



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 16, 2015

No. 55

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal God, You rule the Earth with goodness. Great and marvelous are Your works. Help us so to live that we can be Your instruments for good in our world. Lord, fill our hearts with Your peace and undergird us with the unfolding of Your loving providence.

Bless our Senators. Enlighten and illumine them that they may know You and Your precepts. Touch their lips so that they may speak no words that grieve You. Give them faith for every challenge, strength for every temptation, and wisdom for every perplexity.

We pray in Your majestic Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, human trafficking affects every State in this Nation—every single one of them. In Kentucky we have heard reports of victims as young as 2 months old—2-month-old victims of human

trafficking. We heard about a Kentuckian who said she was sold for sex from the age of 5 until she was able to physically break free as an adult. Stories such as these may shock the conscience, but they are hardly unique in our country.

The Judiciary Committee recently heard the story of Aviva, who was barely a teenager when she was kidnapped and forced into modern slavery. Listen to this. Aviva was sold to as many as 10 different men a night. Freedom was stolen from her, innocence ripped away. Aviva's trafficker tried to stamp out everything that made Aviva Aviva. Aviva even forgot what it felt like to be human anymore.

Democrats have said they were in favor of helping victims such as Aviva. Democrats demanded that I bring the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act to the floor. But now that the very legislation is here on the floor, our Democratic friends seem to have changed their tune completely—a totally different tune. Now that they have a chance to actually help the victims, they decided they are more concerned about a few sentences in the bill—a provision they seemed perfectly fine with until just recently. They are more concerned about those few sentences than actually solving the problem the bill would address.

Now, this provision has been included in countless bills they have voted for and cosponsored. It is language they were perfectly happy to endorse again in another bill this very week—2 days ago. But that bill was designed to help doctors, not children enslaved by sex traffickers. So it is OK to vote for that kind of language if you are trying to help doctors, but not OK to vote for that kind of language if you are trying to help these poor young children. Obviously our Democratic friends think that doctors are worthy of their help. What about the victims of modern slavery?

Now, the rationale for this filibuster seems to shift by the day, and it is al-

most incomprehensible. Their foremost concern seems to be about treating this specific kind of money this way, versus treating that specific kind of money that way. It is hard to follow; isn't it? Focusing all their attention not on the victims of these crimes but on financial assessments levied on the people who perpetrate them—the traffickers.

Honestly, I am not sure why anyone would think money collected from criminals ought to get more consideration than money collected from law-abiding taxpayers. What a strange argument. But this is where they have planted their flag. That ridiculous argument is where they have planted their flag.

Their contention is essentially that the victims of trafficking should get no help at all because Democrats say the money they would receive might be considered "private" and that this bill should not pass, therefore, because the bipartisan Hyde principles it contains might apply to those private funds. If that argument sounds contrived and illogical to you, you are not alone.

Now we find out it is not even true. Let me repeat that. The very heart of the Democrats' argument isn't even true. That is what the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service told us just yesterday.

So I would ask my Democratic friends to listen to this closely. CRS, the Congressional Research Service, answered some very straightforward questions posed by the senior Senator from Texas, my friend and colleague Senator CORNYN. Here is what they said to Senator CORNYN: Money deposited in the General Treasury from traffickers, as the Federal law requires, is Federal money, according to CRS.

So let me repeat. The Democrats have been blocking an antislavery bill over money they call private, and they are not even correct about this. Our Democratic colleagues have also blocked this bill because they say Hyde has only applied to annual spending or

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2227

appropriations—not mandatory spending. It is another argument that the Congressional Research Service tells us is simply not true—not true.

The experts at CRS say Hyde has applied to mandatory spending of Federal funds out of the General Treasury, as the Cornyn amendment provides. And CRS concludes that Hyde just applied to mandatory spending in the very doc fix bill that 100 percent of our Democratic friends voted for 2 days ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the CRS memorandum be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I ask my Democratic friends to stop this. Stop this. Take a breath and think about what is being done. Children are being sold into sexual slavery, having their freedom and self-respect ripped away. Will they finally allow the Senate to help them or will they continue some debunked crusade?

We have offered several compromises to address the concerns they have raised. We will soon vote on another one that Senator CORNYN has been offering. He has been reaching out to our Democrat friends for weeks now to try to find a solution to this nonproblem. The findings of CRS make it clear that we are doing nothing extraordinary or unusual here. We are simply applying long-accepted principles that Americans overwhelmingly support. Most people would think that sounds pretty reasonable. It is time to get serious and pass this important legislation.

A large, bipartisan majority of the Senate has already voted repeatedly to approve this bill. With the support of a couple more courageous Democrats, we can bring an end to this debunked filibuster today.

The victims who survive brutal abuse don't need more of our friends' illogical contortions and justifications. They just need help, and they need it now. They need the help the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act would provide.

Why don't we finally get around to fixing this problem? The time to do that is now.

I yield the floor.

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

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 15, 2015.

To: Senate Committee on the Judiciary.
From: Edward C. Liu, Legislative Attorney;
Jon O. Shimabukuro, Legislative Attorney.

Subject: Analysis of S.Amdt. 1120 to S. 178.

This memorandum responds on an expedited basis to your request for an analysis of specific questions you have posed regarding a draft amendment denoted "ALB15639" which appears to be identical to S.Amdt. 1120 to S. 178. Your questions have been reproduced below verbatim followed by our responses.

"1. DOES THE TEXT OF ALB15639 REQUIRE ALL SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS TO BE DEPOSITED IN THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?"

Yes. Section 3302(b) of Title 31 of the United States Code, also known as the miscellaneous receipts statute, requires that all money received for the federal government

must be deposited in the General Fund of the Treasury unless disposition of the receipts is otherwise specified by law. S. 178, as amended by S.Amdt. 1120 does not appear to specify a different treatment for the assessments received.

The new §3014(d) created by S.Amdt. 1120 would specify that "consistent with [the miscellaneous receipts statute], there shall be transferred to the [Domestic Trafficking Victims'] Fund from the General Fund of the Treasury an amount equal to the amount of the assessments collected under this section, which shall remain available until expended." The transfer of funds from the General Fund does not affect the disposition of the assessments in a way that would supersede the miscellaneous receipts statute, though the end result for the respective balances of the General Fund and the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund appears to be mathematically equal to directly depositing the assessments into the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund. The conclusion that the assessments are deposited into the General Fund is reinforced by the clause requiring that the transfer occur "consistent with" the miscellaneous receipts statute.

"2. ONCE THE SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS IN ALB15639 ARE DEPOSITED INTO THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND, WOULD THEY BE CLASSIFIED AS FEDERAL FUNDS?"

Yes, amounts in the General Fund are considered "federal funds" by the Office of Management and Budget ("OMB"). In the Analytical Perspectives volume of the Budget for FY2016, OMB provides background information on budget accounts. This information would seem to be instructive for determining how funds, i.e., amounts, in the Treasury account will be classified. OMB observes:

When money is received by the federal government, it is credited to a budget account. . . . All budget accounts belong to one of two groups of funds: federal funds and trust funds. . . . The federal funds group includes the "general fund," the largest fund in the government used for the general purposes of government and special funds and revolving funds, both of which receive dedicated collections for spending on specific purposes. Where the law requires that federal fund collections be dedicated to a particular program, the collections and associated disbursements are recorded in special fund receipt and expenditure accounts. . . . Money in a special fund must be appropriated before it can be obligated and spent. The majority of special fund collections are derived from the government's power to impose taxes or fines, or otherwise compel payment.

"3. DO PRECEDENTS EXIST FOR APPLYING THE HYDE AMENDMENT TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?"

Yes. Mandatory spending can be generally defined as federal spending which is controlled by laws other than appropriations acts. In recent years the Hyde Amendment has included a clause extending its scope to trust funds to which money was appropriated in that same annual appropriations act. For example, the consolidated appropriations act for FY2015 includes a Hyde Amendment with this clause, and also appropriates funds from the General Fund to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund. The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund is used to pay for services provided to Medicare beneficiaries under Part A of the program. Because these payments from the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund are controlled by the Social Security Act and are considered to be mandatory spending, this would appear to constitute an example of mandatory spending that was subject to the versions of the Hyde Amendment.

"4. IS NOT THE LANGUAGE IN SECTION 221(C) OF H.R. 2 (HYDE LANGUAGE IN HOUSE-PASSED SGR LEGISLATION) ATTACHED TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?"

Yes. Section 221(a) of H.R. 2 amends §10503 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) which appropriates funds to the Community Health Center Fund (CHC Fund) for certain fiscal years, out of any monies in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Section 221 extends the funding provided in §10503 for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. Pursuant to §10503, amounts in the CHC Fund are available until expended, and are to be used by the Secretary to increase funding of community health centers and the National Health Service Corps. Subsection 221(c) of H.R. 2 further provides that:

Amounts appropriated pursuant to this section for fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 are subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 113-235 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act.

On its face, this restriction would appear to apply to the amounts appropriated to the CHC Fund for fiscal years 2016 and 2017. The spending of funds appropriated for those fiscal years would appear to be controlled by §10503 of ACA, and would not appear to be controlled by an appropriations act. Therefore, spending from the CHC Fund would appear to be classified as mandatory spending subject to the restriction in subsection 221(c) of H.R. 2.

"5. IS THE LANGUAGE ON PAGE 4, LINES 8-14 OF ALB15639 (HYDE LANGUAGE) ALSO ATTACHED TO MANDATORY SPENDING FROM THE GENERAL TREASURY FUND?"

Yes. The new 18 U.S.C. §3014(e)(3), as added by S.Amdt. 1120, states that:

Amounts transferred from the [Domestic Trafficking Victims'] Fund pursuant to this section for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019 are subject to the requirements contained in Public Law 113-235 for funds for programs authorized under sections 330 through 340 of the Public Health Service Act.

S.Amdt. 1120 further provides that amounts in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund shall be used by the Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to award grants or enhance victims' programming, "without further appropriation." This provision is found in an authorizing measure which amends Title 18 of the United States Code, and not an appropriations act.

Therefore, using the same definition of mandatory spending as provided above, the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund would appear to be mandatory spending that is subject to the restrictions in the new 18 U.S.C. §3014(e)(3) that would be added by S.Amdt. 1120.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING LEGISLATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am not an expert in the field of etymology, which is the study of the origin of words, but I do find the origin of English words to be enlightening. For example, the word "govern" is one we hear often in the Capitol. "Govern" is derived from the Greek word meaning "to steer or pilot

a ship." The most important question for a party in power is simply this: Can you govern? I say this to my Republican friends. In other words, can you steer the ship? Can you pilot this great Nation of ours in the right direction?

We are just over 100 days in this Republican-controlled Congress, and it is already clear that the Republican leader and his side have not been up to the task. One need look no further than the Republicans' botched handling of the human trafficking bill before the Senate.

I would just say in partial response to my friend the Republican leader that I have never been a big fan of polling—political polling or any kind of polling—because you can get any answer you want by asking the right question. Of course, the Republican leader, in the questions submitted to the Congressional Research Service, asked the wrong questions.

The majority leader and the assistant majority leader took a piece of legislation and steered it right into the rocks. The ship has sprung many leaks. All Democrats and Republicans support the provisions of this bill to help the victims of sexual trafficking and hold the offenders accountable, but instead of legislating on common ground, the Republicans are legislating to obstruct. When they were in the minority, all they did was obstruct. So they know how to do that. I vouch for that. One of the things I said was that we are not going to treat them the way they treated us. And we haven't done that.

The Republicans, now in the majority, can't filibuster themselves so they are resorting to tanking good legislation—bills they themselves wrote and support—in order to score some type of political point. Does that seem like reasonable governance to anyone? I don't think so.

Yesterday, I sat listening to the majority leader—and I did today—claiming that they are seeking a compromise, even saying that Republicans have offered three compromises. Well, if we are just going on the number of offers made, we have done 10. We have made 10 good-faith offers to get this human trafficking bill on the right path. We have tried and tried and tried to reach an agreement. We have done 10. I will mention just a few.

We proposed that they strip the Hyde language from the bill. Then we proposed the Leahy substitute, which would strip the Hyde language and also include LEAHY's Runaway and Homeless Youth Act and Senator KLOBUCHAR's Stop Exploitation through Trafficking Act, which would strengthen the legislation. Then we proposed to use the entire trafficking bill passed by the House instead of the Cornyn bill. That is the bill the House passed. Let's bring it to the floor here and pass it. We even proposed to keep the Cornyn fund but use it only for law enforcement efforts to help catch sex traffickers and use the House bill's authorization for victims services, including health care.

But Republicans would not agree to any of those changes. They simply are not interested in getting to "yes." This morning, I heard some talk that maybe we can work something out. I hope that, in fact, is true. I hope they are not using this urgently needed trafficking bill to continue to push through the party's backward agenda relating to women's health.

The Hyde language—I served in the House of Representatives more than 30 years ago. I served with Congressman Hyde, a fine man. If there ever were anyone who looked like a public servant, it was Henry Hyde—big man, beautiful white hair, great speaking voice. He, this good Congressman, is responsible for the Hyde language. It has been in bills since then, but it applied and has always applied to government money, taxpayer money—taxpayer money.

What we have said over the last couple of weeks time and time again is that Hyde should not be expanded to cover nontaxpayer dollars. That is what this is all about. We are not going to bend on that issue. It is not right. We do not need to expand Hyde. We think the Republicans believe this is a way to pacify the right-to-life community, some of these—not all but some of these ideologues out there who want to expand Hyde. We are not going to allow that to happen. Hyde should apply to taxpayer-funded money and nothing else.

What has taken place on the direction of human trafficking is an effort to obfuscate—to hide the real purpose of the legislation. We all agree that human trafficking should stop. This legislation we have before us is a step in the right direction. We want to support that legislation.

My friend the Republican leader said: Well, all they are complaining about is a sentence or so. Well, that is why people spend all these years going to law school, taking contracts courses. That is why my friend the assistant Republican leader, who served as a trial court judge, a supreme court justice—during his entire career, he dealt with lawyers coming to him talking about sentences in a contract or sentences in a piece of legislation. That is what this is all about.

We should eliminate those sentences that allow Hyde to be expanded to nontaxpayer money. We cannot allow that to happen.

So, over 100 days into this Congress, we should move forward and get this bill done. It is time that, on this legislation, Republicans right the ship. If human trafficking legislation is any indication, Republicans have not had a desire to govern dependably. I think that is unfair.

I hope this cloture vote will be defeated. I hope at that time people will finally come to the realization that we are willing to do whatever needs to be done to change this language so that the Hyde language is not applied to taxpayer dollars. If that is the case, we can move forward expeditiously.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 178, which the clerk will report by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 178) to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

Pending:

McConnell (for Cornyn) amendment No. 1120, to strengthen the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act by incorporating additional bipartisan amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Texas

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote at 11 a.m. this morning.

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

100TH DAY OF THE NEW CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am an optimistic person. As a matter of fact, I think everybody from Texas is an optimist. Can you imagine the challenges the people who founded our State had—Indians, wide-open hostile territory, tough weather. But they persevered because they were optimists. They thought the fight was worth the struggle. They thought the goal and the accomplishment—the hope for accomplishment—was worth the struggle.

I still remain optimistic—despite the last few weeks that have challenged that optimism—that we will actually break through here and get to consider and vote on the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act and get help to the people whom the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, described, the children who cannot help themselves. I mean, for heaven's sake, if we cannot help the most vulnerable people in our country—children who cannot help themselves, who are the victims of modern-day slavery—what in the world can we do?

So we have marked 100 days here in the Senate with the new Republican majority. As I look back, I do not think anybody can deny that under the majority leader's stewardship we have had some significant accomplishments in a relatively short period of time. Sure, it has been bumpy along the way. The Keystone XL Pipeline was a significant bump in the road. But we had a strong bipartisan vote. Unfortunately, the President decided to veto that legislation.

After years of this Chamber being used solely for the purpose of messaging and conducting political show votes, we are actually starting to get

some things done. It is pretty exciting. As somebody who has been here since 2002, it is hard to believe, when I say that, that I have actually been here during different phases and cycles of the Senate operating. I have to tell you that the last 4 years or so has been a dark period, a stain on the reputation of the Senate in terms of actually getting things done in the interests of the American people.

I understand the he said-she said and the blame game. The blame game is a world-class sport here in Washington, DC. But most of our constituents couldn't care less about the blame game; they actually want to see government function in their interest. Consistent with our principles, we are going to have some disagreements, there is no doubt about it. But they hate the dysfunction. They hate the political posturing. You know what. I do, too. I dare say that the vast majority of Senators hate the dysfunction the Senate has experienced.

So there is a new spirit of optimism and, yes, hope, not that the Age of Aquarius has suddenly broken out—peace, love and understanding and we are all going to hold hands and sing “Kumbaya.” That is not going to happen. But can we work together as Americans, as people who love our country, who have taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States, who owe a fiduciary duty to the people we represent? I represent 26.9 million people. That just staggers my imagination when I think about it, when I think about the responsibility associated with it. But I am encouraged when we have the chance to help people, especially those who cannot help themselves.

Well, one reason for my optimism about the new Congress is that we have held a lot of votes. We had 15 votes last year, 15 rollcall votes in the Congress last year. We have had about 100 in the 100 days we have been here. As a matter of fact, I have heard some of our colleagues say: I am a little tired of voting quite as much as we have, particularly on the budget vote-arama which lasted until 4 in the morning. I understand that. But, you know, we have passed a balanced budget in the Senate without raising taxes. The Congress has not passed a budget since 2009. What more fundamental, basic function of government is there than to pass a budget?

The distinguished Presiding Officer was Governor of his great State. I am absolutely confident he viewed that as one of the fundamental responsibilities of his State government and of his office in particular—to get the fiscal house in order. The way you do that is by passing a budget and determining what your priorities are—things you absolutely have to do, things you perhaps want to do but maybe have to delay, and things you simply cannot afford.

Every State, every local government, and, yes, the Federal Government

should pass a budget. We will in short order. The Senate has, and now we need to reconcile our differences with the House, which we will shortly. But it is not just government; every family and every business has to work on a budget. So that is progress. I am happy about that.

On Tuesday night, we actually fixed a problem that had been nagging the Congress since 1997. Back in 1997, we, the Congress—we were not here; the Presiding Officer and I were not here. The Congress had this bright idea: We are going to save money on health care by whacking the payments we make to providers and hospitals. Well, after a while we found out that if we do not pay doctors and hospitals for treating Medicare patients, they will not see them.

So our seniors, to whom we had made a sacred promise—we will continue to make sure Medicare provides quality service and is accessible—all of a sudden, it was not quite so accessible because people could not find a doctor who would take a new Medicare patient.

That is still a problem, so we came back over the intervening years and 17 times out of the 18 times those cuts would have been imposed, Congress reversed them. We had an expression around here that unfortunately we had to use a lot; we called it the doc fix. That is an inelegant way, perhaps, of describing what we were doing, but basically what we were trying to do was preserve Medicare and access to doctors and hospitals for our seniors who are the beneficiaries of the Medicare system. That, to me, represents some progress, that we have fixed that once and for all.

