Day and National Adoption Month by promoting national awareness of adoption and the children awaiting families, celebrating children and families involved in adoption, and encouraging the people of the United States to secure safety, permanency, and well-being for all children.

S. RES. 583

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 583, a resolution designating November 30, 2014, as ''Drive Safer Sunday''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3749

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3749 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3870

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3870 intended to be proposed to S. 2410, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3947

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3947 intended to be proposed to S. 2685, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN:

S. 2954. A bill to improve the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am proud to introduce my comprehensive proposal to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, the main law governing institutions of higher education in this country. My bill, the Higher Education Affordability Act, is the product of extensive conversations between both parties in Congress and stakeholders across the higher education community. Over the past year, our Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee has held 12 bipartisan hearings on reauthorizing the Higher Education Act on issues ranging from teacher preparation and accreditation to federal student loans and the States' role in higher education. These hearings were purposely designed to better inform members of Congress and the public on the most pressing issues in higher education and how best to address them at the federal level.

In June, I put forward a discussion draft that included many of the ideas and policies discussed in our hearings. I asked the entire higher education community—including institutions, accreditors, and student advocacy organizations—to weigh in and offer suggestions on how best to strengthen my initial proposal.

I am pleased to say they delivered abundantly on that request. We received comments from over 120 organizations from across the country. What I have put forward today is a direct result of our hearings and the feedback we received. This bill provides clear guidelines based on all the work we have done to date on how we should move forward with reauthorization in a way that puts students and families first. It takes a holistic approach in addressing the most urgent issues in higher education: increasing college affordability, helping struggling borrowers, strengthening accountability, and improving transparency throughout the higher education system.

On the matter of affordability, my bill includes a number of policies designed to reduce college costs for students on the front end. It proposes a new federal partnership with States to incentivize them to reinvest in their systems of higher education. For too long, States have been cutting funding for their institutions of higher education and passing those costs onto students and their families. This is a trend in cost-shifting that must stop. The bill also reinstates year-round Pell Grants to enable students to get their degrees faster and establishes a pilot program to reward institutions that do a good job of graduating low-income students. My bill also creates two grant programs to promote statewide and institutional innovation in higher education. Making sure college is affordable requires an all-hands-on-deck approach: the Federal government, states, students and their families all need to do their part.

We also hope to empower students and families through greater transparency by giving students and families better information on college costs and outcomes from the beginning of the college selection process and all the way through graduation. The bill promotes a seamless process from high school to post-graduation to ensure that students know exactly what they are getting into with regard to college quality and costs before they get started.

On the matter of student debt, my bill takes a range of steps to help student borrowers better manage their loans. It provides for better up-front and exit counseling for students regarding their federally guaranteed loans. It eliminates fees on federal loans to save students money. My bill also strengthens consumer protections for student loans, and it creates a safety net for borrowers who are seriously delinquent on their loans by automatically enrolling them in an income-based repayment plan with affordable monthly payments. To ensure that private student debt is treated no differently than any other consumer debt, my bill would allow private student loans to be discharged in bankruptcy, as they were before the law was changed in 2005.

My bill would hold schools more accountable to both students and taxpayers by ensuring that no Federal money goes to marketing and advertising instead of education. I am also introducing new metrics, including a repayment rate, by which to better measure schools' performance. The bill also changes the current ''90/10'' rule to ''85/15'' to ensure that for-profit schools are not wholly subsidized by the Federal government. For those bad actors making record-breaking profits through fraud and abuse of taxpayer dollars, my bill includes a number of provisions designed to penalize this behavior and to stop it.

Our country has reached a critical point in higher education. Beyond disagreements on specific policy issues, we must come together to decide whether higher education should be preserved, first and foremost, as a public good. Over the past two decades, rising college costs have been shifted unfairly onto the backs of students and families. The central question we must ask is whether this accelerating trend is the right direction for this country—whether paying for college should be the sole responsibility of students and families or our shared responsibility as a nation. My bill reflects the overall belief that all stakeholders—states, the Federal Government, students and families—should invest together in higher education to keep college affordable and accessible to all. Our country's economic future and the promise of equal opportunity depend upon this critical investment.

