

faced the Ebola crisis, we responded. When the avian flu crisis hit, we responded quickly with emergency funding. We have done the same with tornadoes, hurricanes, floods, earthquakes, and fires, but the Republicans aren't doing that. I don't know; I don't understand this. It is an emergency. Zika is an emergency. It is devastating. Republicans should treat it as such and work with Democrats to fully respond to this. They should do it now; they should have done it months ago.

It is stunning and sad that instead of responding responsibly to this Nation's emergency in a bipartisan way, the Republicans have retreated behind closed doors and are negotiating Zika funding among themselves. There is a conference going on, but nothing is happening. The Republicans over in the House are playing around with something they are going to send us. We know; we have been there. It is going to come here. The Republicans in the House will then decide to go home, and the Democrats will have to go with them, and they will be gone. So we will be jammed sometime next week, and the Republican leader will say: Listen, we have to do this. The House is gone. We can't change anything. Well, that is wrong. They should not turn this general public health emergency into a partisan game, syphoning money from Ebola or cutting the Affordable Care Act as we heard they are doing over in the House. That is a dangerous break from our commitment to address emergencies we are funding.

We should respond to this crisis and respond now. We know what we need to send the President—at least \$1.9 billion—and it is an emergency. It is no different, as I have said, than a flood or a fire or those other emergencies I mentioned. For every moment the Republicans delay in responding to the Zika virus, we endanger more Americans.

Mr. President, there are a number of people on the floor. I would ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, SCIENCE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 2578, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2578) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby/Mikulski amendment No. 4685, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for McCain) amendment No. 4787 (to amendment No. 4685), to amend section 2709 of title 18, United States Code, to clarify that the Government may obtain a specified set of electronic communication transactional records under that section, and to make permanent the authority for individual terrorists to be treated as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations for a period of 14 days.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote will be equally divided between the managers or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I rise to speak as in morning business.

ZIKA VIRUS

Mr. President, the statement just made by the Senate Democratic leader on the Zika challenge to the United States is well documented. What is well documented is that the President of the United States came to Congress 4 months ago and said: We are facing a public health threat. Do something.

For 4 months the Republican-led Congress has done nothing. Meanwhile, the mosquitoes carrying this deadly virus are on the march.

This is a report from the New York Times from last week which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in its entirety.

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

[From the New York Times, June 17, 2016]

U.S. OFFICIALS ARE SURPRISED BY ZIKA RATE IN PUERTO RICO

(By Catherine Saint Louis)

Roughly 1 percent of recent blood donors in Puerto Rico showed signs of active infection with the Zika virus, suggesting that a substantial portion of the island's population will become infected, federal health officials reported on Friday.

From April 3 to June 11, testing of 12,700 donations at blood centers in Puerto Rico identified 68 infected donors, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Over all, about 0.5 percent of donors had active Zika infections, but the prevalence rose to 1.1 percent in the week ending June 11. The virus, carried by the yellow fever mosquito, has been linked to birth defects in infants and neurological problems in adults.

"There are a lot more Zika-positive people than we would anticipate this early" in the outbreak, said Phillip Williamson, an author of the C.D.C. report and the vice president of operations at Creative Testing Solutions, a blood-donor testing laboratory.

Based on prior experience, Dr. Williamson said he would not have expected so many Zika-infected donors until late June or at early July.

The C.D.C. has estimated that as many as a quarter of the island's 3.5 million people may become infected with the Zika virus this year.

"It's possible that thousands of pregnant women in Puerto Rico could be infected," Dr. Thomas R. Frieden, the agency's director, told Reuters on Friday, leading to "dozens or hundreds of infants being born with microcephaly in the coming year."

Zika-contaminated donations are removed from the blood supply. In the continental

United States, where local transmission of the virus has yet to be reported, most blood banks are not yet using the experimental screening test used in Puerto Rico, which was made by Roche Diagnostics.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this article is entitled, "U.S. Officials Are Surprised by Zika Rate in Puerto Rico."

It goes on: "Roughly 1 percent of recent blood donors in Puerto Rico showed signs of active infection with the Zika virus, suggesting that a substantial portion of the island's population will become infected, federal health officials reported on Friday."

They go on to cite the statistics that have been analyzed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and here is what they concluded:

Based on prior experience, Dr. Williamson [of the CDC] said he would not have expected so many Zika-infected donors until late June or early July.

