits scheduled under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(2) increase either the early or full retirement age for the benefits described in paragraph (1);

(3) privatize Social Security;

(4) result in a reduction of guaranteed benefits for individuals entitled to, or enrolled for, benefits under the Medicare program under title XVIII of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); or

(5) result in a reduction of benefits or eligibility for individuals enrolled in, or eligible to receive medical assistance through, a State Medicaid plan or waiver under title XIX of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 20

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 20.

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

The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], for Ms. HIRONO, proposes an amendment numbered 20.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To protect the Medicare and Medicaid programs)

At the end of title IV, add the following:

SEC. 4. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION THAT WOULD PRIVATIZE MEDICARE OR LIMIT FEDERAL FUNDING FOR MEDICAID.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would—

(1) privatize the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or turn the program into a voucher system;

(2) increase the eligibility age under the Medicare program; or

(3) block grant the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), impose per capita spending caps on State Medicaid programs, or decrease coverage under such program from current levels.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

FOREIGN CULTURAL EXCHANGE JURISDICTIONAL IMMUNITY CLARIFICATION BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the final hour of our legislative business early last December 10, we passed a remarkable bill. It had no ideological division, did not cost the taxpayers a dime, and will benefit Americans in every part of the country. And, like the House did, we passed it unanimously.

This bill had the somewhat unwieldy title of the Foreign Cultural Exchange Jurisdictional Immunity Clarification Act. While not lending itself to a catchy acronym, it is accurately descriptive. For more than 50 years, a Federal law has provided legal protection for art loaned by foreign governments for exhibition in the United States. Confidence in that protection is an essential piece of the complex arrangements that can take years to complete in order to bring wonderful exhibits to American museums for everyone to enjoy.

America has hundreds of museums of all sorts. The art museum at Brigham Young University, for example, is one of the largest and best attended in the Mountain West. When it began working on a major exhibition of art from Islamic countries, some of its loan requests were unexpectedly denied. It turns out that a 2007 Federal court decision had made such loans risky, rather than secure. After that court decision, the act of lending, even after State Department review and approval, could actually lead to a new category of lawsuits against the foreign lenders.

This legislation, now signed into law, reverses that court decision and clarifies that lending art after State Department review does not raise the possibility of new litigation. Foreign governments can once again have confidence that lending art for exhibition will improve cultural understanding and enrich people's lives without the threat of new lawsuits.

The bill has two narrow exceptions. I want to thank Dr. Wesley Fisher, director of research at the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany, and Rabbi Andrew Baker, director of International Jewish Affairs at the American Jewish Committee, for their help in drafting the exception for Nazi-era claims. The second exception covers comparable state-sponsored coercive campaigns of cultural plunder. Art that was looted in such a campaign should not be given protection for exhibition in the United States.

The senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, was my principal partner in this effort. She and her staff have been patient, thoughtful, and dedicated; in particular, I want to thank her chief counsel, Eric Haren, and counsel Lartase Tiffith for working so diligently with my own chief counsel, Tom Jipping. The problem to

be solved was clear, but it was challenging to find the right language to solve that problem without unintended consequences.

I also want to thank the Association of Art Museum Directors, their director of government affairs Anita Difanis, and their special counsel Josh Knerly. They have been committed to this goal from the start, and their effort began with educating many of us about this unique area of law and policy. They mobilized hundreds of art institutions and associations to support this bill. And they were flexible about many things while staying focused on the essentials.

I gratefully acknowledge the consistent support for this legislation from the BYU Museum of Art, the Utah Fine Arts Museum, and the Utah Museums Association. We have a vibrant art community in Utah, and this legislation means that these fine institutions have additional opportunities to bring new experiences to the people in our great State.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks a letter from James S. Snyder, director of The Israel Museum in Jerusalem. He writes that the risk of new lawsuits has been "a disincentive to lend works to American museums," but that this legislation "will ensure that museums worldwide can continue to lend to American museums in the precise spirit of international cultural cooperation that U.S. Immunity from Seizure protection was intended to provide." That, in a nutshell, is the problem and the solution we are enacting today.

This legislation restores the confidence that foreign governments need to lend art for exhibitions that Americans across the country can enjoy. That is something we can all be proud of.

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

THE ISRAEL MUSEUM,
Jerusalem, March 17, 2013.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
U.S. Senate,

Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: I am Director of The Israel Museum, Jerusalem, an encyclopedic museum embracing the history of material world culture from pre-historic archaeology of the ancient Holy Land through the rise of Judaism, Christianity, and Islam; Jewish world culture; and the fine arts of the Western and non-Western traditions. Our collections comprise over 500,000 objects, and our 600,000 sq. ft. campus sits on a signature 20-acre site in Jerusalem. We are internationally active as producers of temporary exhibitions in Jerusalem and internationally and as major borrowers and lenders from sister institutions worldwide.

Our international museum community, which enjoys a close and collegial relationship with our American counterparts, is concerned about the trend toward a weakening of the Immunity from Seizure protection customarily offered by U.S. museums when they request loans from foreign museums. These concerns are two-fold:

First, that foreign museums risk being sued in connection with works loaned to an

American exhibition if there is a question that works on loan are held by their lending institutions in violation of international law. The act of lending can therefore be used as the basis to seek damages in a U.S. court, which is counter to the premise that Immunity from Seizure protects works on loan from legal action while they are on loan; and Secondly, foreign museums that loan works with clear provenance to an American exhibition may nonetheless be sued with regard to other works in their collections that may lack full provenance. In this regard, the simple act of lending, in the spirit of international exchange, opens us to possible claims with regard to any and all works in our collections.

Each of these potential circumstances raises troubling concerns, and, taken together, they are a disincentive to lend works to American museums, given the potential risk of suit in U.S. courts. And this prospect is exactly what U.S. Immunity from Seizure was originally established to avoid.

Anything that you can do to strengthen Immunity from Seizure in the U.S. will ensure that museums worldwide can continue to lend to American museums in the precise spirit of international cultural cooperation that U.S. Immunity from Seizure protection was intended to provide.

Please let me know if I can answer any further questions in this matter.

Sincerely,

JAMES S. SNYDER,
Director.

TRIBUTE TO SARAH R. SALDAÑA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, today I would like to pay tribute to a dedicated public servant and Texan, Sarah R. Saldaña. Ms. Saldaña is stepping down as Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and retiring after many years of Federal service.

Born as the youngest of seven children to working-class parents in Corpus Christi, TX, Director Saldaña learned the importance of hard work and education at a young age. After she graduated from W.B. Ray High School in 1970, Director Saldaña attended Del Mar Junior College and graduated summa cum laude from Texas A&M, formerly Texas A&I, University in 1973. Shortly thereafter, she began her career as an 8th grade language arts teacher at D.A. Hulcy Middle School in Dallas. Later, she worked as a technician for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, EEOC, and as an investigator and management intern for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, HUD. Additionally, she worked as a Federal Representative for the Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration until 1981.

Ms. Saldaña then decided to pursue a legal education at Southern Methodist University, SMU, in Dallas, TX, where she earned her J.D. in 1984. Following graduation, she clerked for the Honorable U.S. District Judge Barefoot Sanders. As a trial attorney, Director Saldaña was an associate for the law firms of Haynes and Boone, and then Baker Botts, where she became partner in their trial department.