It is unacceptable to ask students and their families to shoulder the bulk of college costs. Historically, this has never been the case, and we should not allow this unfortunate trend to grow worse. My bill would get us back on the right track, ensuring that our higher education system is affordable, transparent, and ultimately accountable to our students and taxpayers. Higher education should serve as an equalizer of opportunity for all, and that is a promise that we must fulfill together.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2956. A bill to prevent caller ID spoofing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, in 2010 Congress passed, and the President signed into law, the Truth in Caller ID Act, which prohibits caller ID spoofing when it is used to defraud or harm Americans.

What is caller ID spoofing? It is a technique that allows a telephone caller to alter the phone number that appears on the recipient's Caller ID screen. In other words, spoofing allows someone to hide behind a misleading telephone number to try to scam consumers or trick law enforcement officers.

The Truth in Caller ID Act put in place tough new sanctions to crack down on phone scams, empowering States to help the Federal Government track down and punish these fraudsters.

Since then spoofing technology has evolved to give fraudsters new tools to pull the wool over our eyes. They take advantage of innovative text messaging services to trick unsuspecting Americans into sending money or providing sensitive personal information.

I believe our laws must evolve and adapt to the new tactics and technologies used by these criminals. That is why I am introducing the Phone Scam Prevention Act of 2014, to update the protections we put in place in 2010 and give consumers the tools they need to help them protect themselves.

The bill does 3 simple things.

First, it extends the current prohibition on Caller ID spoofing to calls coming from outside the United States and stops crooks from using text messaging services to scam consumers.

Second, it ensures consumers have access to what are known as ''whitelist services,'' where the technology exists. Whitelist services allow consumers to pick a list of approved phone numbers to ring through to their phone. All other numbers are automatically forwarded to voicemail or rerouted to a different number.

Calls from first responders, government agencies, and other important entities would still ring through to the consumer's phone.

Several phone companies currently offer whitelist services to their customers. It only makes sense to allow more Americans to have access to these valuable services so that they can help protect themselves from abusive phone calls.

Third, the bill directs the Federal Communications Commission, FCC, to develop Caller ID authentication standards within 5 years from the date of enactment to ensure Caller ID information is accurate, or at the very least warn consumers when such information cannot be verified.

An international group of telecom engineers, including specialists at the FCC, are currently working to develop such standards. The bill would merely accelerate the timeline for the standards to be finalized and move us to a more secure telephone system sooner.

When in place, Caller ID authentication will give consumers the information they need to judge the legitimacy of the call. Scammers will no longer be able to use spoofing technology to claim to be from the IRS, your bank, your utility company, or law enforcement and bilk you out of all your savings.

I invite my colleagues to join Senators COLLINS, DONNELLY, BOOKER, and me in support of the Phone Scam Prevention Act of 2014. Working together, I am hopeful that we can finally stop many of the fraudsters behinds these phone scams.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2956

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Phone Scam Prevention Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. AVAILABILITY OF WHITELIST SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part I of title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 232. AVAILABILITY OF WHITELIST SERVICES.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'voice service' means any service that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1);

''(2) the term 'exempt entity' means—

''(A) the Federal Government, a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an agency thereof; and

''(B) any entity with respect to which the Commission determines that allowing calls that originate from that entity to connect directly with the voice service customer premises equipment (commonly referred to as 'CPE') of a subscriber would serve the public interest; and

''(3) the term 'whitelist' means a list of telephone numbers, designated by a subscriber, for which calls originating from those numbers to the subscriber are permitted to connect directly with the voice service CPE of the subscriber.

''(b) REQUIREMENT TO OFFER WHITELIST SERVICE.—A provider of a voice service shall offer each subscriber the option to designate a whitelist, if technically feasible (as determined by the Commission on a periodic basis).

''(c) TREATMENT OF NONAPPROVED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If a subscriber elects to designate a whitelist under subsection (b), the provider of the voice service of the subscriber shall ensure that any call the provider receives for termination that is not associated with a telephone number on the whitelist of the subscriber or the telephone number of an exempt entity is processed according to preferences set by the subscriber with respect to the whitelist, including by limiting or disabling the ability of an incoming call to connect with the CPE of the subscriber.

''(2) SAFE HARBOR.—Whitelist processing that, in accordance with the preferences of a subscriber, limits or disables connection with the CPE of a subscriber shall not be considered to be—

''(A) blocking traffic; or

''(B) an unjust or unreasonable practice under section 201 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201).