Then, imagine my surprise that, after the contentious issue of congressional approval of the anticipated Iranian-U.S.—along with our allies—nuclear negotiations, this deal that could be forthcoming this summer, imagine my surprise, after the President said he would veto it, when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee unanimously passed a bill out of the committee. All Democrats voted for it. All Republicans voted for it. Oh, by the way, when the President began to count the numbers and the support in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, he said: You know what. I think I will sign that piece of legislation when it comes to my desk. I think that represents progress.

One other item that has made me somewhat optimistic on this 100th day of the new Congress is that we are very close to working out a trade deal that the President supports and I would say Republicans by and large support. Honestly, there is probably more controversy on the Democratic side than there is on the Republican side. But in a world where 80 percent of the purchasing power and 95 percent of the population exists beyond our shores, why in the world would we not want to open new markets to the stuff we

grow—our farmers, our ranchers—the livestock we raise, and the things we make? I think it makes good sense.

So you can see why I, perhaps, am optimistic about this new Congress and what we have been able to do together on a bipartisan basis to make progress in the interests of the American people.

The one thing that has me completely bamboozled and befuddled is the objections over this antitrafficking legislation that had 30 cosponsors—roughly an equal number of Democrats and Republicans—and passed—sailed out of the Judiciary Committee.

My friend the Senator from Illinois, the Democratic whip, knows that the Judiciary Committee is no place for the faint of heart. We have a lot of disagreements. Maybe that is because we have a lot of lawyers on the Judiciary Committee. We fight a lot about things we believe in strongly. But this antitrafficking legislation sailed out of the Judiciary Committee on a unanimous basis.

I hope we can work out these differences, and I have made multiple suggestions and compromises in an effort to try to get everybody to yes.

I agree with the majority leader's description of the sordid, unspeakable, evil of human trafficking and the compelling reason we ought to do something to address it.

I know that is where the hearts of all of our colleagues are, but somehow we have just gotten stuck. We need to get unstuck, and I hope today will be that day. Of course, human trafficking is a plague in all 50 States, and my State, unfortunately, has way too much of its share.

I, like all of our colleagues, have had the chance to meet many of the brave victims of human trafficking. One victim I met last week in Austin is Brooke Axtell.

Our friends at Google convened a meeting in Austin. The technology community understands that a lot of the solicitation of underage girls and victims of human trafficking occurs online. So they have come together to try to work with law enforcement, work with victims' rights groups to try to come up with a comprehensive way to combat it.

At Google last week in Austin, I met Brooke Axtell, who was introduced to America when she gave a moving speech at this year's GRAMMY Awards. In Texas, she is better known for her work with a number of non-profits that are focused on ending domestic violence and human trafficking. I can't begin to tell you how inspiring she is and her words were, particularly when you comprehend the horror, the absolute horror of what she had been through as a victim of human trafficking herself.

Starting at the age of 7—7 years old—Brooke was sexually abused. She was literally put in chains and a cage—treated like an animal—in a basement. She was repeatedly sold to men who raped and abused her.

Out of this horror that she experienced as a young child, Brooke has brought life to her pain, and I think her leadership in the antitrafficking effort has actually helped her heal. She is one brave, courageous, young woman. She founded a group called Survivor Healing and Empowerment, which is a healing community for the survivors of rape, abuse, and sex trafficking.

That is why, today, at 11 o'clock, I hope all of our colleagues listen not only to Brooke's voice and her experience, but each one of us on the floor could tell a similar story about somebody in their State, somebody they know, they have met, who would be helped by this legislation.

I hope we don't tell them no. I hope we don't shut another door in their faces.

I see some of our colleagues on the floor. I want to briefly give them a chance to speak before we vote at 11 o'clock, just to say that the underlying legislation is not partisan. It would strengthen law enforcement tools and authorities to rescue victims, while taking down the human traffickers and the criminal networks that support them. The goal is to provide at least \$30 million through fines and penalties paid into the public Treasury that would then go to help heal and rescue the victims of human trafficking.

Now, this is not tax money, so it is deficit neutral. We are not raising taxes to do it. We are making the people who purchased these services, who were convicted and have to pay fines and penalties, pay to help rescue and heal the victims.

Shortly, we will vote on another compromise I have offered. I have tried to listen to the objections of our friends across the aisle—and I don't want to relitigate those because, frankly, that is not particularly productive. They seem to be locked in. I am sure they would say we are locked in, and so we are trying to find a way forward.

First, and most important, this amendment would completely replace a provision that Members on the other side have objected to regarding the application of the Hyde amendment. The amendment would replace the language or the provision negotiated by Leader PELOSI from the doc fix bill I mentioned earlier that passed the House with 392 votes; 180 House Democrats voted for this bill, including Leader PELOSI. So we have substituted that language for the original language.

Of course, in the Senate we had 92 Senators vote for that same language, and our colleagues across the aisle have repeatedly voted for similar language.

So the Pelosi language from this bill that my amendment includes would simply say any funds used to provide services for victims of human trafficking would be subject to the same requirements as funds of the Public Health and Services Act.

The majority leader has said it well: If this language is good enough to help

the doctors and the hospitals, surely it is good enough to help young 7-year-old victims of human trafficking, such as Brooke Axtell.

To further clarify, to address the stated concerns of our friends across the aisle, this amendment would also clarify that all money—all the money in the Domestic Trafficking Victims' Fund—must be derived from the General Treasury. This is an objection I don't personally understand, but we want to make it clear—just perhaps to help our colleagues get to yes—that all of the money would be derived from the General Treasury, which, of course, is where all Federal funding comes from, and we would make clear that all of the money would be public dollars.

I don't get this because tax dollars are private dollars until you give them to the government, and then they are no longer public-private, they are public. Private penalties are private until you pay it to the government, and then it is public.

But we want to make clear, to eliminate any rationale for any objection, and say that explicitly these would be public dollars. The requirements placed on funds under the bill would not be placed on the fees and penalties. That seemed to be a matter of concern, and we tried to address that.

As I explained, the pending amendment would do what I have tried my dead-level best to do, to try to address the concerns our Democratic colleagues, who have blocked the bill so far, have continually expressed.

So the language is just the same as the doc fix, and we have made clear that none of the fines and penalties themselves—but rather funds derived from the General Treasury—would be used to pay for these services in an equivalent amount to the fines and penalties.

I would add, parenthetically, when I was talking to one of our colleagues about it, they said: Well, that is money laundering. You are taking fines and penalties and you are transferring it, you are substituting it into a general fund.

I mean, give me a break. What we are trying to do is find a solution. I think we have given our colleagues every opportunity to get to yes.

I know, because I have talked to a lot of them—including the Senator from Illinois—people want to get to yes. I hope we have found a way to do that. So I hope we will not let the political gamesmanship continue to get in the way of a bill that would bring relief and healing to victims of human trafficking.

I hope we will have that vote at 11 o'clock, and there will be broad, bipartisan support to proceed to the bill and to pass the legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time remains on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I will be very brief because I see my colleague from Connecticut on the floor.

Let me say at the outset, in the most positive way, I thank Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota for their bipartisan effort to bring this issue to the floor and to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

We had a hearing in a subcommittee on this subject, and it was heart-breaking to hear about the exploitation of these young women at such a tender age. Unspeakable things were happening to them.

Sadly, in many States, when they finally came into the custody of law enforcement, some of them—some of the children—these young girls, were being charged as criminals until it was clear they had been enslaved and they had been exploited for so many years. So thinking on this subject is moving in the right direction. The suggestions of Senator CORNYN and Senator KLOBUCHAR are also in the right direction.

So why don't we pass this bill? We have all of this bipartisan support. One provision in this bill turns out to be fraught with controversy.

Thirty-nine years ago, a Congressman from Illinois named Henry Hyde offered compromise language on the issue of abortion. It was just a few years after *Roe v. Wade*. It was still very controversial. He said: We will prohibit the expenditure of taxpayer funds for abortion except in cases of rape, incest, and the life of the mother.

For 39 years, that has been the standard. There has been an uneasy truce between those who see this issue in many different ways. They have come to the conclusion this will be the standard that would be applied to the expenditure of taxpayer funds, and it is renewed year after year.

Senator CORNYN, perhaps by accident or perhaps by design, crossed the line and started talking about not taxpayer funds but funds collected in fines from those guilty of human trafficking to create a victims' fund.

That has brought all of the debate and controversy—in fairness to Senator CORNYN and to Senator MURRAY, who has joined with others in this battle, there has been an active exchange of compromise language. We have counted, I think, 12 different versions we have sent over to Senator CORNYN. He sent probably as many our way.

So it isn't as if both sides have hunkered down and are just staring one another down. There is an honest effort to find a solution. The solution would not be embodied in the vote that had been scheduled for 11 o'clock; it is the old language. But they are still working on new language, and I hope we reach a point soon where we achieve that. We all agree human trafficking should stop and victims should be compensated.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise with regret because, unfortunately, we remain divided. There is so much common ground, so many good ideas in this bill, and so much that unites us. We have so much more in common than in conflict on this bill.

The Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act has involved so much work by great colleagues—Senator CORNYN, Senator KLOBUCHAR, Senator MURRAY, Senator FEINSTEIN, and my colleague who has just finished speaking.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill. We are divided on one paragraph that is simply unacceptable, and it is fundamental to the goals of this bill, which is to restore human dignity and freedom to victims and survivors of human trafficking. Restoring freedom involves giving those survivors choices over whether they will bear children as a result of that trafficking. Trafficking is, fundamentally, modern-day slavery. It is sex slavery and sex exploitation, which results, all too often, in pregnancy. At its core, the human trafficking bill before us today is about restoring human dignity to those victims and survivors and enabling them to avoid the long-lasting and enduring consequences of that slavery.

This legislation is an acknowledgment of our common commitment to these survivors and to providing them the services and support they need so much. One of them is abortion. Where we are divided is on guaranteeing that reproductive right—the essence of freedom, dignity, and choice. So it is well beyond a technicality here. It is about the fundamental goals of this bill, which are contradicted by this provision in the law.

Senator CORNYN's proposed amendment changes the words of this paragraph that we find objectionable, but it doesn't change the basic substance or its practical effect. We are told the provision in question doesn't matter because it includes a rape exception, but it requires the survivor to request, to ask, to entreaty and supplicate to the State whether the rape was really rape, whether it is a pretense or they must bear a rapist's child.

We are told the provision in question is essentially the same as the Hyde amendment, but that is flatly untrue because the Hyde amendment applies to taxpayer funds. I would say to my colleague from Texas, a good friend, who is determined to address this problem of human trafficking, there are no taxpayer funds in that \$30 million that is taken from criminal fines and penalties. It is an entirely different source of funds.

As a former prosecutor, I view those moneys as restitution. They come from criminals and they are used to try to support and serve the victims of that criminal activity. There is nothing more fundamental than using funds taken from criminals for the benefit of their victims. Congress has never be-

fore privileged the concerns of criminals over the rights of women, and we should not start now.

I respect my colleague from Texas and other colleagues who may differ with me on this issue. He has stated, in heartbreaking and eloquent terms, the practical human impact of trafficking, sex slavery. I ask my colleagues now to give these women the real freedom from that sex slavery. Liberate them, truly, from this heinous and horrific violation of basic human rights by guaranteeing them one of the basic human rights, which is the right to make choices about their own bodies, about their futures, about their hopes and dreams as they are liberated from this slavery. Let this Chamber and my colleagues recognize the rights they have to truly be free from those who enslave them. I urge this body to strike the Hyde language from S. 178 and to make good on its promise.

As cochair of the bipartisan Senate caucus to end human trafficking, I agree completely this cause ought to be bipartisan. It ought not to divide us along any partisan or party lines. I am proud to have worked with Members on both sides of the aisle, and I hope we can come to agreement now with my good friend and my excellent colleague Senator CORNYN and others who have worked so hard and who are so genuinely determined to solve this problem and to take a step—it is only a first step—in the direction of combating human trafficking.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, my friend and colleague Senator CORNYN has been involved in discussions with the minority about a path forward on the trafficking bill, and I would like to ask him if he is optimistic that we may be able to reach an agreement at some point in the near future about a way to go forward.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to the distinguished majority leader that I am more optimistic than I have been at any time in the last few weeks. I just talked to the Democratic leader who told me there are active discussions taking place by all of the key people who can help us break this deadlock, and so I am more optimistic. We are not there yet, but we are in a much better place than I think we have been certainly in the last 3 weeks. So I am hopeful and somewhat more optimistic.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we would like to be able to process this important bill and move on to a vote on the President's nominee for Attorney General. Based upon the progress that is being made by my friend and

colleague from Texas, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion on the Cornyn amendment No. 1120.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, as I have done for the last several weeks, I am back again for this week's "Waste of the Week," a series of weekly speeches which points out how we can save taxpayer dollars by looking at waste, inefficiency, duplication, and other factors that are simply a waste of taxpayer money.

Because this is April and because it is just a day after that fateful day in April, April 15—and we all know what that means—our waste of the week.

Clearly, there is a growing consensus that our Tax Code is hopelessly complex, hopelessly burdensome, hopelessly anticompetitive, and needs comprehensive reform. That is not what we are here to talk about today, but I am a strong proponent of moving forward on that issue. It has been almost 30 years now—1986 was the last time a comprehensive reform was enacted by Congress. It turned out to be a tremendous stimulus to our economy. It created a boost in growth and boosted the economy in a way that provided us with the necessary funding without having to raise taxes, and, in fact, it lowered taxes because of its dynamic effect. That is an issue for another day. We will continue to try to pursue that. As a member of the Finance Committee, I know that is one of our major goals this year, as it is in the House of Representatives. Whether or not we are able to achieve our goal, we need to keep working on that.

Today, I want to talk about the waste of the week by looking at the Tax Code and doing something I think would be a relatively easy and simple way to save the taxpayer some money. It involves a refundable child tax credit. The tax laws allow a refund which is not an offset of taxes owed but an actual direct payment that occurs if you have children. The refundable child tax credit is pretty straightforward. It qualifies a taxpayer for a credit of up to \$1,000 per child depending on their income level.

I am not here today to talk about the merits of that tax credit. I have supported it in the past, and I think it is something that ought to be given serious consideration in any kind of tax reform. Rather, I am here to discuss the cost to the American taxpayer due to

the improper use of payments that are made to recipients who don't legally qualify for this refundable payment.

According to the inspector general at the IRS, the Internal Revenue Service sent out at least \$5.9 billion in improper payments in 2013—payments that went to people who did not legally qualify for the benefit.

Listen to what Russell George, the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration, said:

The IRS has continually rated the risk of improper Additional Child Tax Credit payments as low. However, [our] assessment of the potential for improper payments in this program indicates that its improper payment rate is similar to that of the Earned Income Tax Credit.

What is that rate? Nearly \$6 billion and even more than that over a period of time.

He goes on to say:

It is imperative that the IRS take action to identify and address all of its programs that are at high risk for improper payments.

Today, we are talking about one of those programs that Russell George, the Treasury Inspector General, defined and suggested we look at, and we will be looking at some others later.

We are proposing a pretty easy fix, and I am supporting legislation that will require the submission of a valid Social Security number in order to claim the refundable portion of the child tax credit. Requiring the submission of a valid Social Security number does not take the credit away from anyone who legally qualifies for this credit, but it does help ensure that only those who are truly legally qualified will benefit from the credit and will receive the payment.

According to the most recent estimate by the Joint Committee on Taxation, this simple fix—simply requiring a valid Social Security number before a payment is given so we can weed out those improper payments—could save taxpayers \$20 billion over a 10-year period. Compared to our multitrillion-dollar budget, \$20 billion is a fairly small percentage, but compared to the way the taxpayer looks at this, \$20 billion is a lot of change. It is a lot of money, and the savings from that can be used in any number of ways. Hopefully, it will be used to lower rates people have to pay in terms of the tax revenues they send to Washington, but if it is needed for essential programs, such as national defense or homeland security, and we can prove a need for that—we are constantly looking for ways to pay for things that are essential and need to be done—this is a perfect pay-for. So one way or another, it is a benefit to the American taxpayer.

As we mark tax day this week, I wish we could say we are getting close to major tax reform, but since we are not, it is important that we continue to look at the Tax Code as well as other functions of government to determine how we can continue to save taxpayers money and how we can continue to identify unfair and complicated areas of our Tax Code.

So with that we add to the gauge, which is growing every week that we identify a program. We started off at zero. Now we are approaching \$50 billion worth of savings for the taxpayer. Our goal is \$100 billion. We are going to keep doing this week after week, and we are going to keep adding money that is identified by our politically neutral accounting efforts. We are going to keep adding to this gauge until we reach our goal and hopefully go well beyond it.

Mr. President, \$20 billion is no small amount of change. It is being used improperly, and we can save that money.

Stay tuned for next week's "Waste of the Week."

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. FLAKE assumed the Chair.)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEYO NOMINATION

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I come to the floor today to recommend to the Senate the confirmation of a very qualified individual, Mr. Russell C. Deyo, to become Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security.

We are very fortunate to have an individual of Mr. Deyo's qualifications and integrity willing to serve our government working with Secretary Jeh Johnson and trying to help him succeed in his mission of keeping this Nation safe.

Mr. Deyo has a long and successful career and background. After law school, he clerked for Judge John Hannum of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania and then spent 2 years at a private law firm.

In 1978, Mr. Deyo joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of New Jersey as an assistant U.S. attorney.

In 1983, he was promoted to chief of the special prosecutions unit for public corruption.

In 1985, he came to Johnson & Johnson as a litigation attorney and became associate general counsel in 1999. He ultimately became vice president and general counsel later in 2009 and was responsible for human resources.

After retiring from Johnson & Johnson in 2012, Mr. Deyo served as both a standing member of a panel for potential product liability arbitration for Eli Lilly and as chairman of the Corporate Board of Advisers of the National Counsel of LaRaza.

He obtained his education at both Dartmouth College, with an associate bachelor's degree, and at Georgetown University with a J.D. in June of 1975.

Again, I wish to thank Mr. Deyo for being willing to serve his Nation in this crucial capacity.

I would also like to thank the members of our conference for clearing his name. I have worked very closely with our ranking member, the Senator from Delaware, in trying to develop not only a mission statement but also a commitment to enhance the economic and national security of our Nation. We listed a bunch of priorities. The Presiding Officer is on our committee, and she is also committed to those exact same goals. One of the priorities we listed was our commitment to do everything we can to help the Secretary of Homeland Security, Secretary Jeh Johnson, succeed in his mission of keeping this Nation safe. Our committee worked hard over a number of obstacles to make sure Mr. Deyo has his vote now for confirmation.

I certainly thank my ranking member, the Senator from Delaware. I thank my Republican colleagues for clearing the way for this vote.

I urge all of our colleagues here in the Senate—I would love to see a unanimous vote to approve Mr. Russell Deyo as the Under Secretary for Management at the Department of Homeland Security.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, today I wish to express my gratitude to the chairman for his work with his conference to clear the path to this discussion today of the nomination of Russ Deyo and to bring his name forward for hopefully confirmation this afternoon.

When I first met Russ Deyo, I asked him: How do you pronounce your name?

He said: "Dio" as in Rio.

I said: I think you mispronounce your own name.

He said: No, no. It is "Dio" as in Rio.

So I try to do that, but he has been called a lot of things. Some of the things he ought to be called are talented and dedicated, and we should call ourselves lucky that a guy or gal with his credentials from the private sector is willing to come and go to work for the people of America and to serve all of us.