The CDC has estimated that as many as a quarter of the island's 3.5 million people may become infected with the Zika virus this year.

"It's possible that thousands of pregnant women in Puerto Rico could be infected," Dr. Thomas R. Frieden, [the CDC's] director, told Reuters . . . leading to "dozens or hundreds of infants being born with microcephaly in the coming year."

What is the Republican majority waiting for in the U.S. Senate? What is the Republican majority waiting for in the U.S. House of Representatives?

Don't they believe this is a serious public health threat? If they don't, they are ignoring the obvious—evidence given to us by the leading public health defense agency in the United States of America, if not the world. Over and over again, they tell us this is a deadly threat. While the infection rates increase and the infections among pregnant women increase and the number of these infants who are afflicted by serious birth defects increase, the Republicans in the House and Senate are too busy focusing on Donald Trump to pay attention to this public health crisis. It is about time they accepted the reality, and the reality is they were elected to lead, they were elected to protect, they were elected to serve, and when it comes to the Zika virus, they are doing none of this. They are standing back, twisted in knots, trying to figure out how to take money away from other public health challenges to deal with this, and 4 months have passed. These mosquitoes are spreading this infection across Puerto Rico, and soon we will know more in the United States.

Senator REID suggested there were 2,000 Americans with the Zika virus infection; 400—if I recall his numbers correctly—pregnant women, and there is already evidence of babies here being born afflicted because of this infection. What is the Republican majority waiting for?

FIGHTING TERRORISM

Mr. President, the Senate Republican leader came to the floor earlier this morning to speak to us about ISIL and

terrorism. I hope he understands there is a political consensus on the following statement: We should do everything in our power to prevent any terrorist attack in the United States and everything in our power to stop the spread of terrorism overseas, including and especially when it comes to ISIS.

What Senator REID asked of Senator MCCONNELL is the right question. You come with criticism of our current policy, but you offer nothing. There is no suggestion by the Senate Republican leader that we should be sending invading armies again. We did try that in Iraq, and the consequences are well known. We lost 4,844 lives—American soldiers who gave their lives in Iraq. Over a half million returned with injuries, some of them with injuries that will be with them for a lifetime. The cost to the United States in terms of death, injury, and the problems that these veterans face will go on for generations. Is the Senator from Kentucky suggesting we should do that again? I hope not.

What we are doing is joining up with Iraqi forces to defeat ISIS. We are using the best of American intelligence and guidance to make sure they are effective and there is evidence of success.

The statement put in the RECORD from Senator CARPER goes into detail. Senator REID alluded to it in his speech. It talks about the things we have done and the success we have had. The notion that we can do this overnight, that we just invade with a large U.S. Army—if that is what Senator MCCONNELL is suggesting, I would suggest he go back in history and reflect on his own vote for the invasion of Iraq, which I disagreed with at the time and still do. It was a mistake for us to invade.

Then there is the question about the gun issue, particularly when it comes to assault weapons. Do you know what the terrorists have told us? They basically said to us: Go ahead and fight the last war. Focus on what happened on 9/11. Put all your resources at airports. Be ready to stop anyone who wants to take over an airplane. It is a worthy goal, but while you are diverted with that goal, fighting the last terrorist war, we are opening up new fronts, and one of those fronts very specifically is that the terrorists warned us: We know where to buy assault weapons in the United States. We know about your gun shows. We know about your Internet sales, and that is where we are going to turn.

They are calling on their aspiring terrorists around the world to find access to assault weapons and turn them on innocent Americans. We saw the devastating impact of that in Orlando two weeks ago.

Because of the filibuster last week that was initiated by Senator MURPHY of Connecticut and sustained by Senator BOOKER of New Jersey and Senator BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut and 37 others who came to the floor to support them, we forced a vote on Monday

night on 4 gun safety issues. None of them passed. It was established that they needed an extraordinary majority. That was the decision made by the Republican leadership. While we came close to a majority on many of these votes, we didn't have the 60 votes necessary to make them law.

Luckily, we have one Republican Senator on the Republican side who showed extraordinary courage. Senator COLLINS of Maine has stepped up to try to craft a measure to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of terrorists in the United States. Do the American people agree with Senator COLLINS? Only by a margin of 90 percent, they believe she is right. They believe we are right—that we should do something to defy the National Rifle Association and make it more difficult for those who are suspected terrorists to buy firearms, especially assault weapons. Well, she is working on it, and I am working with her. Many of us are supporting her effort—a bipartisan effort, and one that is long overdue.

