shocking that over the last three years the United States Government probably would have armed and trained 2,516 units (or individuals in those units) containing murders, rapists and torturers without the Leahy Law.

The Leahy Laws don't actually prohibit the U.S. from working with even these units—the ones that have committed murder and torture. It only says that the U.S. cannot arm or train them until the foreign government takes steps to clean up the unit.

Three Questions

So whenever anyone says that it is a problem for the United States that it cannot train or arm a particular foreign battalion or police unit, one should ask three questions:

(1) What did the unit do? If we can't work with them, it must mean that the United States has determined that this unit is one of the worst of the worst. It is in the 1 percent of units where the U.S. government found credible information linking it to murder, rape, torture or another gross atrocity. So, when someone argues that we should arm a Leahy-prohibited unit, one should ask, ''What did the unit do to get on the list?''

(2) Why won't the government clean up the unit? Maybe the foreign government wants to make a point to the U.S.—it doesn't accept the U.S. commitment to human rights; it won't let the U.S. ''tell it what to do.'' Maybe the government has no control over its own military and cannot do anything to clean up the unit even if it wanted to do so. But one should insist on knowing: ''Why won't the government clean up the unit?''

(3) Finally, if the unit committed murder, rape or torture and the foreign government won't or can't clean it up, why should U.S. taxpayers give that specific unit guns anyway? Under what possible circumstances would it make sense for the United States to arm known killers who are either completely out of their government's control, or who work for a government that refuses to take any action against them?

Responses to Three Criticisms

Tempus Fugit: There are a number of arguments raised against the Leahy Law which might make some sense if the law covered lesser offenses. For instance, there is an argument that it makes no sense to keep a unit on the Leahy Law ''pariah'' list long after the atrocity occurred, especially if everyone who was in the unit has now moved on. But there are no other contexts in which we would accept a 4 year, or 8 year or even 15 year statute of limitations on murder, torture or rape. So why accept one here? And the law is intended to create an incentive for foreign governments to improve their human rights records and to hold people accountable. Letting a unit off the hook because the government rotated people out of the unit (and into other ones) or because the foreign government simply waited us out for a few years sends exactly the wrong message. Moreover, units have reputations and traditions that are regularly passed on to new members of the unit over many years and even decades. That is often true for units with gallant histories. But it is also true of death squads and praetorian guards.

Just as importantly, one needs to ask what it says about a foreign military ''partner'' if documented cases of murder, rape and torture go without redress after decades. The government always has the option of working with the United States to create new, carefully vetted units—something that has been done in a number of countries with gross human rights problems. If the government will not do that, it is probably trying to make a point. Is it appropriate to reward such behavior with assistance?

Pariah Forever: Critics of the law also sometimes argue that it is impossible for a tainted unit to be rehabilitated. This is, of course, completely false—unless the government in question refuses or is unable to take any meaningful action to address the problem. So what these critics are really saying is: It is almost never the case that America's military partners in these countries have the political will or commitment to human rights to take the kind of disciplinary action against killers and rapists that is absolutely routine in the U.S. military. And that is a very odd sort of argument for waiving or weakening the Leahy Law so that we can give more guns to these government's forces.

In fact, there are cases in which specific units have been rehabilitated. But it takes a willing partner. This is one area where critics of the law and its supporters should make common cause to support earmarked funding for remediation of tainted units. One percent of U.S. military assistance—just one penny out of every dollar—should be set aside for vetting and remediation. It should be used to help foreign militaries set up JAG officer corps, criminal investigation services and other elements of a professional disciplinary system. This should simply be considered a cost of doing business in some of the most violent places on earth. There is a precedent for applying a fixed surcharge as a ''cost of doing business.'' Every time the United States Government sells weapons abroad it applies a surcharge—currently 3.5%—to administer the sale. The U.S. should apply a 1% surcharge to ensure that it knows what is being done with the other 99% and so that it can help move its partner forces in a positive direction on human rights.

Just a Few Bad Apples: Critics sometimes argue that it is wrong to hold whole units accountable for the acts of just a few, or perhaps even just one, member of the unit. They argue that we should vet specific individuals rather than units and only withhold information from those individuals who are linked to atrocities.

Here it is important to understand that the Leahy Law was a compromise. There was and is an important human rights law—Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act—which does not permit the United States to engage in a unit by unit assessment of foreign partner forces: ''No security assistance may be provided to any country the government of which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.'' There is a very strong argument to be made under Section 502B that the United States should be providing no assistance whatsoever to Nigerian forces, and many others around the world.

But historically the United States has been extremely reluctant to invoke Section 502B even in the most extreme cases. So the Leahy Law was proposed as an intermediate step: If the U.S. will not completely cut off governments engaging in a consistent pattern of gross human rights violations, then at least it should not arm the specific military units it believes are the ones actually committing the gross violations. However, Senator Leahy also believed that it would be absurd and unreasonable to ask that human rights victims be able to identify the specific murder, torturer or rapist by name before the U.S. took any action. So, his law states that if credible information can be presented that links an identifiable unit to a specific atrocity the United States would be required to cut off that unit—at least until the foreign government identifies the specific individuals within it who are responsible and deals with them.