The Department of Homeland Security is a Department that, as we know, does enormously important work to protect us. People all over this Nation—in the air, on the ground, on the borders, in our cities, and all over our countryside—have my gratitude and I know the gratitude of all of us.

Every organization of any consequence needs good management, and the idea of bringing in Russ Deyo is—this is a fellow who will offer real strength to the management team at the Department of Homeland Security. We need him. We are glad he is ready to go into the lineup, and I hope we will put him in there later this afternoon.

The position for which he has been nominated, the Under Secretary of

Management, is the third highest position in the Department of Homeland Security.

While this vote is long overdue, he has been approved by our committee now not once, I think, but twice. Unfortunately, we failed in the Senate to act on his nomination before the end of the last Congress, so we had to start over again. I am just glad he is willing to serve in this role.

As of this week, more than a year will have passed since the last Senate-confirmed Under Secretary for Management—a fellow named Rafael Borrás, a very good leader—stepped down from this post. I again thank Chairman JOHNSON for his efforts and our joint efforts to move this nomination forward.

Everything I have learned about Russ Deyo over the past several months has led me to conclude that he is an exceptional candidate to be the next Under Secretary for Management at DHS. Chairman JOHNSON has already walked through his impressive career.

Russ Deyo is also no stranger to public service. We tend to emphasize his very significant responsibilities at Johnson & Johnson and as a partner in a major law firm, but he has also worked with law enforcement organizations. He was an assistant U.S. attorney in New Jersey for 8 years—something we don't always note—including a period as chief of the public corruption unit. His perspective from the private and public sectors is going to be a great asset to Secretary Jeh Johnson and to Alejandro Mayorkas, the Deputy Secretary at the Department, as they work together to get the Department operating in a more unified and cohesive manner, in creating one DHS.

If confirmed, Mr. Deyo is going to face plenty of challenges. For example, the Government Accountability Office continues to remind us that the overall management of the Department remains on GAO's high-risk list of government operations that need urgent attention. Of course, if confirmed, Mr. Deyo will inherit the challenge of improving morale across the Department. I believe Mr. Deyo has the leadership, the experience, and the skills necessary to tackle these and other challenges at the Department and that he really will make a difference.

I would just say in closing that all of the organizations I have ever been a part of or observed, whether they happen to be a school or a university, a sports team, a military unit, a business, a church, the House or the Senate—here or at the local level—the most important element in the success of those organizations is almost always leadership. What we have endeavored to do over the last year, or actually a little more than a year, is to take the Department of Homeland Security—which was largely bereft at the senior levels of Senate-confirmed leadership—and with the addition of Russ Deyo in this No. 3 position to be in charge of the management shop at DHS, they

will have a full slate. They will have a full slate for not the C team or the D team or the B team but I think in many respects the A team. We expect them to rise to the challenge—there are plenty of challenges they face today—and Russ will help make that possible.

I wish to say to Russ Deyo, if he is listening: Thanks for your willingness to hang in there with us until we could get to confirmation.

To the Deyo family: We appreciate very much your willingness to share your spouse and in this case your dad with the people of this Nation. We need him. We will put him to good work, and after a while we will send him back to you safe and sound.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF RUSSELL C. DEYO TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

NOMINATION OF JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security; and Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years.

VOTE ON DEYO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Russell C. Deyo, of New Jersey, to be Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security?

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Deyo nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Ayotte	Franken	Nelson
Baldwin	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Reid
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Manchin	Tester
Cornyn	Markey	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Udall
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Lee Vitter

NOT VOTING—3

Boxer Cruz Rubio

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON CHAUDHURI NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, of Arizona, to be Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission for the term of three years?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. SCHATZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING ACT OF 2015—Continued

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I am going to have, later on—I was hoping

we would be able to do this today—a couple of amendments that I can't imagine will be any problem on the floor. But it has been a problem that has been with us for a long period of time, and we are in a position to do something about it.

Due to a couple of Supreme Court cases, ICE cannot detain convicted criminal aliens awaiting deportation beyond 6 months. So what they have to do is—they have no choice—they have to put them back into the community, and they are back where they can continue to commit the same crimes that they committed before.

In 2013, over 36,000 criminal immigrants with over 88,000 convictions were released back into our communities, including convictions of over 100 commercialized sexual offences, over 700 sexual offences, and many others. But that is 36,000, all in 1 year. Now, since that time, 176,000 of nondetained convicted criminals have gone back into our society. This is something I can't imagine anyone would want to continue.

My amendment would allow for the government to renew detention of these criminal aliens every 6 months to determine, should they be returned to society, what the risk is. Then we can let justice take place. But it does away with that prohibition of anything over 6 months. So we have people out there right now—167,000 alien criminals—who very likely could repeat their crimes. That is my amendment No. 275.

Amendment No. 276. Last summer, we saw tens of thousands of kids come across our southern border. Some were housed in my State of Oklahoma at Fort Sill. This summer, experts are predicting another wave of children from Central America. This is the problem. If these were kids who came over from either Canada or Mexico, we could do something about it. We could actually send them back and have some authority.

But as it is right now, if one of them comes from Central America, even though they come through Mexico, they are citizens of a Central American country, and so we cannot do that.

I have an amendment that would—well, in fact, our situation in Oklahoma is that we had several hundred who were just put there, and what do you do with a bunch of kids? So they put them in Fort Sill, and they had a place where they could temporarily put them down. Then they kind of disappeared.

I had occasion to go into Los Fresnos in southern Texas. That is one of the largest centers where they will put these kids.

I went in there. They didn't really want me to go in there, take pictures, and see what was going on. But in that particular center—I am going from memory now. I think they had a total of 80 beds—only 80 kids at the time.

I asked the question: How many kids have come through here in the last 6 months?

And they said: Over thousands and thousands.

I said: Wait a minute. If you had thousands, where are they now?

They couldn't answer that.

So what happens is the kids come in, they temporarily identify them, and then they disappear into society.

Now, with this change, all we are doing is treating these kids who would be coming into this country by giving our enforcement officers the latitude and the opportunity to send them back or to let them go back voluntarily. Right now, they can't even go back voluntarily once they cross the line coming into this country.

That is amendment No. 276. It is one that we will be considering and hopefully getting a vote on when we return early next week.

I yield the floor.

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. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. FRANKEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 993 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FRANKEN. 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. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMMEMORATING VIRGINIA TECH SHOOTING

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate a horrible tragedy, to honor a community, and to challenge this Congress. Eight years ago today I was the Governor of Virginia. I had just landed in Japan to begin a 2-week trade mission in Japan and India, and there was a knock on my hotel room door. State Police informed me there had been a horrible shooting on the campus of one of my State universities, Virginia Tech. We turned on CNN—that far away around the world—and saw the news unfold, the horrific events of that day. We went back to the airport, and we flew back home and spent weeks, months, and then years dealing with the aftermath of this horrible tragedy.

Thirty-two wonderful Americans, Virginians, and folks from around the world—students, professors, and graduate students of Virginia Tech—lost

their lives that day. If you will allow me, I want to read their names into the RECORD:

Ross Alameddine, Jamie Bishop, Brian Bluhm, Ryan Clark, Austin Michelle Cloyd, Jocelyne Couture-Nowak, Daniel Alejandro Perez Cueva, Kevin Granata, Matthew Gwaltney, Caitlin Hammaren, Jeremy Herbstritt, Rachael Elizabeth Hill, Emily Hilscher, Jarrett Lane, Matthew La Porte, Henry Lee, Liviu Librescu, G.V. Loganathan, Partahi Mamora Halomoan Lumbantoruan, Lauren McCain, Daniel O'Neil, Juan Ramon Ortiz, Minal Panchal, Erin Peterson, Michael Pohle, Julia Pryde, Mary Karen Read, Reema Samaha, Waleed Mohammed Shaalan, Leslie Sherman, Maxine Turner, and Nicole White.

Thirty-two precious, precious people of amazing accomplishment and even more amazing promise. Seventeen others were shot that day and wounded. Six others were not shot but were injured leaping from windows in a classroom building to escape the carnage. And so many others were affected: first responders, pastors, counselors, and the entire Hokie Nation. That is what we call the Virginia Tech community.

I know there has been a presentation on the floor about mental health issues and first responders. Some of the most painful discussions I had were in the aftermath of the shooting. I had many with family members and students who were injured, but some of the most painful were from the first responders. The EMTs on the scene included students who were volunteering at the campus EMT operation. Their description of this carnage they walked into, as horrible as the carnage was—the physical carnage—the thing that many of them told me was the most difficult for them to get over was walking into classrooms where there were dead bodies and hearing in pockets and backpacks next to these prone forms the vibrating and ringing of cell phones from parents and friends who had seen the news on TV and were reaching out to try to find out whether their friend or their child was safe. Those unanswered phones were deeply, deeply difficult to those who were the responders.

I have friends who were pastors and counselors in the Blacksburg community. And their own experiences years later have profoundly transformed their lives. Even in tragedy, though, you can see examples of resilience and remarkable spirit. The Virginia Tech community, the Hokie Nation, on that day demonstrated resilience and in the years since. I do stand to honor that spirit and resilience of the entire community, even as we acknowledge the horrible tragedy.

Two years ago on this day we were in the midst of a grim debate on this floor inspired by another horrific shooting—the murder of schoolchildren in Newtown, CT. I stood on the floor and talked about the shooting at Virginia Tech and the lessons we had learned. I

told the story of just one of the victims. It is sort of unfair to single out a person because all were so special, but one of the victims who was killed that day was a professor of engineering, Liviu Librescu, Romanian-born, who survived the Holocaust and who survived the Soviet takeover of his native country, only to be killed by gun violence in America as he barred the door to his classroom to stop the shooter from entering so that his students could safely escape. He survived the Holocaust, survived the deprecation imposed on his country by Soviet communism and was killed by gun violence at Virginia Tech University in Virginia in this country.

I want to tell you today about two students who were shot that day but survived. They offer a powerful lesson about the resilient human spirit and also offer a challenge to this body.

Colin Goddard was a senior just weeks away from graduation. He was badly wounded. He was shot four times that day. My wife Anne and I visited him in the hospital 2 days after the shooting. We see him and his parents often. They live in Richmond, where we live.

In the years since his graduation, Colin has become a passionate advocate for gun safety, especially focusing on the need for a national system of background record checks. He helped produce and was part of an award-winning documentary about his friends. The documentary is called "Living for 32," and it is very powerful.

Elilta "Lily" Habtu was also a senior, and she was majoring in psychology. She was shot and badly injured that day. She is with us today in the Senate Gallery. Lily was already focused on helping people, but the shooting put her on a new path. Along with other survivors, she founded Students for Gun Free Schools, a grassroots movement to keep campuses safe. She received a master's degree in conflict analysis and resolution from George Mason University, and she has used that training to work on a number of gun safety issues. She also served as an intern at the White House.

I could tell wonderful stories about many of the others who were killed or injured, and all of them are precious. I hope to do that in the years to come because I have a feeling I will stand on this floor often on April 16. I focused on Colin and Lily today because of their passionate work for gun safety.

In the aftermath of the shooting at Virginia Tech, I commissioned a panel to review what went wrong that day. Lawyers said: Don't do that. People could use it to bring lawsuits against the State.

I said: No. We have to know what went wrong. We have to know what we can do to reduce the chance this will ever happen again. We will not be able to eliminate violence. We will not be able to eliminate shootings. But at least we can reduce the chance if we learn what went wrong.

My panel dug into it and made recommendations about mental health, campus safety protocol, first responders, the training of campus personnel, and about gun safety. These detailed recommendations led to numerous changes in State and Federal best practices and laws, and I saw legislators from both parties work together, with strong public support, to make changes so our campuses would be safer.

Mr. President, I would not be honest if I didn't say there was one recommendation by my panel that was opposed both at the State and Federal levels—the institution of a comprehensive background record check system to keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous individuals. I wish to talk today about that continuing failure.

The Virginia Tech student who killed and wounded so many, Seung-Hui Cho, should never have been able to purchase weapons at all. He had been adjudicated in a court in the Commonwealth of Virginia as mentally ill and dangerous and was thus barred by Federal law from purchasing or owning weapons. That is a longstanding Federal law, but the Federal law is only as good as the background record check system that is able to determine when someone purchases a weapon if they have, in fact, been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous. Because the record of his adjudication had not been entered into the national NICS database, he slipped through the cracks, and this troubled individual illegally bought the weapons that destroyed so many lives and removed so much promise from this Earth.

We fixed the narrow issue that led to Seung-Hui Cho's adjudication being left out of the database. I did it by executive order. My legislature confirmed it at the Federal level. Laws were passed and signed into law by President Bush to encourage States to enter mental health adjudications into the Federal database—a database that in the last 20 years has succeeded at stopping more than 2 million people from making illegal gun purchases.

But just months later, as Governor, when I tried to make sure we performed background record checks on everybody, especially those who purchased guns at gun shows, which account for a huge portion of the gun purchases in the United States—there is no law requiring background record checks at gun shows. When I made that effort, my general assembly basically caved in to pressure from a Virginia organization—the National Rifle Association—and other groups, and they voted against background record checks.

Two years ago, as a Senator, during the very week we were commemorating the anniversary of the most horrific shooting to ever happen on a college campus in the history of the United States and in the shadow of the horrific shootings in Newtown, CT, we tried to create a uniform background record check system at the Federal level, but the same groups that fought

against us in Virginia fought against background checks here.

Even in the shadow of the horrific shootings of the little kids in Newtown—and since the Newtown shootings, more than 70,000 Americans have been killed by gun violence in this country—we still lack a comprehensive background record check system. It is estimated that 40 percent of all of the guns that are sold in the United States occur with no background record check.

The Presiding Officer knows the law. Convicted felons are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. People who have been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do. Domestic violence perpetrators who have been placed under protective orders are not lawfully allowed to purchase their own weapons, but without a comprehensive background record check system, they can and they do.

So why not fix our laws to create a record check system so we can keep weapons out of the hands of those who are not legally allowed to have them? Why are groups such as the NRA so passionately opposed to keeping guns out of the hands of dangerous people?

I am particularly interested in the NRA's position on this issue because I know the organization very well. The NRA is headquartered in Virginia. I know many NRA members. When I was the mayor of Richmond and I helped implement an antigun program—Project Exile—that would send gun criminals to Federal prison, the NRA supported our effort. So why is the NRA opposed to background record checks?

The NRA opposes background record checks even though American gun owners and even NRA members have frequently indicated strong support for background record checks in polling.

The NRA opposes background record checks even though their avowed principles would suggest that they would support such laws. For example, the NRA has been fond of saying: We don't need new gun laws; we just need to enforce existing gun laws. That is exactly what a background record check does. It makes no change in the law as to who can and cannot have a weapon; it just enables us to enforce existing laws to stop dangerous people, such as Seung-Hui Cho, from purchasing weapons.

The NRA has also famously said that we should not take guns out of the hands of law-abiding citizens; we should instead focus on getting guns away from criminals. Again, that is exactly what a background record check system does. It only stops people from purchasing weapons if they are legally prohibited from purchasing weapons.

If gun owners and NRA members support background checks in polls, and if

the NRA's own principles suggest that background checks are in tune with their philosophy, why have they fought so hard and so long to keep our Nation from having a comprehensive background check system? I have pondered that question since 2007 because that day was one of the worst days of my life. I spent a lot of time thinking about it and thinking about what I ought to do as a citizen and elected official to reduce the chance that anybody will ever have to go through that experience again.

After pondering the question of why any legitimate organization would fight against background record checks, the only purpose of which is to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people who are not legally allowed to have them, I have come to the conclusion that there is only one answer, and the answer is this: The NRA does not really speak for or represent American gun owners. Instead, they speak for and represent and, most importantly, receive funding from gun manufacturers. If you make guns, it is in your financial interest to sell as many guns as you can to whomever you can, whenever you can, and wherever you can. And I believe that is the reason so many States and even Congress are not able to pass background record check laws to keep us safer.

Mr. President, let me be self-critical. I would not call out the NRA if I were not about to do what I am about to do. I will bring it home and talk about Congress. If the NRA is now beholden to gun manufacturers, I have to be honest enough to admit that Congress can hardly be self-righteous about this. I would argue that Congress is equally beholden to gun manufacturers as well.

As the Presiding Officer knows, Congress generally leaves the question of tort law as a matter for States to resolve. We generally don't have big tort reform at the Federal level. Republicans often advance notions of States' rights and oppose Federal laws that trump State laws. Democrats are generally against efforts that block plaintiffs' access to State courts to seek redress for injuries. So, in some ways, both Republican and Democratic principles have tended to be opposed to tort reform at the national level.

But here is an unusual example. In 2005, 10 years ago, both Democrats and Republicans joined together to support a major Federal tort reform act, the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and that act restricts the ability of people to bring lawsuits against firearm manufacturers in State or Federal court for negligent use of firearms. This 2005 act, which was a bipartisan one in this body—13 Democrats joined with Republicans to pass it—is highly unusual because if you look through the entire United States Code, you are not going to find many national, Federal-level tort laws that shield entire industries from State court claims based on negligence. There may be another one, but I don't

know what it is. This is a highly unusual shielding of an entire industry—the gun manufacturing industry—from State and Federal claims based on negligence. This industry uniquely receives this very special protection from the Congress of the United States.

When the law was passed in this body and signed into law by President Bush, plaintiffs in State courts whose cases were being tried had to immediately close down their cases. Plaintiffs who had won cases and had cases on appeal immediately had their cases dismissed. This does not happen often, but for gun manufacturers, in this Congress, it has happened.

I will conclude by saying this: We have to make a decision about what is important. We have to make decisions every day about what is important. Should we keep weapons out of the hands of dangerous people, people who are prohibited by law from having them—if you think the answer is yes, then you should support background check laws—or should we embrace a policy that is based on the notion that we should sell as many guns as we can to whomever we can, whenever we can, and wherever we can? Because that is the current state of the law with an inadequate background check system. It serves no one's interest other than gun manufacturers', but the human cost is incalculably high.

As we commemorate the shooting at Virginia Tech, honoring those we lost and those brave survivors, such as Colin and Lily, who are using their painful experience to help others, and honoring the resilience of the entire Hokie Nation, it is my hope that my colleagues will get serious about gun safety.

I am a gun owner and a proud supporter of the Second Amendment, but the time is long overdue for a comprehensive background check system that keeps weapons out of the hands of dangerous people like Seung-Hui Cho. I look forward to the day when we will accomplish this and have a safer nation as a result.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise again to speak about and honor our Nation's and North Dakota's Vietnam veterans, and, through my continuing series of floor speeches, specifically those brave servicemembers who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

As you know, we are in the midst of a commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war. This special

period of honoring our Vietnam veterans runs through 2025. I have partnered with students from Bismarck High School in researching these soldiers, and once again I thank their instructors Laura Forde, Sara Rinas, and Allison Wendel for coordinating this project and sharing their students' research with my office.

Last month, I visited these students and was so impressed with their commitment to this project. I want to say thank you again to the Bismarck High 11th graders and their teachers for helping us gather important information about the lives of these servicemembers.

This week, I am especially happy to be able to include information they helped to find about the lives of Tom Alderson and John Tingley. I am also grateful to my friend Jim Nelson, a Vietnam veteran, who is dedicated to making sure each of these soldiers' immediate relatives receives a Gold Star Family member pin and certificate.