''(d) NUMBER OF TELEPHONE NUMBERS ON WHITELIST FREE OF CHARGE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A provider of a voice service shall allow a subscriber (or a designated representative thereof) to designate not less than 10 telephone numbers to be on the whitelist under subsection (b), free of charge.

''(2) TELEPHONE NUMBERS OF EXEMPT ENTITIES.—The telephone number of an exempt entity shall not be considered to be on the whitelist of a subscriber for purposes of calculating the 10 telephone numbers that may be designated under paragraph (1).''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Section 232 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (a), shall take effect on the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. AUTHENTICATION OF CALL ORIGINATION.

Part I of title II of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), as amended by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 233. AUTHENTICATION OF CALL ORIGINATION.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'voice service' means any service that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1).

''(b) DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHENTICATION STANDARDS BY COMMISSION.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of the Phone Scam Prevention Act of 2014, the Commission shall develop authentication standards for providers of a voice service to validate the calling party number and caller identification information of a call originated through a voice service so that the subscriber receiving the call may obtain—

''(1) a secure assurance of the origin of the call, including—

''(A) the calling party number; and

''(B) caller identification information for the call; or

''(2) notice that an assurance described in paragraph (1) is unavailable.

''(c) ADOPTION OF AUTHENTICATION STANDARDS BY ENTITIES.—Each provider of a voice service that is allocated telephone numbers from the portion of the North American Numbering Plan that pertains to the United States shall adopt the authentication standards developed under subsection (b).''.

SEC. 4. EXPANDING AND CLARIFYING PROHIBITION ON INACCURATE CALLER ID INFORMATION.

(a) COMMUNICATIONS FROM OUTSIDE UNITED STATES.—Section 227(e)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(1)) is amended by striking ''in connection with any telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service'' and inserting ''or any person outside the United States if the recipient of the call is within the United States, in connection with any voice service''.

(b) COVERAGE OF TEXT MESSAGES AND OTHER VOICE SERVICES.—Section 227(e)(8) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)(8)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service'' and inserting ''voice service (including a text message sent using a text messaging service)'';

(2) in the first sentence of subparagraph (B), by striking ''telecommunications service or IP-enabled voice service'' and inserting ''voice service (including a text message sent using a text messaging service)'';

(3) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) TEXT MESSAGE.—The term 'text message'—

''(i) means a real-time or near real-time message consisting of text, images, sounds, or other information that is transmitted from or received by a device that is identified as the transmitting or receiving device by means of a telephone number;

''(ii) includes a short message service (commonly referred to as 'SMS') message, an enhanced message service (commonly referred to as 'EMS') message, and a multimedia message service (commonly referred to as 'MMS') message; and

''(iii) does not include a real-time, 2-way voice or video communication.

''(D) TEXT MESSAGING SERVICE.—The term 'text messaging service' means a service that permits the transmission or receipt of a text message, including a service provided as part of or in connection with a voice service.

''(E) VOICE SERVICE.—The term 'voice service' means any service that furnishes voice communications to an end user using resources from the North American Numbering Plan or any successor plan adopted by the Commission under section 251(e)(1).''.

(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to modify, limit, or otherwise affect—

(1) the authority, as of the day before the date of enactment of this Act, of the Federal Communications Commission to interpret the term ''call'' to include a text message (as defined under section 227(e)(8)) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by subsection (b)); or

(2) any rule or order adopted by the Federal Communications Commission in connection with—

(A) the Telephone Consumer Protection Act of 1991 (Public Law 102–243; 105 Stat. 2394) or the amendments made by that Act; or

(B) the CAN-SPAM Act of 2003 (15 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.).

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this section.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission prescribes regulations under subsection (d).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 585—DESIGNATING DECEMBER 3, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL PHENYLKETONURIA AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 585

Whereas phenylketonuria is a rare, inherited metabolic disorder that is characterized by the inability of the body to process the essential amino acid phenylalanine, and which causes intellectual disability and other neurological problems, such as memory loss and mood disorders, when treatment is not started within the first few weeks of life;

Whereas phenylketonuria is also referred to as ''PKU'' or Phenylalanine Hydroxylase Deficiency;

Whereas newborn screening for PKU was initiated in the United States in 1963 and was recommended for inclusion in State newborn screening programs under the Newborn Screening Saves Lives Act of 2007 (Public Law 110–204);