When the Senator who is the Republican majority leader comes to the floor and says we need to do more to fight terrorism, what is he doing to fight terrorism? When it comes to assault weapons and those who are purchasing them in the United States—like the deadly killer in Orlando—he can help us. The Kentucky Senator who is the Republican leader can help us by making America safer and keeping automatic weapons, assault weapons, and semiautomatic weapons out of the hands of would-be terrorists. That would mean defying the National Rifle Association, and many on the Republican side are scared to death of that—just scared to death of what that organization might do to them if they join Senator COLLINS, if they join Senator FEINSTEIN, in trying to stem the rise of terrorism from these assault weapons in the United States.

I have said it before and I will say it again: There is no self-respecting hunter, sportsman, or even a person looking for self-defense who can defend these weapons that are being sold in the United States.

There was a Snapchat video of one of the victims in Orlando, the last 9 seconds of her life before she was killed. She turned on her cell phone, and in 9 seconds, 17 rounds were fired by this aspiring ISIS terrorist who had access to an assault weapon. Assault weapons belong in the hands of law enforcement and the military. They shouldn't be so easily accessible by those who would turn them on innocent Americans, whether it is in a classroom in Newtown, CT, or in a nightclub in Orlando.

I would say to the Senator from Kentucky that if he wants to stop terrorism, start at home. Start at home by preventing terrorist access to these deadly weapons that have no effective use when it comes to sport and hunting and that are just being purchased, sadly, for collections reasons or for those who want to misuse the weapons to kill innocent people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk (Lindsay Gibmeyer) proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. 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. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the Democrats and Republicans during the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4787

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I am concerned about a pending amendment, McCain amendment No. 4787.

We had a series of votes earlier this week on sensible gun safety measures. We know by all the polling that the overwhelming majority of Americans supported these measures, but they were blocked by Senate Republicans.

Now it appears the Republican leadership wants to change the subject. They are resorting to scare tactics to divert the attention of the American people from their failure to act in response to mass shootings. Let's be clear about what we need to stay safe. We need universal background checks for firearms purchases and we need to give the FBI the authority to deny guns to terrorist suspects.

Senate Republicans rejected those commonsense measures earlier this week, but we still have the chance to give law enforcement real and effective tools. We should strengthen our laws to make it easier to prosecute firearms traffickers and straw purchasers.

I am a gun owner. I know if I go in to buy a gun in Vermont—even though the gun store owner has known me most of their life—I have to go through a background check. But you can have somebody who has restraining orders against them, warrants outstanding against them, or who could have been convicted of heinous crimes, and they can walk into a gun show, with no background check, and buy anything they want.

We also know they can go and buy all kinds of weapons to sell at a great profit to criminal gangs that couldn't buy them otherwise, and of course to those who are going to commit acts of terrorism and hate crimes.

We also need to fund the FBI and the Justice Department so they have the resources to combat acts of terrorism and hate. Those are the elements of the amendment that Senators MIKULSKI, BALDWIN, NELSON and I filed yesterday.

In contrast, Republicans are proposing to reduce independent oversight of FBI investigations, and make permanent a law that as of last year had never been used. The McCain amendment would eliminate the requirement for a court order when the FBI wants to obtain detailed information about Americans' Internet activities in national security investigations.

You can almost hear J. Edgar Hoover, who loved to be able to spy on any American he didn't like, asking: Why didn't I have that when I was the head of the FBI?

The McCain amendment could cover Web sites Americans have visited; extensive information on who Americans communicate with through email, chat, and text messages; and where and when Americans log onto the Internet and into social media accounts. Over time, this information would provide highly revealing details about Americans' personal lives, Americans who are totally innocent of any kind of criminal activity, and they get all of this without prior court approval.

That is why this amendment is opposed by major technology companies and privacy groups across the political spectrum, from FreedomWorks to Google, to the ACLU.

Senator CORNYN and others have argued that we cannot prevent people on the terrorist watch list from obtaining firearms without due process and judicial review. Yet at the same time they are proposing to remove judicial approval when the FBI wants to find out what Web sites Americans are visiting. The FBI already has the authority to obtain this information if it obtains a court order under section 215 of the USA PATRIOT Act.

None of us would feel comfortable if the FBI or any law enforcement agency could just walk into our home, rifle through our desks, and go through the notes of whom we have called or whom we have talked to. But they are saying because we have done it electronically and through the Internet, we ought to be able to just ignore any right of privacy and go into it.