I was happy to be part of Jim's ceremony in Bismarck last year in honoring these soldiers and their families. Through this effort, I hope to make sure our Nation never forgets the needs of our Vietnam veterans and the sacrifices of those who fell in service to our country.

There were 198 sons of North Dakota who did not make it home from the Vietnam War. One hundred ninety-eight sons of North Dakota gave their lives for their country and their State. Today, I am honored to tell you about a few of them.

CLIFTON "CLIFF" CUSHMAN

First is Clifton "Cliff" Cushman. Cliff was from Grand Forks and was born on June 2, 1938. He served in the Air Force—the 469th Tactical Fighter Squadron. Cliff was 28 years old when he went missing on September 25, 1966.

Cliff left behind his widow Carolyn and their son Colin, born just days before Cliff learned that he would be deployed to Vietnam. Colin was 9 months old when Cliff left for Vietnam.

Everyone in Grand Forks knows the name of Cushman because Cliff was a standout athlete and a Silver Medalist in the 1960 Olympics in the 400 meter hurdles. Grand Forks named their high school football stadium Cushman Field after Cliff.

Grand Forks kids are still inspired annually by the reading of the 1964 letter Cliff wrote to students about effort, after he fell while attempting to qualify for the 1964 Olympics. This is a quote from Cliff's letter: "I would much rather fail knowing I had put forth an honest effort than never to have tried at all." Later in the same letter, Cliff wrote: "Unless your reach exceeds your grasp, how can you be sure what you can attain?"

THOMAS "TOM" ALDERSON

I want to talk about Thomas Alderson. Tom was from Grand Forks. He was born on September 9, 1941. He served as a captain in the Army's 56th medical company. He died October 3,

1968, at the age of 27. He was survived by his wife, mother, brother, and two sisters.

Tom was an Army dental officer in the Vietnam Dental Corps. His father-in-law was his commanding officer.

In high school, he was an honor student and lettered in basketball, track, and tennis. He attended the University of North Dakota and the University of Minnesota, where he earned his dental degree in 1966.

In Vietnam, Tom was in charge of several dental offices, which required travel throughout the country. Tom's driver in Vietnam wrote the family a letter explaining that even as a dentist, Tom was ducking mortars all day long during his service.

RAYMOND "RAY" KRAMER

Next, Ray Kramer. Ray was from New Salem and he was born December 31, 1946. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division.

Ray died on February 2, 1968. He was 21 years old. Ray was the sixth of nine children. His brother, Cecil, also served in the Army. Ray's nephew, Cody, is very proud of his Uncle Ray's service.

Ray grew up on the farm where his family raised grain and dairy cows. He was an honor student at New Salem High School and later worked as a dedicated carpenter. Ray's sister, Beverly, remembers that Ray's dog loved him so much that he slept under Ray's car while Ray was in Vietnam. After Ray was killed in action, his parents left the farm and moved to town. His sister took Ray's dog to her farm 10 miles away, but the dog ran all the way back home to wait for Ray under his car.

RONALD "CHRISTY" GOODIRON

Ronald Christy Goodiron was from Shields and was born December 23, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' 3rd Battalion, 5th Marines.

Christy was 20 years old when he died on February 28, 1968. His father Paul Goodiron served in World War I and was a code talker. Christy's close cousin, Paul Goodiron, also served in Vietnam. Unfortunately, Paul unexpectedly died last month. Paul's son, CPL Nathan Goodiron, was also killed in action in 2006 serving his country in the U.S. Army National Guard in Afghanistan.

Christy's family remembers him as smiling all the time. Today, they honor him at powwows by raising the American flag they received when he died and singing the Vietnam "Warrior's Song" to honor Christy.

Christy's family appreciates reading what his fellow marines serving with him wrote about their memories of him and the account of what happened the day he died.

RONALD "RON" BOND

Maj. Ronald Bond was from Fargo and was born on July 30, 1930. He served in the Air Force's 604th Air Commando Squadron. He was 37 years old when he went missing May 11, 1968.

Ron was the oldest of six kids and the first in his family to attend col-

lege. Ron's family remembers him as an adventuresome spirit. He loved hunting, fishing, water skiing, and even competitive sailing with his wife.

Ron's military career began as a Naval ROTC Cadet in his first year at North Dakota State University. Ron then served in the Naval Reserve, enlisted in the Navy, and upon discharge immediately enlisted in the Air Force.

Despite an aircraft accident that injured his spine, Ron became a flight instructor and flew in more missions until he was killed in action in Vietnam. His body has never been recovered.

GARY LOKKEN

Gary Lokken was from Bowman and was born on July 2, 1941. He served in the Army Reserve's Engineering CMD. He was 26 years old when he died on April 10, 1968. Gary left behind his widow Paige and infant twins, a boy and a girl. The twins were 10 days old when Gary left for basic training.

Gary was a medical doctor, who studied in North Dakota and Texas. He completed his medical internship in Hawaii and planned to return there with his family to live after his service. Six months after arriving in Vietnam, Gary was killed while transporting patients when his vehicle hit a landmine.

His twins both entered the medical field. His son is a histology technician and his daughter a medical doctor.

WILLIAM "BILL" ECKES

William "Bill" Eckes was from Beach. He was born on September 20, 1940. He served in the Navy as a Petty Officer First Class journalist. Bill died March 10, 1967. He was 26 years old.

Bill was the oldest of seven children. His father was an Army sergeant in World War II. Bill was a well-known football player for Beach High School. He was on his second tour of duty in the Navy as a journalist when his aircraft crashed in South Vietnam.

He previously wrote for Stars and Stripes while he was stationed in Sicily and Iceland. Margot, Bill's sister closest in age, remembers him as an intelligent, determined person whose plan was to come home after attending the University of North Dakota and have a career in the Foreign Service.

JEROME ELLENSON

Jerome Ellenson was from Walcott and was born on April 3, 1946. He served in the Army's 196th Infantry Brigade. Jerome died on January 10, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Jerome was the fifth of seven children. Jerome's oldest sister, Margie, remembers him as having a unique love of life, being a great storyteller, and everyone's friend.

Margie tells about how Jerome would often give his family side aches because he had made them laugh so much on long car trips. Jerome didn't say goodbye to anyone when he left for Vietnam.

His family was told he was the last survivor of his unit; that he manned the radio until his death.

CHESTER "SKIP" COONS

Chester "Skip" Coons was from Bismark. He was born March 29, 1936. He served in the Navy's Observation Squadron 67. He was 31 years old on February 17, 1968, when he went missing.

Skip and his two brothers, Larry and Ronald, all served in the Navy. Their mother Elsie still lives in Bismark and is 95 years old. Skip left behind two young daughters who were thankful to meet fellow sky sailors of their dad's old unit.

Skip had planned to make a career out of the military. In high school, he joined the North Dakota National Guard, then he joined the Air Force for 3 years, and later joined the Navy as a pilot. He was on his third tour of duty in Vietnam when his plane was shot down on a reconnaissance mission over Laos. In 1993, his remains were finally recovered.

RICHARD BURINGRUD

Richard Buringrud was from Argusville and was born on November 24, 1946. He served in the Army 12th Infantry Regiment. Richard died on June 9, 1969. He was 22 years old.

Richard loved softball and playing basketball in high school. Richard's father still lives in Fargo and his family remembers the letters he sent home describing having been in a swamp, which was the first kind of bath he had in a week.

Richard was an expert rifleman and was killed when he went ahead of his armored unit to help clear the way.

BRENT SVEEN

Brent Sveen was from Harwood and went to high school in West Fargo. He was born October 25, 1951. He was 18 years old when he died on September 7, 1970.

Brent's father also served in the Army in World War II. Brent's older brother Bruce, a marine, served two tours of duty in Vietnam.

Brent's sisters, Jean and Ava, remember Brent as befriending everyone, being the life of the party, and having a great sense of humor and wit.

Brent's sisters cherish one family picture in particular. Their older brother Bruce was wearing his marine uniform. Before taking the picture, Brent disappeared. He returned wearing his dad's old World War II Army uniform and the family took the picture with both boys in uniform.

Having an older brother serve in Vietnam, Brent could have waived out of his own service, but he was eager to serve his country and enlisted while in high school. Shortly before he died, Brent wrote this poem he mailed to his parents.

I think of my buddy I was talking to yesterday;

Now he's lying on the ground not far away;
They say he's dead, but I hope it's not true;
And if it is, to ease my tears I'll think of you.

I looked down at his body and began to cry;
I turned to the clouds and asked, God, why?
I waited awhile, but no answer came;

Only the unceasing falling rain.

I want to thank Brent's sister Jean Kraft for participating in this project. Jean joined me recently in a visit to the Bismarck High School sharing her own family's stories and encouraging these students to reach out to families and to learn about the lives of these young men whom we lost in Vietnam. She is among my very favorite people and a hero herself.

PETER BINSTOCK, JR.

Peter Binstock, Jr., was from New England. He was born May 5, 1947. He served in the Army as an Armor Recon Specialist. He died on January 3, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Peter was the oldest of 11 children. His family had eight girls and three boys. Peter planned on taking over the family farm when he returned from Vietnam. His sister Rose remembers Peter as always being in good spirits. While he was in Vietnam, he was fondly called "Big Pete" because he was 6 feet 3 inches and very strong. He was promoted to corporal after his death.

RONALD KENT

Ronald Kent. Ronald was from Page and was born April 21, 1943. He served in the Army 25th Infantry Division. He was 23 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Ronald was one of eight children. His family remembers him as a fearless man. He was small in stature but big in spirit. His sister Candice remembers that Ronald loved the outdoors, and he had the ability to talk his nieces and nephews into anything, including cleaning his car.

A few years ago, Ronald's brother Steven spoke to the young men who carried Ronald's body back to the base after he was killed. After hearing the description of that day, Steven knows that in those final moments, all that Ronald was thinking about was saving his brothers-in-arms.

WARD EVANS

Ward Evans. Ward was from Harwood, and he was born February 22, 1940. He served in the Army 5th Infantry Division. He died on February 8, 1969. He was 28 years old. Ward was the youngest of five children. His family remembers him as someone who was always ready to help others. His sister Maryann remembers that when he came home from Vietnam on a break, he seemed sad and that the war had gotten to him, but he went back to complete his duty.

On February 8, 1969, almost all the men near Ward were killed. When the chopper came back to pick up the survivors, Ward demanded to stay behind in order to rescue three men who were still alive but also wounded. While tending to the injured soldiers, Ward stepped on a land mine.

Ward's nephew Mark is so proud of him and will always remember Ward as a man who did what was right no matter what the personal cost.

JOHN TINGLEY

John Tingley was from Kathryn. He was born on August 19, 1946. He served

in the Army 128th Aviation Company. He was 21 years old at the time of his death, January 10, 1968.

John was one of six children born in 8 years. John's sister Mary remembers John as someone who did it all. He played the trombone in band, sang in the choir, was a member of the 4H Club, and played sports. He had a photographic memory and his sister knew he would have had an enormously bright future.

In Vietnam, John was a helicopter gunner crew chief. The day he was killed, John's helicopter was responding to a helicopter that had just gone down. While they were going to assist soldiers involved in the crash, he was shot and killed.

All of these young men serving their country and serving each other remind us of the sacrifices we have experienced in war. They remind us that there are so many among us who will run to the sound of the guns and protect our freedom. We cannot let their sacrifice ever be forgotten.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

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. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are continuing to make progress on the bipartisan antitrafficking bill. Senator CORNYN is working with Chairman GRASSLEY and Senators on both sides of the aisle to resolve the remaining issues.

It is my hope we will be able to go through an orderly amendment process and pass the trafficking bill early next week. The Senate will then consider the Lynch nomination through the regular order, as I have already committed to doing, followed by consideration of the Iran bill as reported unanimously by the Foreign Relations Committee earlier this week.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1191

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, with the concurrence of the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 30, H.R. 1191, and that if the motion to proceed is agreed to, Senator CORKER or his designee be recognized to offer a substitute amendment, which is the text of S. 615 as reported by the Foreign Relations Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I reserve my right to object, and would say that with the work done by Senators MURRAY and all the Judiciary Committee, led by Senator LEAHY and, of course, Senator KLOBUCHAR, working with Senator CORNYN, significant progress has

been made. There is no question in that regard. But we are not there yet. Remember, we had a problem with this initially because of the language in the bill. So every word is going to have to be read with this new language that is drawn up, and then we will see if we can make it to the finish line. I think we can, but we are certainly not there yet. But progress has been made.

Mr. President, in my reservation to object I would say that I note that the request the majority leader propounded is seeking to move to a House revenue bill, which of course would provide a vehicle for the Foreign Relations Committee-reported Iran legislation. I support the Committee-reported Iran legislation. I commend Senators CARDIN and CORKER for their historic work on this package. I do hope the Senate can pass it with no changes.

But I note that the majority leader is once again choosing not to move to the nomination of Loretta Lynch as Attorney General. It has been more than 5 months—it will be 6 months in a week or 10 days—since President Obama nominated her. Her nomination has been on the Senate calendar for 49 days, longer than the last 7 Attorney General nominations combined.

So I ask whether the majority leader would modify his consent request to add this: That there be 2 hours for debate, divided in the usual form, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote on the nomination; further, that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Part of the consent request is that on Monday, April 20, at 3:30 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the majority leader so modify his request?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I have indicated, gosh, at least for 6 weeks now, we are going to deal with the Lynch nomination right after we finish trafficking.

I am optimistic that we will be able to do trafficking in 1 day. There is not a huge demand for amendments. As I have assured my friend the Democratic leader and our colleagues, then we will move forward on the nominee for Attorney General.

Therefore, I object to the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection to the modification is heard.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, continuing my reservation, as the majority leader is well aware, procedurally, the Senate provides many opportunities for delay. We are not going to treat the current majority the way the Republican minority treated us when we were in the majority. I am not going to object to the majority leader's consent today. However, I want everyone to know—I

am going to serve notice right now—that Ms. Lynch's nomination will not remain in purgatory forever.

So I withdraw my objection.

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

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.

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of my remarks to the American Council on Education.

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

HIGHER EDUCATION REAUTHORIZATION

I am here today to read you a letter and ask for your help. I'm going to be very specific. First, I want to thank Chancellors Kirwan and Zeppos for the work they've done with others at the request of four United States senators: two Democrats and two Republicans, Senator Mikulski and Senator Bennett on the Democratic side and Senator Burr and myself on the Republican side.

We asked them to not give us a sermon but to give us specific recommendations for exactly what to do about the problem of over-regulation of higher education, and they've done that. The English professors on our campuses would be very pleased with it because it's actually recommended in plain English with mostly declarative sentences. It's an unusual report. It's very well done. And the way things work in Washington, it reminds me a lot of the report called "Rise Above Gathering Storm" that the National Academy of Sciences sponsored about ten years ago, and Norm Augustine headed it. We basically said, "Just give us ten specific things to do, and if you do, we'll probably do most of them." They gave us 20 recommendations, and we've done most of them.

So this is really a blueprint or an agenda for the United States Congress and the United States Secretary of Education to act on the problem. I want to thank Molly Broad for her work at ACE on this and for organizing it and Terry Hartle and Anne Hickey, who are staff members there. There's Christina West at Vanderbilt University, who worked hard on the report. At the University System of Maryland, there's PJ Hogan, and Andrew LaCasse on our staff in the Senate. They did a terrific job.

Now, what I'm supposed to do here is take 10 or 12 minutes and then sit down and see what questions or suggestions you have with the chancellors. So, I thought the best way to do that was to read you a letter and come close to telling you a story. One of my friends was the late Alex Haley, the author of *Roots*. After I made a speech one time, he came up after and said, "May I make a suggestion?" I said, "Well of course." He said, "If before you make a speech, you say, 'Instead of making a speech let me tell you story,' people may actually listen to what you have to say." So, let me begin with a short story.

I got this over the weekend from someone I don't know. It's from a president from a University in Missouri, handwritten, and says, among other things, "I've been in higher education administration for over 40 years, the last 20 as a university president, and I've never experienced the amount of regulatory pressure that our institution currently faces."

I hear that in lots of different ways, and this report is an expression of what to do about that. For example, this isn't just a sermon, as I mentioned. There are 59 specific suggestions about what to do. In testimony before our committee, almost everyone who testified said that requiring students to fill out the FAFSA form in their senior year and providing tax information before they file their taxes makes no sense. It would make a lot more sense to do it the year before. Almost everybody said that we should do that.

So, in this report are 59 recommendations, and what I want to ask you to do is organize yourselves in your own state and make an appointment with your member of the United States Congress. And get six or seven members of the university and sit down and talk about this report, and say, "Now we worked two years on this. This is serious business. It costs a lot of money. It discourages a lot of students from coming to our colleges, and we'd like for you to support the legislation Senator Alexander and Senator Mikulski and Senator Burr and Senator Bennett are introducing in order to implement the report." You might add Senator Murray of Washington who is the ranking Democrat on the committee as she will be deeply involved in this as well.

Sometimes university presidents come to Washington to meet with members of Congress. That's the biggest waste of time I can think of. We're all running around here with 15-minute schedules trying to keep up with things and have many more requests for appointments than we have time to see or pay attention to. But almost every single senator who is on the committee that is going to deal with this is home every weekend, and the senator from Tennessee, with all due respect, doesn't really want to see the president of the University of Maryland. He would like to see the president of the University of Tennessee or of Vanderbilt or of Milligan College or Maryville College or Rhodes College. If five or six or eight of those presidents say, "Senator Alexander, may we have a 30-minute appointment with you while you're home next month?", I'll do it in a minute. So will every other senator. And you have the credibility to go to that member of Congress and say, "Will you please vote for this? Will you cosponsor the legislation? Will you support it? Will you encourage the president to sign it?" Odds are, if you do that they will. It's about that simple.

There are a lot of things we work on up here about which we have big partisan differences. There is no reason to have any big partisan differences over this. There are a few things in it that get haggles on the left and the right, but most things aren't like that at all. There is just the accumulation of eight reauthorizations of the Higher Education Act beginning in 1965, and you know exactly what happens. A well-meaning group of senators, congressmen, education secretaries, regulators come up with an idea and said, "Let's do this, or here's a good idea let's make everybody do that." And they just keep doing that until pretty soon you get a stack of regulations that's twice as tall as I am. You're looking at the Higher Education Act, and that's how tall it actually is. Nobody's weeded the garden. Well, this is an effort to weed the garden. So, I read a letter. I've asked for your help, and your help is very specific.

Will you please make an appointment in your home state, starting with the 22 members of the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee and say to us, "We hope you'll vote for and support that."

Now, you'll all recognize this. This is what 20 million parents fill out every single year. And lots of colleges have said, "Well we like this information." You have to think about how much you like it. Does it really work? Asking 20 million families to fill out 108 questions like this every year just to get a grant or loan to go to college? A testimony before our committee said we could get it down to two questions: what's your family income, and what's the size of your family? Maybe it's two, maybe it's four, maybe it's 10, maybe it's 12. President Obama in his budget advocated for removing about thirty of those questions, so that takes it down from 108 to about 78.