Whereas approximately 1 out of every 15,000 infants in the United States is born with PKU;

Whereas PKU is treated with medical food;

Whereas the 2012 Phenylketonuria Scientific Review Conference affirmed the recommendation of lifelong dietary treatment for PKU made by the National Institutes of Health Consensus Development Conference Statement 2000;

Whereas the American College of Medical Genetics and Genomics and Genetic Metabolic Dieticians International published medical and dietary guidelines on the optimal treatment of PKU in 2014;

Whereas medical foods are medically necessary for children and adults living with PKU;

Whereas adults with PKU who discontinue treatment are at risk for serious medical issues such as depression, impulse control disorder, phobias, tremors, and pareses;

Whereas women with PKU must maintain strict metabolic control before and during pregnancy to prevent fetal damage;

Whereas children born from untreated mothers with PKU may have a condition known as ''maternal phenylketonuria syndrome'', which can cause small brains, intellectual disabilities, birth defects of the heart, and low birth weights;

Whereas although there is no cure for PKU, treatment involving medical foods, medications, and restriction of phenylalanine intake can prevent progressive, irreversible brain damage;

Whereas access to health insurance coverage for medical food varies across the United States, and the long-term costs associated with caring for untreated children and adults with PKU far exceed the cost of providing medical food treatment;

Whereas gaps in medical foods coverage has a detrimental impact on individuals with PKU, their families, and society;

Whereas scientists and researchers are hopeful that breakthroughs in PKU research will be forthcoming;

Whereas researchers across the United States are conducting important research projects involving PKU; and

Whereas the Senate is an institution that can raise awareness of PKU among the general public and the medical community: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates December 3, 2014, as ''National Phenylketonuria Awareness Day'';

(2) encourages all people in the United States to become more informed about phenylketonuria; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the National PKU Alliance, a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the lives of individuals with phenylketonuria.

SENATE RESOLUTION 586—CALLING ON THE GOVERNMENT OF BURMA TO DEVELOP A NON-DISCRIMINATORY AND COMPREHENSIVE SOLUTION THAT ADDRESSES RAKHINE STATE'S NEEDS FOR PEACE, SECURITY, HARMONY, AND DEVELOPMENT UNDER EQUITABLE AND JUST APPLICATION OF THE RULE OF LAW, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. COONS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 586

Whereas, of the 1,500,000 members of the Rohingya ethnic minority community worldwide, over 1,200,000 stateless Rohingya live in Burma, mostly in northern Rakhine State, including 140,000 internally displaced persons (IDPs);

Whereas the security, stability, and development of Rakhine State is dependent on the rule of law and non-discriminatory access to citizenship, livelihoods and services, and protection for all residents;

Whereas, on November 12, 2014, President Barack Obama traveled to Burma, where he ''stressed the need to find durable and effective solutions for the terrible violence in Rakhine state, solutions that end discrimination, provide greater security and economic opportunities, protect all citizens, and promote greater tolerance and understanding,'' while noting that legitimate government is a government based on ''the recognition that all people are equal under the law'';

Whereas the Department of State has, since 1999, regularly expressed its particular concern for severe legal, economic, and social discrimination against Burma's Rohingya population in its Country Report for Human Rights Practices;

Whereas the United Nations Special Rapporteur for Human Rights in Burma reported a ''long history of discrimination and persecution against the Rohingya Muslim community which could amount to crimes against humanity'';

Whereas the current Government of Burma, like its predecessors, continues to use the Burma Citizenship Law of 1982 to exclude Rohingya from a list of legally recognized ethnic groups, despite many having lived in Rakhine State for generations, thereby rendering Rohingya stateless and vulnerable to exploitation and abuse;

Whereas, in its March 2014 census, the first in over 30 years, the Government of Burma reneged on its commitment to allow all people in Burma to self-identify and ordered the Rohingya to ethnically identify as ''Bengali'', resulting in their exclusion from census data and thereby severely undermining the validity of the data for Rakhine State and creating the potential for further discrimination and conflict;

Whereas local and national policies and practices discriminate against Rohingya by denying them freedom of movement outside their villages and camps, restricting access to livelihood, education, and health care;

Whereas authorities have required Rohingya to obtain official permission for marriages, with reportedly onerous, humiliating, and financially prohibitive requirements for approval;

Whereas a two-child policy sanctioned solely upon the Rohingya population in two