One Final Thought

The Bible tells us in the Book of Acts that before his conversion on the road to Damascus the Apostle Paul was a persecutor of the Christian Church. In fact, according to Acts (Chapter 7, Verse 59) he was present at the killing of St. Stephen and held the cloaks of those who stoned him. He cast no stones himself; but he was complicit. He gave aid to the killers. When we go to places like Nigeria, shouldn't we at least ask, ''Whose cloaks are we holding?'' That's all the Leahy Law says.

The Leahy Law cannot guarantee that the U.S. will never arm bad people. It's not a panacea. It's just the least we can do.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER 5 DANIEL SANDBOTHE

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor CW5 Daniel Sandbothe of the 1107th Missouri National Guard in Springfield, MO. As a soldier, he has dedicated 40 years to serving in the Missouri National Guard. Over those years, through his commitment and service, he has risen to a unique rank signifying his expertise in flying and maintaining the rotary aircraft of the U.S. Armed Forces.

CW5 Daniel Sandbothe's career started in 1972 in the 1038th Maintenance Company. Throughout the next four decades, he mastered the ability to fly a variety of airframes commonly used by the U.S. Army, logging more than 5,000 military flight hours. He has earned the respected designations of instructor pilot, maintenance test flight evaluator, and rotary wing instrument flight examiner as he progressed.

His profession has sent him to four overseas duty stations in Central America and Japan. He also participated in three combat tours, including Operation Desert Storm in 1991, Operation Iraqi Freedom with 1107th Aviation Classification and Repair Depot in 2005, and Operation Enduring Freedom with 1107th Theater Aviation Sustainment Maintenance Group in 2010. In addition, Daniel Sandbothe was selected to lead a team to assist the Lebanese Armed Forces in improving their aviation maintenance program.

CW5 Daniel Sandbothe has also been appointed to the Missouri Army National Guard Senior Warrant Officer Advisory Council. His job will be to help pick the future non-commissioned leaders of the Missouri National Guard's air elements. This distinction represents his commitment to his profession as a United States serviceman.

His legacy will be felt by future generations of the National Guard in Missouri, including those he has trained, led, and mentored over the last four decades. For his years of committed services, CW5 Daniel Sandbothe has earned his retirement. I wish him well in his next opportunity and thank him for his years of service to Missouri and the Nation.•

DIABETES STUDY

• Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I wish to draw attention to a study by the

University of Florida on diabetes. Diabetes is a chronic disease that affects the body's blood glucose levels. Diabetic Americans have too much glucose in their blood, which can lead to serious health problems. In addition to the large number of Americans who suffer from diabetes, the disease is one of the costliest chronic diseases and, currently, about 1-in-3 Medicare dollars is spent on people with diabetes.

This study, led by Dr. Todd Manini of the University of Florida's Institute on Aging, suggests a correlation between the amount of time people spend sitting and their risk of developing diabetes later in life. The findings from this study are alarming, particularly given the statistics about diabetes in our Nation. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2012, 29.1 million Americans—9.3 percent of the population—had diabetes. Diabetes was the country's seventh leading cause of death and Americans with diabetes spend an average of 2.3 times more on medical expenses. The disease is also highly pervasive amongst our older Americans—11.8 million seniors age 65 or older, 25.9 percent of all Americans over 65, have diabetes and 51 percent of seniors are pre-diabetic.

As Chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I am well aware of the challenges diabetes poses to seniors. Last July, the Aging Committee held a hearing to discuss the growing impact of diabetes with advancing age. Diabetes impacts millions of Americans across all ages and even though seniors are particularly vulnerable to problems created by the disease, diabetes needs to be fought across the age spectrum.

Researchers tracked the weights and sitting times of nearly 90,000 women between the ages of 50 and 79 who were not initially taking diabetes medications. Women who sat more than sixteen hours during their waking day had the highest risk of developing diabetes, and even if they introduced an exercise regimen, this high risk remained. Obese women have a 23 percent risk of developing diabetes and were more likely to develop diabetes than overweight and normal-weight women even if they were both sedentary for the same amount of time. The study found that the diabetes risk can be reduced by standing or walking for 5 minutes for every hour spent sitting.

This new University of Florida study enhances our understanding of the disease and emphasizes the importance of healthy behavior and habits throughout our lives. Though much progress has been made in diabetes research, we still have a long way to go in combatting this disease that affects millions of Americans. We must continue funding groundbreaking research like that at the University of Florida and promoting the kinds of lifestyle changes that will reduce the risks of diseases like diabetes in old age.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 4718. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation.

H.R. 4923. An act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4923. An act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 4718. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and make permanent bonus depreciation.

S. 2599. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CARPER, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 2354. A bill to improve cybersecurity recruitment and retention (Rept. No. 113–207).

By Mr. TESTER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 161, a bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–208).

Report to accompany S. 1074, a bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 113–209).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2596. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal criminal penalties for interstate child endangerment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2597. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the establishment of Promise Zones; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2598. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify and expand Federal criminal jurisdiction over Federal contractors and employees outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. COATS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2599. A bill to stop exploitation through trafficking; read the first time.

By Mr. JOHANNS (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2600. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is transferred to the State and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 501. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Wright Museum of WWII History in Wolfeboro, New Hampshire; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. Con. Res. 40. A concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to award Congressional Gold Medals in honor of the men and women who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 109

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 109, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 119

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 119, a bill to prohibit the application of certain restrictive eligibility requirements to foreign nongovernmental organizations with respect to the provision of assistance