What's the importance of that? The importance of it is pretty obvious. The importance of it is that it saves money, it saves time, and the president of the community college in Memphis, Southwest Tennessee Community College, told me he thinks he loses 1,500 students every semester because of the complexity of the form that impair students that would like to go to college.

The second story you'd like to know is Chancellor Zeppos's story about how much it costs at Vanderbilt every year to comply with federal regulations on higher education: \$150 million for one institution, \$11,000 or \$12,000 for everyone to add onto their tuition. That's just ridiculous. That's absolutely absurd.

Now, another fact is that the National Academy of Sciences says, and they've done two reports to verify this, that investigators of federally-sponsored research at colleges and universities spend 42 percent of their time on administrative matters. Now we spend \$30 billion, we taxpayers at colleges and universities on research. How much of that money is spent on administrative? Well, Chancellor Zeppos said that at Vanderbilt—and I think I've got my figures right—that about \$136 million of the \$146 was allocated for research. So, the way I figured it, about 25 percent of all the research money he gets at Vanderbilt, which is probably \$500 million, goes to administrative tasks. Forty-two percent of the time we're researching. If we can move from 42 to 35 to 33 to 30, we could save \$1 billion or \$2 billion and take the dollars to fund hundreds, maybe thousands, of multi-year research grants, which we hear so much about declining.

And then the fact that we've been trying to reduce these for a long time. One of my first acts as a senator was to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Department of Education to make a calendar of all of the things that you are supposed to comply with if you are in one of the 6000-plus colleges and universities in America. They have had seven years, and they haven't been able to do it. Well, if they can't do that, how can a small Catholic college in Wisconsin hire somebody to figure it out? And according to this report, there is a new guidance or regulation coming out on average every workday in the U.S. Department of Education. So, you just have that combination of 108-question FAFSA; \$150 million at one university to comply; the National Academy saying 42 percent of time is spent by investigators is spent on administration; and the department itself unable to make a list of all of the rules that it expects you to comply with—that's a pretty good case to make for the people you talk to.

And then I would suggest that a delegation—and again I have discussed this with the chancellors—go see Arne Duncan at the U.S. Department of Education. I meant this isn't all his fault; it's all of our faults among

all of us who have been Secretary of Education, all of us who have been in the Congress since 1965. We haven't done our job, and of the 59 recommendations, probably a dozen are recommendations that the U.S. Secretary of Education could do himself. They could be done by an administrator. So, go to Secretary Duncan and say, "Look, we'd like to make a hero out of you. We're here to say, we've identified the 12 areas that you can change that would make a big difference in increasing innovation and reducing cost of colleges all across America." And I've talked with him about that, and I think he'd be willing to hear about that.

We'll be reauthorizing the Higher Education Act later this year after we get through fixing "No Child Left Behind," which is the first order of business. And the first thing we want to do is make it easier for students to go to college. That's the "FAST Act," aimed at simplifying the student aid form. That includes saying that you can apply your junior year of high school, so you can know what your award will be before you are admitted to college. And, you will know what your tax information is before you have to turn in your form.

We want to simplify the number of grants and loans. We want to make it possible for there to be year-round Pell for your students to be able to follow their own rate and use their Pell grants and student aid progressively at their own rate in college. We'd like to discourage over-borrowing by changing some rules that exist, permit you to do more counseling of students, change the rule that allows a part-time student to borrow a full-time amount of money. We'd like to simplify the repayment plans. Now, all those things don't have much to do with being a Republican or a Democrat. They have a lot to do with an important system.

We'd like to take as many of these fifty-nine recommendations and put them in a bill and pass them as we can. A lot of that will depend upon your business at home to the men and women who run the universities in your state. We want to take a look at the accreditation and make sure it's focused on the right thing. As a former university president, I didn't like a lot about accreditation. The only thing I would like less would be having the U.S. Department of Education take the place of the accreditor. So, let's work together and fix the accreditation system and have focus on academic quality instead of all that random other stuff that accreditors often get themselves involved in.

We want to make it harder to over-borrow. I mentioned a couple of ideas about this. There are a few more in this report. Finally, we want to do our best to make sure that the consumer information that you're asked for really is needed and is presented in a useful way to students. Typically, it's just a big pile of stuff that has the disadvantage of by the time you go all the way through you haven't learned anything. It's like a mortgage application or a car loan. You just sign at the bottom and have no clue about what you just signed. We need simpler, plain English, clear sentences—pieces of information that are valuable to students and that are valuable to parents, and that we can weed our way through the system more confidently.

So, that's what we're trying to do, and we need your help. One thing that I would say to you is that this is a train that is likely to move down track in out of the station by the end of year. Why do I say that? Well, because it has bipartisan support in a town that's not noted for that. This report has been active interest of four senators who will a lot more. The FAST Act, as we call it, which will simplify student aid has the support of six: Senator Booker and Senator King and Senator

Burr and Senator Isakson and me, equally divided by party. Senator Murray and I, she's from Washington state, will work together to reauthorize it. I've talked to the president about it. He did a very good job of working with us on some forms on student loans two years ago. There's no reason he can't work with us in that way and this year finish the job.

So, I hope you'll keep in mind the letter that I read. I suspect that you have made the same feelings, and I am here to thank you for the tremendous work that ACE and the chancellors and their team and staff did on the report. It's been one of the most consequential reports made to the Congress during this year. Will you please make an appointment in the next thirty days in your home state, first with the members of the Senate education committee? Bring along a few colleagues and say, "We spent a lot of time on this. This is wasting a lot of money. This is discouraging a lot of students. This is taking a lot of time. Will you please support this bipartisan effort to bring some common sense to the jungle of red tape that is the current federal regulation of higher education?" Thank you.

NATIONAL HEALTHCARE DECISIONS DAY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to recognize that today, April 16, 2015, is National Healthcare Decisions Day.

National Healthcare Decisions Day exists to inspire, educate and empower the public and providers about the importance of advance care planning. Started by a Richmond attorney as a local, grassroots initiative in Virginia, NHDD became an annual event in 2008 and today is recognized across all 50 States. Faith-based groups, doctors and nurses, hospitals, patients, and caregivers alike are engaged in these efforts.

It is critical that Virginians and all Americans—both patients and providers—engage in advance care planning, and that they have access to clear, consistent, and concise information on how to make these critical health care decisions. Today, on National Healthcare Decisions Day, it is important to discuss preferences and goals with family and friends—and this starts with filling out an advance directive. But advanced care planning is about much more than that, and in the last several years, there has been a growing awareness of the need to transform advanced care, both among providers and families.

First, broader transformations in health care, especially the movement towards paying for quality, not volume, of services offer opportunities to speed the adoption of effective advanced care programs. Our health care system does a great job paying for procedures: surgery, chemotherapy, hip replacements. It does a not so good job paying for health care providers to spend face-to-face time with patients, helping them to choose among many options with uncertain outcomes. Improvements to care planning would give individuals and their families the ability to make smarter decisions. It

would provide additional information and support so they can make informed choices based upon those values and goals.

Meanwhile, across the country, people are innovating and creating new models of care to provide patients with the tools and support to make their own advanced care decisions. For example, in my own State of Virginia, a Richmond Academy of Medicine initiative called Honoring Choices Virginia promises to fill a critical hole. This innovative partnership involves the academy and three independent health care systems working to adopt nationally-recognized best practices, and adapting them to the needs of patients, families, doctors, and hospitals of the local community in Central Virginia. This commitment to patients and families in our region sets an example for the rest of the Commonwealth and the country.

It is similarly essential that we consider how Federal policies impact patients and their families during times of serious illness. For example, the vast majority of these patients receive care funded by Medicaid and Medicare, and many of them are elderly or disabled. Medicare, however, does not adequately reimburse physicians or other important members of the care planning team, such as nurses or social workers, for systems to support patients and their families. Likewise, faced with an uneven patchwork of advance directive laws across States, providers too often base their actions on the technicalities of forms or on fear of being sued. Such hurdles make it difficult for health care providers to focus on what the patient really wants.

In the 111th and 112th Congress, I introduced the Senior Navigation and Planning Act, to help people grapple with the challenges of caring for those with advanced illness. And in the 113th Congress, Senator ISAKSON and I introduced the Care Planning Act. The purpose of the Care Planning Act is to align the care people want with the level of care they get. It does not limit choices—it works to make sure people are made fully aware of the broad range of choices they have. I hope to reintroduce the Care Planning Act in the coming weeks.

I believe this effort is critical, not just from my time serving as a Governor and as a Senator, but also through the eyes of a loved one who struggled with these issues. My mother suffered from Alzheimer's disease for 10 years, and for 9 of those years, she couldn't speak. My father, sister and I found grappling with the challenges of caring for her difficult. The difficulty was greater because, when she was first diagnosed, my family didn't take the opportunity to talk in an honest and fully informed way with her and her health care providers about the full array of health care options available, or about what her priorities would be during the final years of her life.

It is not easy, and this is a subject that most people do their best to avoid.

But it is critical. National Healthcare Decisions Day reminds us of the importance of discussing ways to improve advanced care planning at all levels—Federal, State, local—and above all, amongst Americans and their loved ones.

TRIBUTE TO JIM SCOTT

• Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the retirement of Jim Scott after nearly 50 years as Cincinnati's familiar voice of morning radio.

Jim Scott began his Cincinnati radio career in 1968 as morning show host for the iconic pop radio station 1360 WSAI-AM in Price Hill. He joined 700 WLW in 1984 and for 45 years, Jim has been the familiar voice of morning radio.

During his morning time slot from 5am to 9am, Jim interviewed countless dignitaries and celebrity newsmakers from Presidents and civic leaders to top movie stars and sports figures. He routinely talked with news correspondents from around the globe, including those reporting at the White House and from posts in London to Baghdad.

Jim is a true public servant and an inspiration to us all. He has been a long-time volunteer leader of the Greater Cincinnati United Way and has served on many boards, including the Wellness Community, Cincinnati Playhouse in the Park, the March of Dimes, and Big Brothers and Big Sisters.

A stalwart volunteer, Jim is Cincinnati's voice of volunteerism; whether he's hosting Marty & Joe night at the Great American Ballpark, serving as emcee for your favorite animal shelter or welcoming Presidents and foreign dignitaries to the Queen City.

Jim has been recognized with many awards, including the Silver Medal of the Cincinnati Ad Club, and the Neil H. McElroy Award from the United Way. In 1996 and 2000, the U.S. Olympic Committee named Jim "A Community Hero" and he was thrilled to be a torchbearer in the Olympic Torch Relay.

Jim Scott has dominated morning show ratings in every decade since the 1970s and was the winner of the 2002 Marconi Award for Large Market Radio Personality of the Year. In 2013, the Cincinnati Enquirer named Jim the No. 1 radio personality of the past 40 years.

Jim Scott will remain on air until his "favorite day of the year," Cincinnati Reds Opening Day on April 6, 2015, when he'll walk in the Findlay Market Opening Day Parade to say thank you to his fans who have supported him throughout his career.

Thank you, Jim Scott. Your daily "good morning and thanks for listening" greeting will be missed.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING ORA ESTUARIES

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, due to their unique perspective, American en-

trepreneurs are often at the forefront of innovative solutions to local problems. This is especially true with environmental initiatives, and down in Louisiana where the ecosystems are diverse and delicate, the locals are best equipped to protect them. That is why ORA Estuaries of New Orleans, LA is the Small Business of the Week.

Civil engineer and New Orleans native Tyler Ortego was a student at Louisiana State University when he and a friend discovered a way to fight coastal erosion using oysters. In 2005, Ortego patented the OysterBreak system, which essentially allows oysters to fuse together on a man-made rock-like material in order to create a living coastal reef. Now holding two patents, Ortego and ORA Estuaries are focused on rebuilding and revitalizing coastal regions. ORA Estuaries recently claimed the top prize of the New Orleans Entrepreneurial Week's "Big Idea Pitch," and with the prize money hopes to move into food production and new versions of the OysterBreak system.

Our coast and wetlands provide some of Louisiana's most important resources and beautiful habitats, and because our geography makes us vulnerable to natural disasters, it is absolutely vital that we protect them. Innovative technologies like ORA's OysterBreak system play a significant role in restoring our coasts and wetlands, which protect Louisianians and gulf coast residents from storms and flooding. Currently, ORA's natural reefs systems are deployed in four different areas along the Louisiana coast, including an oyster habitat restoration project run by the Nature Conservatory of Louisiana. ORA is looking toward expanding to all five of the Gulf States, as well as the Chesapeake Bay area and even North Carolina. Not only is ORA's breakthrough system protecting vulnerable shorelines, but the growth and retention of oyster colonies that naturally process and filter water interests scientists and environmentalists, as well.

Congratulations to ORA Estuaries for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your commitment to restoring and protecting our precious ecosystems and coastlines in Louisiana and the Gulf Coast.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 2. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare sustainable growth rate and strengthen Medicare access by improving physician payments and making other improvements, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 12:39 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. 709. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes.

H.R. 1026. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations.

H.R. 1058. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights.

H.R. 1104. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations.

H.R. 1152. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under 501(c)(4) of such Code.

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organization.

H.R. 1562. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 529. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 709. An act to provide for the termination of employment of employees of the Internal Revenue Service who take certain official actions for political purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1026. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the release of information regarding the status of certain investigations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1058. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that a duty of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue is to ensure that Internal Revenue Service employees are familiar with and act in accord with certain taxpayer rights; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1104. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1152. An act to prohibit officers and employees of the Internal Revenue Service from using personal email accounts to conduct official business; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 1562. An act to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in

writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 636. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

H.R. 644. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

H.R. 1314. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

S. 984. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-8. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan memorializing the United States Congress to reinstate funding for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 21

Whereas, Over the past four decades, nuclear power has been a significant source for the nation's electricity production. There are 104 operating nuclear power reactors in the United States, providing about one-fifth of the nation's electricity generation. According to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, Michigan's three nuclear power plants provided 28 percent of the electricity generated in Michigan in 2013; and

Whereas, Nuclear power can provide large amounts of reliable, emission-free electricity at stable prices. Many electricity markets across the nation are, or will soon be, in need of new baseload generating capacity. However, the construction of new nuclear power plants is being hampered by the unresolved issue of spent nuclear fuel; and

Whereas, Since the earliest days of nuclear power, the great dilemma is how to deal with used nuclear fuel. Currently, more than 70,000 metric tons of spent nuclear fuel are stored in pools or casks at temporary, and potentially vulnerable, sites around the country, including in Michigan. More nuclear waste is generated every day. This high-level radioactive waste demands exceptional care in all facets of its storage and disposal, including transportation; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 requires the federal government, through the Department of Energy (DOE), to build a repository for the permanent storage of high-level radioactive waste from nuclear power plants. This act includes a specific timetable to identify a suitable location and to establish the waste repository; and

Whereas, The establishment of a federal nuclear waste repository is more than fifteen years overdue. Under the Act, the DOE was supposed to begin accepting and storing the nation's nuclear waste by January 31, 1998. In 2002, Congress and President Bush approved Yucca Mountain in Nevada as the site of the repository, and in 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) accepted an application by the DOE to construct and operate the repository. However, in 2010, at the urging of President Obama, the DOE chose to unilaterally and irrevocably terminate the Yucca Mountain repository process; and

Whereas, The NRC released a report in October 2014 that found Yucca Mountain would be a safe and acceptable repository for the permanent storage of used nuclear fuel. The repository would meet all NRC standards for protecting people and the environment from radioactivity. Clearly, it is time to re-open the Yucca Mountain process, as it will provide the best long-term solution to our nation's used nuclear fuel problem; and

Whereas, The Yucca Mountain process cannot move forward without the U.S. Congress appropriating additional funds. Electric ratepayers in Michigan and across the country have paid billions into the federal Nuclear Waste Fund specifically to support development of a long-term repository. Since 1983, in accordance with the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, customers of Michigan electric utilities have paid \$812 million into the federal fund. While fee collection has been suspended as of May 16, 2014, the fund still contains a total balance of over \$31 billion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That we memorialize the Congress of the United States to reinstate funding for the Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-9. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine memorializing the President of the United States and Congress of the United States to support the reform of the Social Security offsets of the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE PAPER 382

Whereas, under current federal law, individuals who receive a Social Security benefit and a public retirement benefit derived from employment not covered under Social Security are subject to a reduction in the Social Security benefits; and

Whereas, these laws, contained in the federal Social Security Act, 42 United States Code, Chapter 7, Subchapter II, Federal Old-Age, Survivors, and Disability Insurance Benefits, and known as the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision, greatly affect public employees, particularly women; and

Whereas, the Windfall Elimination Provision reduces by a formula the Social Security benefit of a person who is also receiving a pension from a public employer that does not participate in Social Security; and

Whereas, the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision are particularly burdensome on the finances of low-income and moderate-income public service workers, such as school teachers, clerical workers and school cafeteria employees, whose wages are low to start; and

Whereas, the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision both

unfairly reduce benefits for those public employees and their spouses whose careers cross the line between the private and public sectors; and

Whereas, since many lower-paying public service jobs are held by women, both the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision have a disproportionately adverse effect on women; and

Whereas, in some cases, additional support in the form of income, housing, heating and prescription drug and other safety net assistance from state and local governments is needed to make up for the reductions imposed at the federal level; and

Whereas, other participants in Social Security do not have their benefits reduced in this manner; and

Whereas, to participate or not to participate in Social Security in public sector employment is a decision of employers even though both the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision directly punish employees and their spouses; and

Whereas, although the Government Pension Offset was enacted in 1977 and the Windfall Elimination Provision was enacted in 1983, many of the benefits in dispute were paid into Social Security prior to that time: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, request that the President of the United States and the United States Congress work together to support reform proposals that include the following protections for low-income and moderate-income government retirees:

1. Protections permitting retention of a combined public pension and Social Security benefit with no applied reductions;
2. Protections permanently ensuring that level of benefit by indexing it to inflation; and
3. Protections ensuring that no current recipient's benefit is reduced by the reform legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Barack H. Obama, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; and each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-10. A resolution adopted by the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts condemning all forms of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, there is clear evidence of increasing incidents and expressions of anti-Semitism throughout the world; and

Whereas, in April 2014, the United States Department of State released the International Religious Freedom report recognizing that anti-Semitism continues to be prevalent internationally; and

Whereas, anti-Semitic acts committed and recorded in 2014 include murders, violent attacks and death threats against Jews, arson, graffiti and property desecration and murders at Jewish cemeteries, places of worship, schools and community events; and

Whereas, such anti-Semitic acts also extend to soccer stadiums, the Internet, editorial cartoons and the use of Nazi salutes, leading many Jewish individuals to conceal their religious identity; and

Whereas, the recent terror attack at a kosher supermarket in Paris, France, and a mounting sense of insecurity among France's Jews reminds us of the urgent need for a commitment to address and confront anti-Semitism; and

Whereas, the Governments in France, Germany, Italy and the United Kingdom, the 4 countries where the majority of anti-Semitic incidents have occurred in Western Europe, have strongly condemned anti-Semitism as unacceptable in European society and have all made clear statements that such attacks on their Jewish communities are intolerable; and

Whereas, anti-Semitic imagery and comparisons of Jews and Israel to Nazis have been on display at demonstrations against Israel's actions in Gaza, throughout the United States, Europe, the Middle East and Latin America; and

Whereas, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has a rich history of tolerance to all faiths and religions; and

Whereas, the United States Government has played an essential role in counteracting the resurgence of anti-Semitism worldwide and has consistently supported efforts to address the rise in anti-Semitism through its bilateral relationships and participation in international organizations such as the United Nations, the organization for security and cooperation in Europe, and the organization of American states; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts General Court joins with people everywhere in unequivocally condemning all forms of anti-Semitism and rejecting attempts to justify anti-Jewish hatred or violent attacks as an acceptable expression of disapproval or frustration over political events in the Middle East or elsewhere; and

Whereas, the Massachusetts General Court applauds the United States and those foreign leaders who have condemned anti-Semitic acts and calls on those who have yet to take firm action against anti-Semitism in their countries to do so; and

Whereas, the very recent killings of a Danish film director and a Jewish guard in Copenhagen, along with the vandalism of a Jewish cemetery in Eastern France, have given rise to concerns about a rise of terrorism and anti-Semitism across the continent: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts General Court supports expanded anti-bias and Holocaust education programs to increase awareness, counter prejudice and enhance efforts to teach the universal lessons of the Holocaust; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Clerk of the Massachusetts Senate to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of State, the Governor of the Commonwealth and to each member of Congress elected from this State.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Ericka M. Miller, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

*Michael Keith Yudin, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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 Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 968. A bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 969. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from the tax on early distributions for certain Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers who retire before age 55, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 970. A bill to allow more small insured depository institutions to qualify for the 18-month on-site examination cycle, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. BURR):

S. 971. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an increase in the limit on the length of an agreement under the Medicare independence at home medical practice demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 972. A bill to clarify the effect of designating a National Monument on certain land in Chafee County, Colorado; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for equity investments by angel investors; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 975. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 976. A bill to promote the development of a United States commercial space resource exploration and utilization industry and to increase the exploration and utilization of resources in outer space; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 977. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to secure the rights of visual artists to copyright, to provide for resale royalties, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. KING):

S. 978. A bill to clarify the definition of general solicitation under Federal securities

law; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 979. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. LEE):

S. 980. A bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 981. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a repatriation holiday, to increase funding to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HELLER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. HATCH, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 982. A bill to prohibit the conditioning of any permit, lease, or other use agreement on the transfer of any water right to the United States by the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture, and to require the Secretaries of the Interior and Agriculture to develop water planning instruments consistent with State law; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 983. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. KIRK):

S. 984. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices; read the first time.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 985. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the United States Coast Guard; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 986. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 988. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 989. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to exempt from duty residue of bulk cargo contained in instruments of international traffic previously exported from the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 990. A bill to improve the process by which the Librarian of Congress considers requests for exemptions to section 1201(a)(1)(A) of title 17, United States Code, and to ease restrictions on the use of certain statutory exemptions to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 991. A bill to establish the Commission on Evidence-Based Policymaking, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 992. A bill to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act of facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 994. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the "Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 995. A bill to establish congressional trade negotiating objectives and enhanced consultation requirements for trade negotiations, to provide for consideration of trade agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 996. A bill to facilitate nationwide availability of volunteer income tax assistance for low-income and underserved populations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 997. A bill to extend the authorization for the major medical facility project to replace the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Aurora, Colorado, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers to manage the construction of such project, to transfer the authority to carry out future major medical facility projects of the Department from the Secretary to the Army Corps of Engineers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 998. A bill to establish a process for the consideration of temporary duty suspensions and reductions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 999. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for improvements to small business development centers; to the Com-

mittee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1000. A bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GARDNER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1001. A bill to establish authorization levels for general business loans for fiscal years 2015 and 2016; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1002. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1003. A bill to extend the trade adjustment assistance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1004. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to encourage the nationwide observance of two minutes of silence each Veterans Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1005. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the credit for health insurance costs of certain eligible individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1006. A bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 136. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 1, 2015, as "Silver Star Service Banner Day"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 137. A resolution congratulating the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 138. A resolution congratulating the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. Res. 139. A resolution commemorating the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Con. Res. 12. A concurrent resolution recognizing the need to improve physical ac-

cess to many federally funded facilities for all people of the United States, particularly people with disabilities; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 192

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 192, a bill to reauthorize the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 230

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 606

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri

(Mrs. McCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 606, a bill to extend the right of appeal to the Merit Systems Protection Board to certain employees of the United States Postal Service.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 650

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to extend the positive train control system implementation deadline, and for other purposes.

S. 665

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 747

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 747, a bill to prioritize funding for an expanded and sustained national investment in basic science research.

S. 753

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 753, a bill to amend the method by which the Social Security Administration determines the validity of marriages under title II of the Social Security Act.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's

disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 854

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 854, a bill to establish a new organization to manage nuclear waste, provide a consensual process for siting nuclear waste facilities, ensure adequate funding for managing nuclear waste, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 884

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 884, a bill to improve access to emergency medical services, and for other purposes.

S. 933

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 933, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act with respect to the timing of elections and pre-election hearings and the identification of pre-election issues, and to require that lists of employees eligible to vote in organizing elections be provided to the National Labor Relations Board.

S. 950

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 950, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a refundable adoption tax credit.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution supporting the designation of the year of 2015 as the "International Year of Soils" and supporting locally led soil conservation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 974. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to prohibit employment of children in tobacco-related agriculture by deeming such employment as oppressive child labor; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the important issue of child labor in tobacco fields. I want to tell you about Calvin, a 17-year-old boy just over five feet tall, who migrated to the United States by himself at age 13, leaving his family behind in Mexico. Calvin never enrolled in school.

Instead, he joined a migrant crew that travels between several states to work in different crops. He migrates to Kentucky in August to work in the tobacco fields. Calvin has worked in tobacco farms since he was 16, and he experiences headaches and nausea from nicotine poisoning.

Calvin said he got sick while working in a curing barn. "I got a headache and nausea. I was vomiting," he said. "It happened when I was hanging the tobacco in the barn."

I wish that Calvin's experience was unusual. But in May of last year, the Human Rights Watch published a report based on interviews with over 140 children who worked on U.S. tobacco farms in 2012 or 2013. The majority of those children were working for hire, and not on a family farm. Some of the findings are staggering and show that Calvin is not alone.

Human Rights Watch found that child tobacco workers began working on tobacco farms at age 11 or 12. During peak harvest periods, children can work as many as 50-60 hours a week. The majority of these children experience symptoms like nausea, vomiting, loss of appetite, dizziness, lightheadedness, headaches, and sleeplessness while working on tobacco farms. These symptoms are consistent with acute nicotine poisoning, which happens when you absorb nicotine through their skin.

Furthermore, in these conditions, children work in high heat and humidity and in some instances, they use dangerous tools that include sharp spikes to spear tobacco plants and climb to dangerous heights to hang tobacco in curing barns. These children are exposed to pesticides that are known toxins. Long-term effects of this exposure include cancer, neurological deficits, and reproductive health problems.

In his first summer in the field, 12-year-old Miguel was topping tobacco plants on a farm in North Carolina wearing shorts and a short-sleeved shirt, his torso draped with a black plastic garbage bag to cover himself from the summer's heavy rainstorms. Miguel wore only socks—because he did

not have shoes that could withstand the thick mud from the heavy rain.

Miguel lives with his mother, 13-year-old brother, and 5-year-old sister in a rural town in North Carolina. He attends a public school full-time, and works in the fields during his summer break to help cover the costs of food, clothes, and school supplies for the family.

Miguel was hired by a farm labor contractor to work on different farms planting sweet potatoes one day, topping tobacco the next. When asked which crop was harder work, Miguel said, "tobacco, because you have to walk, and you have to use your hands all the time. It's really tiring."

It is tiring. By the time Miguel got home, he would have trouble walking because his legs and feet were so sore from working all day. Not only was 12-year Miguel physically overworked, he, like Calvin, also had to deal with frequent headaches, caused by nicotine poisoning, from working in the tobacco fields. He said, "It was horrible. It felt like there was something in my head trying to eat it."

I am introducing legislation today, with Senator REED of Rhode Island, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BROWN to take children like Calvin and Miguel out of the tobacco fields. Our bill would make it illegal to allow children under the age of 18 to handle tobacco plants or dried tobacco leaves.

Currently, U.S. law prohibits children under the age of 18 from buying cigarettes . . . but allows children as young as 12 to work in tobacco fields. In most other jobs in the U.S., children are not allowed to work before the age of 15.

Today, there are no specific restrictions protecting children from nicotine poisoning or other risks associated with tobacco farming in this country. The United States is the 4th leading tobacco producer in the world, behind China, Brazil, and India. Even Brazil and India prohibit children under 18 from working in tobacco production.

It's time for the United States to adopt similar restrictions. Our children shouldn't be working long hours with a plant that makes them sick. I encourage my colleagues to work with me to pass S. 974, the Children Don't Belong on Tobacco Farms Act.

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. 974

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

SECTION 1. TOBACCO-RELATED AGRICULTURE EMPLOYMENT OF CHILDREN.

Section 3(1) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203(1)) is amended—

- (1) in this first sentence—
- (A) by striking "in any occupation, or (2)" and inserting "in any occupation, (2)"; and
- (B) by inserting before the semicolon the following: " , or (3) any employee under the

age of eighteen years has direct contact with tobacco plants or dried tobacco leaves"; and (2) in the second sentence, by striking "other than manufacturing and mining" and inserting " , other than manufacturing, mining, and tobacco-related agriculture as described in paragraph (3) of the first sentence of this subsection."

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 975. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. 975

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 "American Business for American Companies Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 4713. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

"(a) PROHIBITION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

"(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

"(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

"(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

"(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

"(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

"(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

"(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

"(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

"(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

"(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

"(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

"(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

"(B) after the acquisition, either—

"(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

"(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

"(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

"(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

"(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

"(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

"(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

"(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

"(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

"(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

"(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

"(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the

Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(C) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

“(A) required in the interest of national security; or

“(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded—

“(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

“(ii) public health programs.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4712 the following new item:

“4713. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

“(a) PROHIBITION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

“(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

“(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

“(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of \$10,000,000, other than a

contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

“(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

“(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

“(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

“(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

“(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

“(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

“(A) the entity completes before, on, or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

“(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

“(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

“(B) after the acquisition, either—

“(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

“(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

“(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

“(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

“(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on May 8, 2014.

“(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

“(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

“(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

“(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

“(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

“(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to ‘foreign country’ and ‘relevant foreign country’ as references to ‘the United States’. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

“(c) WAIVER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or Federally-funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

“(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the Committees on Armed Services and Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

“(d) APPLICABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

“(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

“(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ‘expanded affiliated group’, ‘foreign incorporated entity’, ‘person’, ‘domestic’, and ‘foreign’ have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

“2338. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.”.

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall,

for purposes of section 4713(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 2338(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. BURR):

S. 983. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate high priority corridors on the National Highway System in the State of North Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am introducing the Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act of 2015, which would amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, ISTEA, of 1991 to begin the process toward eventually making the US-70 Corridor in North Carolina part of the Interstate system, and to help fully upgrade the corridor to interstate standards. My colleague, Senator RICHARD BURR has agreed to cosponsor the bill. In addition, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD will be introducing a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act of 2015 would designate the following as high priority: U.S. Route 117/Interstate Route 795 from U.S. Route 70 in Goldsboro, NC, to Interstate Route 40 west of Faison, North Carolina; U.S. Route 70 from its intersection with Interstate Route 40 in Garner, NC, to the Port at Morehead City, NC.

If the U.S. 70 corridor becomes part of the Interstate system, it would improve access to military bases in eastern North Carolina and the Port at Morehead City, as well as ease traffic congestion between Raleigh and eastern North Carolina.

This bill helps advance the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Strategic Transportation Corridors Vision, which aims to provide North Carolina with a network of high priority corridors to promote economic development and enhance interstate commerce. Federal High Priority Cor-

ridors are eligible for federal funds to assist states in the coordination, planning, design and construction of nationally significant transportation corridors for the purposes of economic growth and international and inter-regional growth.

In midst of a sluggish national economy, North Carolina has been a bright spot for growth and innovation, and one of the keys to sustaining that economic success is through continued investment in transportation, infrastructure, and our military. The Military Corridor Transportation Improvement Act is a true bipartisan effort to support North Carolina's military installations and complement the State's 25 year transportation improvement plan, which in turn will generate economic development, provide a boost for local communities and create good-paying jobs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow deductions and credits relating to expenditures in connection with marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am here today standing up for the people of Oregon and recognizing their decision to legalize and regulate marijuana for recreational use in the State.

Together with Senators MERKLEY and BENNET, I am introducing the Small Business Tax Equity Act, which will provide more equitable Federal tax treatment for small marijuana businesses who comply with State law. This comes after more than 56 percent of Oregonians voted for marijuana legalization. Congressman BLUMENAUER is introducing a companion bill in the House.

Unlike its treatment of all other legal businesses, the tax code currently denies these marijuana businesses, legitimate businesses, the ability to deduct ordinary expenses. Expenses, such as employee pay and rent, that are essential to operating any successful small business.

This is one piece of the equation as Federal tax inequalities for marijuana businesses extend beyond deductions. For example, other businesses are also eligible for the Work Opportunity Tax Credit for hiring veterans. Therefore the inability to make deductions, combined with other lost credits, often leads to these businesses paying an effective tax rate ranging from 65-75 percent; compared with other businesses who pay between 15-30 percent.

This issue is not unique to Oregon. Oregon is one of four States, along with the District of Columbia, where voters have passed measures that permit the legal adult use and retail sale of marijuana. Oregon is one of 23 States, along with the District of Columbia, have passed laws allowing for the legal use of medical marijuana.

Unfortunately, Federal law has not caught up with changing State laws, creating contradictions, and leaving these legal businesses in a tough position.

Today, I am introducing a bill to fix this problem. Marijuana businesses operating legally under state law should be able to deduct ordinary business expenses just like any other businesses. Voters have legalized their product, now let's help create a more level playing field that recognizes their business operations.

It is the right thing to do. It is only fair that Federal tax law respect the decision Oregonians, and citizens from other States and the District of Columbia, made at the polls.

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. 987

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 "Small Business Tax Equity Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ALLOWANCE OF DEDUCTIONS AND CREDITS RELATING TO EXPENDITURES IN CONNECTION WITH MARIJUANA SALES CONDUCTED IN COMPLIANCE WITH STATE LAW.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 280E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", unless such trade or business consists of marijuana sales conducted in compliance with State law".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 988. A bill to promote minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions caused by participation in school sports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in Illinois and all over the country thousands of high school students are participating in spring sports, including the national pastime: baseball and softball.

As with any sports team, these students are training their growing bodies to compete in a worthy endeavor, but with that comes some risk. They put on helmets, they put on pads, but unfortunately some of them will still get hurt.

Injuries are a part of all sports, but as we learn more about the long term effects of concussions and how frequently they are ignored, it is clear we have to step up our game to confront this health risk.

The National Federation of State High School Associations estimates about 140,000 students who play high school sports have concussions every year. Sports are second only to motor

vehicle crashes as the leading cause of traumatic brain injury among people aged 15 to 24 years.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, the number of children age 19 and younger being treated in ERs for traumatic brain injuries went from 153,373 in 2001 to 248,418 in 2009—a 60 percent increase.

Some students stay in the game not recognizing the risks of playing hurt—especially when they have had a concussion. Many athletes do not know the signs and symptoms of concussion, which may cause many concussions to go undetected.

A 2010 Government Accountability Office study found many sports-related concussions go unreported. Athletes who continue to play while concussed are at risk for catastrophic injury if they sustain another concussion before recovering from the first one. This second injury can cause symptoms that can last for months and can even be fatal. Youth athletes are at the greatest risk from sports-related concussions because their brains are still developing and are more susceptible to injury.

According to the American Academy of Neurology, athletes of high school age and younger with a concussion should be managed more conservatively when it comes to returning to play because they take longer to recover than college athletes.

Since 2009, states have started implementing legislation guiding return to play procedures for student athletes who have sustained a concussion.

With a push from the National Football League, NFL, all 50 States and the District of Columbia have successfully passed some form of legislation with varying concussion safety measures.

Illinois has been a leader on this issue and passed legislation in 2011, recognizing the dangers associated with concussion. In Illinois, a student athlete who is suspected of sustaining a concussion or head injury in a practice or game is immediately removed from the game until he or she is cleared by a health care professional.

This is a great step forward for Illinois, and I commend the Illinois High School Association and its support of this legislation for its work protecting student athletes.

I would like to introduce the Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act, which would support the progress made by states like Illinois. The bill would, for the first time, set minimum State requirements for the prevention and treatment of concussions.

The legislation requires schools to post information about concussions on school grounds and on school websites and adopt a “when in doubt, sit it out” policy.

This policy requires that a student suspected of sustaining a concussion be removed from participation in the activity and prohibited from returning to play that day. They can return to play

in future events after being evaluated and cleared by a qualified health care professional.

The “when in doubt, sit it out” policy is recommended by the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Academy of Neurology, which recommends that an athlete suspected of a concussion should not return to play the day of their injury—under any circumstance.

According to the Center for Injury Research and Policy in Columbus, Ohio, more than 40 percent of young athletes return to play before they are fully recovered.

Concussions are not always easily diagnosed, and symptoms that might indicate concussion don’t always manifest themselves immediately. Athletes don’t want to let down the team or the coach and are often eager to return to the game.

So helping athletes, school officials, coaches and parents recognize the signs and symptoms of concussion can make all the difference in putting a player’s safety above winning.

This legislation will ensure that school districts have concussion management plans that educate students, parents, and school personnel about how to recognize and respond to concussions.

It asks schools to adopt the “when in doubt, sit it out” policy to be sure athletes are not put back in the game before they have recovered from an initial concussion.

I am pleased that a variety of organizations are supporting this bill, including the NFL, NCAA, NHL, NBA, American College of Sports Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, among others.

I look forward to working with the schools, athletic programs and others to build on the progress already made in protecting student athletes from concussions.

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. 988

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 “Protecting Student Athletes from Concussions Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. MINIMUM STATE REQUIREMENTS.

(a) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each State that receives funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) and does not meet the requirements described in this section, as of the date of enactment of this Act, shall, not later than the last day of the fifth full fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act (referred to in this Act as the “compliance deadline”), enact legislation or issue regulations establishing the following minimum requirements:

(1) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY CONCUSSION SAFETY AND MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Each local educational agency in the State, in consulta-

tion with members of the community in which such agency is located, shall develop and implement a standard plan for concussion safety and management that—

(A) educates students, parents, and school personnel about concussions, through activities such as—

(i) training school personnel, including coaches, teachers, athletic trainers, related services personnel, and school nurses, on concussion safety and management, including training on the prevention, recognition, and academic consequences of concussions and response to concussions; and

(ii) using, maintaining, and disseminating to students and parents—

(I) release forms and other appropriate forms for reporting and record keeping;

(II) treatment plans; and

(III) prevention and post-injury observation and monitoring fact sheets about concussion;

(B) encourages supports, where feasible, for a student recovering from a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), such as—

(i) guiding the student in resuming participation in athletic activity and academic activities with the help of a multi-disciplinary concussion management team, which may include—

(I) a health care professional, the parents of such student, a school nurse, relevant related services personnel, and other relevant school personnel; and

(II) an individual who is assigned by a public school to oversee and manage the recovery of such student; and

(ii) providing appropriate academic accommodations aimed at progressively reintroducing cognitive demands on the student; and

(C) encourages the use of best practices designed to ensure, with respect to concussions, the uniformity of safety standards, treatment, and management, such as—

(i) disseminating information on concussion safety and management to the public; and

(ii) applying uniform best practice standards for concussion safety and management to all students enrolled in public schools.

(2) POSTING OF INFORMATION ON CONCUSSIONS.—Each public elementary school and each public secondary school shall post on school grounds, in a manner that is visible to students and school personnel, and make publicly available on the school website, information on concussions that—

(A) is based on peer-reviewed scientific evidence (such as information made available by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention);

(B) shall include information on—

(i) the risks posed by sustaining a concussion;

(ii) the actions a student should take in response to sustaining a concussion, including the notification of school personnel; and

(iii) the signs and symptoms of a concussion; and

(C) may include information on—

(i) the definition of a concussion;

(ii) the means available to the student to reduce the incidence or recurrence of a concussion; and

(iii) the effects of a concussion on academic learning and performance.

(3) RESPONSE TO CONCUSSION.—If an individual designated from among school personnel for purposes of this Act suspects that a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity)—

(A) the student shall be—
 (i) immediately removed from participation in a school-sponsored athletic activity; and

(ii) prohibited from returning to participate in a school-sponsored athletic activity—

(I) on the day such student is removed from such participation; and

(II) until such student submits a written release from a health care professional stating that the student is capable of resuming participation in school-sponsored athletic activities; and

(B) the designated individual shall report to the parent or guardian of such student—

(i) any information that the designated school employee is aware of regarding the date, time, and type of the injury suffered by such student (regardless of where, when, or how a concussion may have occurred); and

(ii) any actions taken to treat such student.

(4) RETURN TO ATHLETICS.—If a student has sustained a concussion (regardless of whether or not the concussion occurred during school-sponsored activities, during school hours, on school property, or during an athletic activity), before such student resumes participation in school-sponsored athletic activities, the school shall receive a written release from a health care professional, that—

(A) states that the student is capable of resuming participation in such activities; and

(B) may require the student to follow a plan designed to aid the student in recovering and resuming participation in such activities in a manner that—

(i) is coordinated, as appropriate, with periods of cognitive and physical rest while symptoms of a concussion persist; and

(ii) reintroduces cognitive and physical demands on such student on a progressive basis only as such increases in exertion do not cause the reemergence or worsening of symptoms of a concussion.

(b) NONCOMPLIANCE.—

(1) FIRST YEAR.—If a State described in subsection (a) fails to comply with subsection (a) by the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 5 percent the amount of funds the State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) for the first fiscal year following the compliance deadline.

(2) SUCCEEDING YEARS.—If the State fails to so comply by the last day of any fiscal year following the compliance deadline, the Secretary of Education shall reduce by 10 percent the amount of funds the State receives under that Act for the following fiscal year.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—Prior to reducing any funds that a State receives under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.) in accordance with this subsection, the Secretary of Education shall provide a written notification of the intended reduction of funds to the State and to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 3. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect civil or criminal liability under Federal or State law.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONCUSSION.—The term “concussion” means a type of mild traumatic brain injury that—

(A) is caused by a blow, jolt, or motion to the head or body that causes the brain to move rapidly in the skull;

(B) disrupts normal brain functioning and alters the mental state of the individual, causing the individual to experience—

(i) any period of observed or self-reported—

(I) transient confusion, disorientation, or impaired consciousness;

(II) dysfunction of memory around the time of injury; or

(III) loss of consciousness lasting less than 30 minutes; or

(ii) any 1 of 4 types of symptoms, including—

(I) physical symptoms, such as headache, fatigue, or dizziness;

(II) cognitive symptoms, such as memory disturbance or slowed thinking;

(III) emotional symptoms, such as irritability or sadness; or

(IV) difficulty sleeping; and

(C) can occur—

(i) with or without the loss of consciousness; and

(ii) during participation in any organized sport or recreational activity.

(2) HEALTH CARE PROFESSIONAL.—The term “health care professional”—

(A) means an individual who has been trained in diagnosis and management of traumatic brain injury in a pediatric population; and

(B) includes a physician (M.D. or D.O.) or certified athletic trainer who is registered, licensed, certified, or otherwise statutorily recognized by the State to provide such diagnosis and management.

(3) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY; STATE.—The terms “local educational agency” and “State” have the meanings given such terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(4) RELATED SERVICES PERSONNEL.—The term “related services personnel” means individuals who provide related services, as defined under section 602 of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1401).

(5) SCHOOL-SPONSORED ATHLETIC ACTIVITY.—The term “school-sponsored athletic activity” means—

(A) any physical education class or program of a school;

(B) any athletic activity authorized during the school day on school grounds that is not an instructional activity;

(C) any extra-curricular sports team, club, or league organized by a school on or off school grounds; and

(D) any recess activity.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 993. A bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act, a bill I am introducing today with a number of my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle and with Representative DOUG COLLINS, who is introducing this legislation in the House. This bipartisan, bicameral bill will improve outcomes for people with mental illness when they interact with the criminal justice system. The Judiciary Committee unanimously approved this bill by voice vote

in the last Congress, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on the committee to move this legislation forward to consideration by the full Senate.

The Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act is meant to address a very serious problem: The United States has 5 percent of the world’s population but has 25 percent of the world’s prison population—in large part because we have effectively criminalized mental illness. People with mental health conditions disproportionately are arrested and incarcerated, but instead of providing people with adequate access to mental health treatment, we let them fall through the cracks and languish in prison. As my home county—Hennepin County—Sheriff Rich Stanek put it, “Local jails are the largest mental health facilities in the state of Minnesota,” and this holds true across our Nation.

Let’s be clear. Using our criminal justice system as a substitute for a fully functioning mental health system doesn’t make sense. It doesn’t make sense for law enforcement officers who often put their lives at risk when they are called upon to intervene in a mental health crisis. It doesn’t make sense for courts which are inundated with cases involving people with mental illness. It doesn’t make sense for people who have mental health conditions who often would benefit from treatment and intensive supervision than from traditional incarceration. It certainly doesn’t make sense for taxpayers who foot the bill for high incarceration costs and overcrowded correction facilities and who must pay again when these untreated mentally ill prisoners are released back into society often in much worse shape than when they were locked up.

We can improve access to mental health services for people who come into contact with the criminal justice system, and we can give law enforcement officers the tools they need to identify and respond to mental health issues in the communities and the situations they confront.

In 2004, Congress passed and President Bush signed into law the Mentally Ill Offender Treatment and Crime Reduction Act—or MIOTCRA—which supports innovative programs that bring together mental health and criminal justice agencies to address the unique needs of people with mental health conditions. Former Ohio Republican Senator Mike DeWine, who now serves as that State’s Attorney General, was the original sponsor of MIOTCRA.

The Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act reauthorizes and improves MIOTCRA. Let me talk a little bit about how the programs supported by this legislation protect law enforcement officers and save lives. I will give one example.

In 2013, I visited the police station in Columbia Heights, MN, a suburb of the Twin Cities. I talked with some of the officers who had been given crisis

intervention training for law enforcement officers to recognize when they are confronted or are entering a situation that involves someone who has a mental illness. The sheriff wasn't there that day, but the county attorney who was there on behalf of the sheriff said that the day after the sheriff had his training, he did not kill a guy he would otherwise have killed because he recognized what was going on. That was pretty dramatic.

So I turned to the other officers there who had also had this crisis intervention training and said to a policewoman: Can you give me a more garden-variety example?

She said: OK. About 3 months ago, I was on the street and I heard a woman screaming. I thought it was some domestic violence thing or something. I went to see what was going on, and she went over to a railing that if she had let go, she would have dropped to a playground below. She might not have killed herself, but she would have gotten very badly hurt. From my training, I realized I was in a situation with someone who was mentally ill, and I used my training to talk her back up. I spoke to the woman. She said she had been sexually abused as a child; that the perpetrator had left town and had left her life, but recently that man had come back.

She said: I think I know where I can get help for you. And she got her access to some treatment.

She said: A couple months later, I was working a street fair when this same woman came up to me, very calm, and said: You saved my life.

I said: OK. This is your garden-variety story?

She said: Yes, I use this training all the time. I will holster my gun maybe once in my career, but I use this all the time.

Now, the grants currently available that would be reauthorized through the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act—which fund programs such as local crisis intervention training—are the only ones offered by the Justice Department that address mental health issues in the criminal justice system. So passing this legislation is critically important, and the bill would improve and expand upon the law.

Here are some of the important things the bill does: It continues support for mental health courts and crisis intervention teams, both of which save lives and money. It includes new grant accountability measures and emphasizes the use of evidence-based practices that have been proven effective through empirical evidence. Our Presiding Officer is a physician, therefore a scientist, and therefore relies on empirical evidence. It authorizes investments in veterans treatment courts, which serve arrested veterans who have been arrested because they suffer from PTSD, substance addiction, which may be used to medicate their mental health or behavioral and other mental health conditions, other sometimes in-

visible wounds. It supports the development of programs, such as crisis intervention training, to train local, State, and Federal law enforcement officers how to recognize and respond appropriately to mental health crises. One of the new things the bill does is to support State and local efforts to identify people with mental health conditions at each point in the criminal justice system in order to appropriately direct them to mental health services.

Our bill also increases the focus on corrections-based programs.

I went to a prison in St. Cloud, MN, where they do intake in our State system. They said this crisis intervention training is incredibly important to them. They said: Do you watch TV on the weekends where they show prisoners, show the prison system, where you put on all the gear because some prisoner has gotten out of control and you have to go into the cell and tackle them? That could be avoided very often by understanding what is going on here. There is a lot of wear and tear when they have to go in like that. It is better to recognize what is going on and know how to deal with it.

The bill also increases the focus on things such as transitional services that reduce recidivism rates and screening practices that identify inmates with mental health conditions.

Finally, the bill gives local officials greater control over program participation eligibility. This again is for a program that already exists.

The current system is broken. It doesn't serve the interests of people with mental illness, and it doesn't protect the safety of law enforcement personnel. As one Minnesota judge wrote:

While [inmates with mental illness] are sitting in jail, they often recede further into the depths of their illness. They present a danger to themselves; they present a danger to fellow inmates; and they present a danger to the . . . men and women who run the jails.

We have an obligation to ensure that people with mental illness receive the treatment and supervision they need and that the officers who put their lives on the line when they are called on to intervene in mental health crises are trained to respond in a way that protects their safety and that of their fellow officers and of the person with mental illness. This bill helps us better meet that obligation.

I am very pleased to introduce this bill with a bipartisan group of lawmakers who are committed to improving the ways in which people with mental health conditions interact with the criminal justice system—in particular, my fellow lead sponsor, Senator JOHN CORNYN, and Representative DOUG COLLINS, who is leading this effort in the House.

This legislation has always enjoyed bipartisan support. In 2004, it was introduced by Michael DeWine, Republican from Ohio, in the Senate. In the last Congress, the predecessor of this bill had 39 Senate cosponsors, including 25 Democrats and 14 Republicans. The

House companion bill had 55 cosponsors, including 24 Democrats and 31 Republicans.

As you can see, this has always been a bipartisan effort, and I am pleased to continue that tradition in this Congress. I would like to thank Senators CORNYN, AYOTTE, BLUNT, and PORTMAN, as well as Senators LEAHY, DURBIN, WHITEHOUSE, KLOBUCHAR, COONS, BLUMENTHAL, BOXER, BROWN, WARREN, and BOOKER, for serving as original cosponsors of the Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act. I look forward to adding more cosponsors in the days to come.

I would also like to recognize the many law enforcement, civil rights veterans, and mental health advocacy organizations—most notably the Council of State Governments—for standing in strong support of this legislation or its predecessor bill and advocating tirelessly for its enactment. More than 250 organizations endorsed this legislation in the previous Congress, including the American Legion, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, the National Sheriffs' Association, the National Alliance on Mental Illness, the National Association of Counties, and the Wounded Warrior Project, just to name a few.

I look forward to working together with advocates and with my colleagues to get this bill enacted into law so that we can ease the burden of mental health problems on our criminal justice system and help a lot of people.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1006. A bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak about Positive Train Control, a crash-avoidance rail safety system that can automatically stop trains in order to prevent impending collisions.

The Senate Commerce Committee recently voted to advance a bill that would give railroads a 5-to-7 year extension of the deadline to implement this life-saving technology.

In my view, a blanket extension is disastrous policy.

Fortunately, the members of the Commerce Committee have signaled their willingness to consider improvements to this bill, and today I rise to offer such an improvement.

This legislation, the Positive Train Control Safety Act, would provide a reasonable extension for the implementation of positive train control until 2018, on a case-by-case, year-by-year basis, for any railroad whose implementation plans were delayed by factors outside of their control.

This provision mirrors language that already passed the Senate in 2012 as

part of the transportation reauthorization bill with overwhelming support. It is a measured, realistic response to the delayed implementation we have witnessed. Overall, this bill strives to hold the railroads to their safety commitments.

To understand the importance of PTC, we must revisit a terrible tragedy in my State of California, near Chatsworth.

In 2008, a Los Angeles Metrolink commuter train collided head-on with a Union Pacific freight train, killing 25 people and injuring 135 more.

Testimony from the victims who survived the crash paint a gruesome picture of the aftermath. "Severed limbs were strewn all about and blood was pooled everywhere." Victims' bodies, many torn to pieces, had to be extracted from heaps of steel and wreckage.

One passenger described coming across a man who had been crushed by an air vent: "His mangled legs were all I could see, but his cries for help were very loud. Eventually he must have died, as he was calling out for his mother and then no more sounds. [. . .] I was trying to decide if I would die by fire or suffocation of smoke."

Many victims suffered traumatic brain injuries and those sitting at tables suffered "horrible abdominal injuries that cannot be medically resolved." As the National Transportation Safety Board found in its investigation, this terrible tragedy could have been prevented if the Positive Train Control technology had been in place.

Positive Train Control is a system for automatic train safety, which was originally recommended by the National Transportation Safety Board in 1970.

Using GPS and wireless technology, Positive Train Control can automatically put the brakes on trains about to collide or derail. Positive Train Control can monitor trains and stop them if they enter the wrong track or are about to run red lights.

In the Metrolink crash, it was later determined that the engineer was texting, causing him to miss a red signal and cause the deadly collision.

PTC could have prevented this, as it could have forced the train to stop before running onto the same track as the oncoming freight train.

This horrific accident became a rallying cry for Congress, which responded by passing the Rail Safety Improvement Act in 2008.

This legislation mandated the widespread installation of PTC by the end of 2015.

The railroad industry has fought PTC from start. Now, as the deadline rapidly approaches, railroads are again lobbying hard to delay installation. Many have not even begun installing PTC in any form—something that is particularly disturbing to me.

After its terrible accident, Metrolink in California has shown great leader-

ship and plans to be the first railroad to be fully certified. Metrolink is on track to do so by the federally-mandated deadline of December 31, 2015.

Several other railroad companies in California are also on track to begin using PTC this year, in demonstration mode, on the path to final certification. These include the North County Transit District in San Diego and Caltrain in the Bay Area.

In addition, new passenger rail services in California plan to operate with PTC from the first moment that they come on-line, including the Sonoma-Marine Area Rail Transit line in 2016 and the first High Speed Rail segment in 2022.

California is committed to safe and efficient rail. I believe my State demonstrates that railroads around the country can and should be expected to implement Positive Train Control as soon as is feasible, without unnecessary delay.

The bill that the Senate Commerce Committee recently voted to advance is a no-strings-attached bill that would extend by 5 years the deadline by which PTC must be implemented.

On top of that, it offers railroads an optional extension of an additional 2 years on a case-by-case basis. Extending the deadline through until the outset of 2023.

Effectively, this is just kicking the can down road once more.

I am deeply concerned about this blanket extension. First, it rewards those that have chosen delay over action. More troubling, it could have deadly consequences for Americans across the country.

It has been 7 years since the collision at Chatsworth claimed 25 lives, and 45 years since the National Transportation Safety Board first recommended a system like Positive Train Control.

Unnecessary delay is simply not acceptable.

This is why I am introducing this bill today. I believe it will incentivize railroads to install PTC as quickly as possible.

My bill allows case-by-case, single-year extensions through 2018 for railroads that have demonstrated good faith efforts to implement PTC. It also instructs the Department of Transportation to only grant extensions if the Secretary determines that a railroad's efforts to implement PTC were delayed due to circumstances beyond their control.

In addition, the bill offers a number of other common-sense provisions relating to Positive Train Control requirements and railroad safety. These provisions reflect the lessons we have learned since the Rail Safety Improvement Act first required the implementation of PTC 6½ years ago.

These provisions include bolstering the transparency of railroads' implementation efforts, by requiring regular status reports; and ensuring trains carrying crude oil or ethanol run on tracks with PTC.

The provision requires better coordination between the Federal Railroad Administration and the Federal Communications Commission to ensure adequate wireless communications availability.

Requiring the Department of Transportation to evaluate the effectiveness of PTC at grade crossings.

Improving opportunities for railroad employees to report safety deficiencies.

Protecting employees in rail work zones.

Improving inspection practices on commuter railroads.

Riding our rails should not be a dangerous activity. It doesn't have to be. If we have the technology to prevent collisions, we must use it.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider this proposal.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 136—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 1, 2015, AS "SILVER STAR SERVICE BANNER DAY"

Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 136

Whereas the Senate has always honored the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas the Silver Star Service Banner has come to represent the members of the Armed Forces and veterans who were wounded or became ill in combat in the wars fought by the United States;

Whereas the Silver Star Families of America was formed to help the people of the United States remember the sacrifices made by the wounded and ill members of the Armed Forces by designing and manufacturing Silver Star Service Banners and Silver Star Flags for that purpose;

Whereas the sole mission of the Silver Star Families of America is to evoke memories of the sacrifices of members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States through the presence of a Silver Star Service Banner in a window or a Silver Star Flag flying;

Whereas the sacrifices of members of the Armed Forces and veterans on behalf of the United States should never be forgotten; and

Whereas May 1, 2015, is an appropriate date to designate as "Silver Star Service Banner Day": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports the designation of May 1, 2015, as "Silver Star Service Banner Day" and calls upon the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 137—CONGRATULATING THE ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY ON THE OCCASION OF THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY

Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 137

Whereas on April 17, 2015, Roosevelt University, located in Chicago, Illinois, will celebrate the 70th anniversary of the founding of the University on April 17, 1945;

Whereas Roosevelt University has graduated more than 95,000 students who have become leaders in their professions and careers, including the first African-American mayor of Chicago, Harold Washington;

Whereas Roosevelt University was founded at a time when most institutions of higher education in the United States did not enroll large numbers of minority or immigrant students;

Whereas Roosevelt University became 1 of the first colleges in the United States to admit all qualified students, regardless of race, religion, or national origin;

Whereas throughout its history, Roosevelt University has always remained true to the values of inclusiveness, opportunity, and social justice; and

Whereas today, Roosevelt remains 1 of the most diverse universities in the Midwest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University; and

(2) wishes the entire Roosevelt community many years of continued success in the future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 138—CONGRATULATING THE PROVIDENCE COLLEGE MEN'S ICE HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. REED of Rhode Island (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 138

Whereas on Saturday, April 11, 2015, the Providence College Friars won the 2015 NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey National Championship by defeating the Boston University Terriers by a score of 4 to 3 at TD Garden in Boston, Massachusetts;

Whereas numbers 16, 10, and 6 scored the first three goals for the Friars to keep the game close;

Whereas the extraordinary goal by number 22 in the third period put Providence College in the lead for good;

Whereas the superb goaltending of number 32 held back Boston University's scoring attacks and sealed the victory for the Friars, earning him Most Outstanding Player honors of the NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Tournament;

Whereas the season-long contributions and dedication of all players and coaches of the Friars' hockey team contributed to this National Championship season;

Whereas this is the first NCAA Championship for the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team;

Whereas the Providence College Friars finished the season with 26 wins and outscored its opponents 19 to 10 in the NCAA Division I Men's Ice Hockey Tournament; and

Whereas the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team became the latest Rhode Island college team to win a National Championship and earn the pride of the State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of the Providence College Men's Ice Hockey team for their hard work and dedication in making this the most successful season in team history; and

(3) recognizes the Providence College students, alumni, and fans who supported the Men's Ice Hockey team in its pursuit of a National Championship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 139—COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON THE ALFRED P. MURRAH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 139

Whereas on April 19, 1995, at 9:02 a.m. central daylight time, in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, the United States was attacked in 1 of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, which killed 168 people and injured more than 850 others;

Whereas this dishonorable act of domestic terrorism affected thousands of families and horrified millions of people across the State of Oklahoma and the United States;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States responded to this tragedy through the remarkable efforts of local, State, and Federal law enforcement, firefighters, and emergency services, search and rescue teams from across the United States, public and private medical personnel, and thousands of volunteers from the community who saved lives, assisted the injured and wounded, comforted the bereaved, and provided meals and support to those who came to Oklahoma City to help the those endangered and affected by that terrorist act;

Whereas the people of Oklahoma and the United States pledged themselves to build and maintain a permanent national memorial to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever;

Whereas that pledge was fulfilled by creating the Oklahoma City National Memorial, which draws hundreds of thousands of visitors from around the world every year to the site of that tragic event in United States history;

Whereas the Oklahoma City National Memorial brings comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity to the many visitors who come to the memorial and the museum of the memorial each year to remember and to learn; and

Whereas the 20th anniversary of the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, is on April 19, 2015: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) joins with the people of the United States in sending best wishes and prayers to the families, friends, and neighbors of the 168 people killed in the terrorist bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma;

(2) sends the best wishes and thoughts of Congress to those injured in the bombing;

(3) expresses the gratitude of Congress for the recovery of those injured;

(4) thanks the thousands of first responders, rescue workers, medical personnel, and volunteers from the Oklahoma City community and across the United States who answered the call for help that April morning and in the days and weeks that followed;

(5) resolves to work with the people of the United States to promote the goals and mission established by the Oklahoma City Na-

tional Memorial on the 20th anniversary of that fateful day;

(6) supports the resolve for the future, written on the wall of the memorial, "We come here to remember those who were killed, those who survived, and those changed forever. May all who leave here know the impact of violence. May this memorial offer comfort, strength, peace, hope, and serenity.";

(7) congratulates the people of Oklahoma City for making tremendous progress over the past 2 decades and demonstrating their steadfast commitment to the ability of hope to triumph over violence;

(8) applauds the people of Oklahoma City as they continue to persevere and to stand as a beacon to the rest of the United States and the world attesting to the strength of goodness in overcoming evil wherever it arises in our midst; and

(9) directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the Memorial Foundation, as an expression of appreciation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12—RECOGNIZING THE NEED TO IMPROVE PHYSICAL ACCESS TO MANY FEDERALLY FUNDED FACILITIES FOR ALL PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, PARTICULARLY PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES

Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. CON. RES. 12

Whereas, in 2012, nearly 20 percent of the civilian population in the United States reported having a disability;

Whereas, in 2012, 16 percent of veterans, amounting to more than 3,500,000 people, received service-related disability benefits;

Whereas, in 2011, the percentage of working-age people in the United States who reported having a work limitation due to a disability was 7 percent, which is a 20-year high;

Whereas the Act entitled "An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped", approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the "Architectural Barriers Act of 1968"), was enacted to ensure that certain federally funded facilities are designed and constructed to be accessible to people with disabilities and requires that physically handicapped people have ready access to, and use of, post offices and other Federal facilities;

Whereas automatic doors, though not mandated by either the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 or the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), provide a greater degree of self-sufficiency and dignity for people with disabilities and the elderly, who may have limited strength to open a manually operated door;

Whereas a report commissioned by the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (referred to in this preamble as the "Access Board"), an independent Federal agency created to ensure access to federally funded facilities for people with disabilities, recommends that all new buildings for use by the public should have at least one automated door at an accessible

entrance, except for small buildings where adding such doors may be a financial hardship for the owners of the buildings;

Whereas States and municipalities have begun to recognize the importance of automatic doors in improving accessibility;

Whereas the laws of the State of Connecticut require automatic doors in certain shopping malls and retail businesses, the laws of the State of Delaware require automatic doors or calling devices for newly constructed places of accommodation, and the laws of the District of Columbia have a similar requirement;

Whereas the Facilities Standards for the Public Buildings Service, published by the General Services Administration, requires automation of at least one exterior door for all newly constructed or renovated facilities managed by the General Services Administration, including post offices;

Whereas from 2006 to 2011, 71 percent of the complaints received by the Access Board regarding the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968 concerned a post office or other facility of the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the United States Postal Service employs approximately 522,000 people, making it the second-largest civilian employer in the United States;

Whereas approximately 3,200,000 people visit 1 of the 31,857 post offices in the United States each day; and

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of equality and freedom, and these principles require that all people, including people with disabilities, are able to engage as equal members of society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) recognizes the immense hardships that people with disabilities in the United States must overcome every day;

(2) reaffirms its support of the Act entitled “An Act to insure that certain buildings financed with Federal funds are so designed and constructed as to be accessible to the physically handicapped”, approved August 12, 1968 (42 U.S.C. 4151 et seq.), commonly known as the “Architectural Barriers Act of 1968”, and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), and encourages full compliance with such Acts;

(3) recommends that the United States Postal Service and Federal agencies install power-assisted doors at post offices and other federally funded facilities, respectively, to ensure equal access for all people of the United States; and

(4) pledges to continue to work to identify and remove the barriers that prevent all people of the United States from having equal access to the services provided by the Federal Government.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a

hearing entitled “Regulatory Burdens to Obtaining Mortgage Credit.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Congress and U.S. Tariff Policy.”

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 12:30 p.m., in room SH-216 of the Hart Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on April 16, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 20, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Executive Calendar No. 24; that there be 30 minutes for debate, equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination, and that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be im-

mediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

CONGRATULATING THE ADMINISTRATION, STAFF, STUDENTS, AND ALUMNI OF ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY ON THE OCCASION OF THE UNIVERSITY’S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

CONGRATULATING THE PROVIDENCE COLLEGE MEN’S ICE HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2015 NCAA DIVISION I NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 137, Roosevelt University; and S. Res. 138, Providence College.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolutions by title en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 137) congratulating the administration, staff, students, and alumni of Roosevelt University on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the University.

A resolution (S. Res. 138) congratulating the Providence College Men’s Ice Hockey team for winning the 2015 NCAA Division I National Championship.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 137) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

The resolution (S. Res. 138) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME EN BLOC—H.R. 636, H.R. 644, H.R. 1295, H.R. 1314, AND S. 984

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are five bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

A bill (S. 984) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare beneficiary access to eye tracking accessories for speech generating devices and to remove the rental cap for durable medical equipment under the Medicare Program with respect to speech generating devices.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The measures will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 20, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, April 20; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of S. 178.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senators SULLIVAN and LEE for up to 10 minutes each.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. 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. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the nuclear agreement that is being negotiated with Iran. I will start by commending

the members of the Foreign Relations Committee, particularly Senator CORKER, the chairman of that committee. They moved the Corker-Menendez bill through the committee a few days ago with a unanimous vote. It was very important work. It is a good start to a critically important topic for the American people. I know it was a struggle. We read about what happened in the press. But it is important to recognize that it was a struggle that should not have been.

The Obama administration put tremendous pressure on Members of this body—Democratic Members of this body—not to allow the U.S. Senate to have any say on this issue, one of the most important foreign policy issues facing the country right now. They did not want the American people to have a voice. In fact, last month when the bill was released, the President vowed to veto it. He backed off only when it was clear that members of the committee, Republicans and Democrats, stood firm against the President and with the American people. Then the President knew he would fail and his veto threat would likely be overridden.

So the President, under pressure, dispatched Secretary of State John Kerry, a former Member of this body, to give me and my colleagues here in the Senate a closed-door preview of these negotiations in this framework agreement. I sat through the meeting and had some discussions with the Secretary. It was useful, but think about it—it was a closed-door briefing. Why not involve the American people?

This is not an issue which is about the Senate or the Congress per se, as we often read in the paper. This is an issue about the American people, who have a voice through us, their representatives in Congress, and should have a say on one of the most critical foreign policy issues facing the United States right now. And, remember, we know this. We were sent here. The people are wise. The citizens of this country are wise. They understand national security. Many of them are in the military. Many of them have sons and daughters in the military. Many of them are veterans. They know what sacrifice is. They know what national security is. They sent us here so their voices could be heard, particularly on issues of national security and on issues of the security of the country they love.

Make no mistake, Americans are overwhelmingly interested in making sure that they, through their representatives in Congress, have a say in this important deal. A recent USA TODAY-Suffolk University poll showed that a whopping 72 percent of Americans think Congress should have a role in approving the nuclear negotiations with Iran.

What is very interesting about this is that once upon a time, even President Obama, Secretary of State John Kerry, and former Senator Clinton all believed this body should have a role in

such important agreements. They said Congress should approve any sweeping deals. In 2007 and 2008, they cosponsored a bill that required congressional approval of any long-term security commitment President Bush made to Iraq.

Vice President BIDEN—then-Senator BIDEN—put it then:

The president cannot make such a sweeping commitment on his own authority. Congress must grant approval.

Those were wise words then, and I believe they are wise words today. Why is that? One reason is that when the executive branch and the Congress work together, we are stronger on issues of foreign policy and national security. Think about all of the different times in which this body, through treaties and other agreements, worked with Presidents of both parties—bipartisan—to make sure we were speaking strongly together on critical issues of national security. I served under Condoleezza Rice as an Assistant Secretary of State and worked on these kinds of issues—sanctions on Iran and terrorist finance issues—and I saw that when the executive branch worked with the Congress, we were stronger.

As I mentioned, when then-Senator BIDEN mentioned these words about congressional approval, they were wise words. Yet, now the Vice President, Secretary Kerry, and President Obama—all former Members of this body—are ignoring their own previous advice and previous wisdom, and they are ignoring the American people in the process through their representatives in Congress.

Where does that leave us today? My own view is that the President should have reached out to the Congress from the very beginning and said that he wanted to work with us and have our approval on this important agreement so we could be stronger as a country, the executive branch and the Congress working together, unified, to enhance America's national security.

The President should have looked to the Congress and the Constitution when considering this potential agreement—whether the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world should get a nuclear weapon and when—and realized this was an important enough national security issue and said: I am going to submit this as a treaty. He should have been willing to make the case to the American people and convince two-thirds of the Senate to vote for this agreement, as required by the Constitution. But he chose another path. He chose the “go it alone” path where even just a few weeks ago the administration signaled that it was not going to show the agreement—the key annexes of this agreement—to the Congress and that any attempts to force him to do so would be vetoed. That was a mistake. That is a mistake, and we are starting to change that.

In these kinds of matters, the U.S. State Department urges any administration—Republican or Democratic—to

use the utmost caution when deciding how to deal with international treaties on key foreign policy issues and the Congress.

I have a quote from the State Department guidelines:

In determining whether any international agreement should be brought into force as a treaty or as an international agreement other than a treaty, the utmost care is to be exercised to avoid any invasion or compromise of the constitutional powers of the President, the Senate, and the Congress as a whole.

That is the State Department—"the utmost care." But the Obama administration did not take the utmost care in this matter. In fact, their goal has been to shut out the American people on this deal.

So what are we doing? The Congress is having to force the President to let the American people be heard. That is what we are doing, and I believe in many ways that is sad. The President is clearly not abiding by the advice he gave when he was a Senator on these kinds of issues, and neither is the Vice President, so the Congress acted.

The Corker-Menendez bill that passed the Foreign Relations Committee, which will be debated soon on this floor, at least gives us an up-or-down vote, and it will enable us to actually see some of the classified annexes that are part of this agreement. Again, it is not us, it is the American people. It is the people we represent.

I urge my colleagues to practice what the State Department has said is the utmost care on these kinds of issues. We need to look hard at whatever agreement is finalized and brought to this body, and we need to work hard to cut through the clutter and opaque language, unclear language, and conflicting views of this agreement—the way in which this administration is describing this deal right now.

I will give one example. Let's take the phrase "snapped back." Right now, the American people are being told that if Iran violates the terms of this agreement, the sanctions, which have been key to this entire agreement and imposed on Iran by this body four different times, can quickly and automatically be snapped back. That is a fantasy. President Obama knows that sanctions—particularly international sanctions—cannot just be snapped back. But it is a great phrase. It sounds good, but it is a fantasy.

As I mentioned, as a former Assistant Secretary of State, I worked with the Congress and other members of the executive branch to go around to different countries in the world and strongly encourage them to divest out of Iran, out of the Iranian oil and gas sector. In many ways, we said: If you don't take action and divest out of Iran, it is very likely that the Congress will sanction you. We worked with the Congress. This was executive branch and congressional branch cooperation, making us stronger as a nation because it worked.

Many of these companies started to divest. It weakened Iran, but this took years. There was no snap involved. This was a slog, but it was successful. It was successful because this body was very intimately involved. The President knows this. Secretary Kerry knows this. But the fact that they are willing to say "Don't worry, sanctions will be snapped back in an instant" should otherwise make us all nervous.

The administration needs to explain to the American people how this snap-back will work. Think about it. If sanctions are lifted, millions, probably billions of dollars are going to flow from European companies, countries; Asian companies, countries; Russian; Chinese. They are going to flow into Iran. They are going to invest in businesses. They are going to invest in the oil and gas sector. They are going to invest in banks. And then we are going to snap that back if there is a violation, automatically, in a couple of days? It is not going to happen. It is a catchy phrase with no substance.

The administration needs to explain it. The American people need to know what is at stake. The Secretary and the President need to be clear with the American people on exactly what is in this agreement. They need to level with the American people. As we move forward, as we think about how we are going to analyze, look at, vote on this agreement, they must tell the American people the truth.

We must start to think about some of these issues. Let's start with a couple of things that are very important for the American people to know, and the American people do know them.

Let's start by recognizing that Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism.

Let's recognize that Iran has consistently lied and cheated with regard to its nuclear weapons program, including even recently, during these negotiations.

Let's recognize that Iran will not—will not—stand down from its stated goal that many of its leaders still state today, which is that they want to wipe Israel off the map.

Let's recognize that Iran is responsible—and this is very important to recognize and understand—for the maiming and killing of likely thousands of U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines in Iraq by supplying Shia militias there with the most sophisticated, the most lethal IED on the battlefield, called an EFP, an explosively formed projectile. If a person was in Iraq as a U.S. military member and that person was in a vehicle that hit one of these IEDs, that person was either going to be killed or seriously maimed. This is something I witnessed during my time as a staff officer to the commanding general of the U.S. Central Command when I was in Iraq as a marine.

Let's recognize that from what we know right now in terms of this deal, Iran doesn't appear to have given up

much at all. They will keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges. They will keep their missile development programs. They will keep their nuclear infrastructure. They will continue to support and sponsor terrorism around the world—the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The American people need to know that if we do lift sanctions—and it is not clear when we are going to lift them; the Iranians are saying we are going to lift them right away—if we do lift sanctions, Iran will very likely use the millions of dollars that will flood into their economy to pump up their terror machine around the world and likely target our citizens. The American people need to understand all of this as we go forward.

Maybe the administration disagrees on some of these points. Maybe they don't think these points are the aspects of the deal. And if none of this is true, then let Secretary Kerry and his team come forward to the Congress and make the case in public to the American people that this isn't the case, that this is a deal which will keep us safe, that this is a deal with a regime that is trustworthy. Let them make that case.

The Congress needs to be very involved, and we are involved because of the respect for the people we represent.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Utah.

COMMEMORATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ATTACK ON THE ALFRED P. MURRAH FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 139, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 139) commemorating the 20th anniversary of the attack on the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 139) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

REMEMBERING NORM BANGERTER

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Gov. Norm Bangerter, who

served as Utah's 13th Governor from 1985 to 1993. He was truly an extraordinary man and an exceptional leader. He passed away this past Tuesday, April 14, at the age of 82.

He loved Utah, and he loved this great Nation. As a veteran, a business owner, an elected official, a father, and a man of faith, he led a life of service to his community, to his church, and to his country.

Norm Bangerter once described himself as "just an old farmer and carpenter." And he was those things. While the qualities of a farmer and a carpenter may seem far removed from business and political leadership, his farmer's grit and determination saw him through many tough political battles, and his eye as a master craftsman ensured every step along the way he could not only start a project, but he knew how to put a fine finish on that project and see it through all the way to completion. His willingness to get his hands a "little dirty" enabled him to tackle difficult issues, the kinds of issues that required hard work and heavy lifting far from the spotlight and limelight of public praise. And he was, indeed, a builder. He was a builder of business, a builder of the great State of Utah, and, as I personally experienced, a builder of people.

I, like so many others throughout my great State and elsewhere, have been

blessed by Governor Bangerter's vision for building other leaders. He stood with me as a young candidate and as a new Senator and provided priceless insight, wisdom, and perspective. He taught me that it was never about me but always about the State, about the Nation, and about future generations. He proved his commitment to this principle when he described his decision not to seek a third term as Governor. When he made that announcement, he said:

We have not concentrated on image or on protecting our popularity in the polls. We have taken the problems as they came, head on, and we have proposed the best solution we knew regardless of political consequences. . . . I want to go down in history as the Governor who didn't spend eight years worrying about how he would go down in history.

All of us in Congress could benefit from this kind of approach. All of us in Congress could learn a great deal from this man's extraordinary example.

Governor Bangerter was one of the most unassuming, kind, honest, genuinely decent people I have ever met. He was the kind of man and was the kind of great Governor who, like a great farmer and a great carpenter, left the world much better than he found it.

Like the farmer planting oak trees for the next generation or the carpenter finishing a finely crafted masterpiece that becomes a treasured heir-

loom for generations to enjoy, Governor Bangerter spent his life planting the seeds for the extraordinary State of Utah and crafted a legacy of leadership that will be remembered and will be followed for many decades to come. Governor Norm Bangerter's leadership will be missed, and his friendship will be cherished forever.

Thank you, Mr. President.
I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
APRIL 20, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m., Monday, April 20.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:48 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 20, 2015, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 16, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

RUSSELL C. DEYO, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION

JONODEV OSCEOLA CHAUDHURI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL INDIAN GAMING COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF THREE YEARS.