So rather than trying to distract us from their opposition to commonsense gun measures, such as their opposition to requiring somebody who has criminal indictments pending against them from being able to go to a gun show and buy guns, Republicans should support actions that will help protect us, such as those in the amendment filed by Senators MIKULSKI, BALDWIN, NELSON, and myself.

Instead of kowtowing to a very well-organized special interest lobbying group, why not listen to the lobby of the American people and do what Americans want. I hope Senators will oppose the McCain amendment. I hope

they will support measures that will actually help keep our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague. He and I have worked on this. He is really outlining the hypocrisy behind what has been going on over the past few days.

Mr. President, due process ought to apply as it relates to guns, but due process wouldn't apply as it relates to the Internet activity of millions of Americans. My view is that the country wants policies that promote safety and liberty. Increasingly, we are getting policies that do not do much of either. Supporters of this amendment, the McCain amendment, have suggested that Americans need to choose between protecting their security and protecting their constitutional right to privacy.

The fact is, this amendment doesn't improve either. What it does is, it gives an FBI field office new authority to administratively scoop up Americans' digital records, their email and chat records, their text message logs, Web-browsing history, and certain types of location information without ever going to a judge.

The reason this is unnecessary—and it is something I believe in very strongly and worked hard for it in the FREEDOM Act—there is a very specific section in the FREEDOM Act, which I worked for and authored in a separate effort in 2013, that allows the FBI to demand all of these records—all of the records I described—in an emergency and then go get court approval after the fact. So unless you are opposed to court oversight, even after the fact, there is no reason to support this amendment.

The FBI has not, in any way, suggested that having this authority would have stopped the San Bernardino attack or the massacre at an LGBT nightclub in Orlando. That is because there is no reason to think that is the case.

The Founding Fathers wrote the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution for a good reason. We can protect security and liberty. We can have both. Somehow, the sponsors of the McCain amendment have said: You can really only have one or the other.

Mr. President and colleagues, the other argument that was made yesterday—some have said, we have to have this amendment because it will just fix a typo in the law. That is not true. I urge colleagues to take a look at the record on this. The record makes it clear that this provision was carefully circumscribed, was narrowly drawn. The notion that this is some sort of typo simply doesn't hold water.

The fact is, the Bush administration—hardly an administration that was soft on terror—said this was not needed, this was not something they would support; that the national secu-

rity letter statute ought to be interpreted narrowly just the way the authors in 1993 envisioned.

I see my friend, the distinguished chair of the Intelligence Committee. I know we are going to hear how this is absolutely pivotal in order to protect the security of the American people. I will recap.

No. 1, never once has the FBI suggested this would have prevented Orlando; No. 2, in the face of an emergency under the legislation I authored, the government, in an Orlando or San Bernardino issue, can go get the records immediately and then after the fact settle up; No. 3, this was not a typo. This was what the authors had suggested; No. 4, the Bush administration, hardly soft on terror, didn't believe what this amendment was all about was necessary. This is an amendment that would undermine fundamental American rights without making our country safer.

In my view, undermining the role of judicial oversight, particularly when it doesn't make the country safer and we have a specific statutory provision for emergencies to protect the American people, this amendment defies common sense.

I hope my colleagues will oppose it. I urge my colleagues to do so. I think it is going to be very hard to explain to the American people how an approach like the one behind this amendment, that would allow any FBI field office to issue an administrative subpoena for email and chat records, text message logs, web-browsing history, location information—that you ought to be able to do it without judicial oversight, when you have a specific law that says government has the right to move quickly in an emergency. I think it is going to be pretty hard to explain to the American people how you are going to have an arrangement like this that does not make us safer and certainly jeopardizes our liberties.

I am for both, and this amendment doesn't do much of either.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, as I grew up, I remember listening daily to Paul Harvey on the radio. Paul Harvey's motto was, "and now the rest of the story."

That is where we are. I give Senator WYDEN a tremendous amount of credit for consistency. He is consistently against providing the tools that law enforcement needs to defend the American people. That is fine, if that is your position, but let's talk about fact.

This statute was changed in 1993, and in one subpart of that legislation, it was not carried over about the ISP—Internet service provider—responsibility to provide this information when requested by law enforcement.

From 1993 until 2010, every technology company, when requested by the FBI, continued to provide this information. This is not a new expansion.

It is clearly something that continued from 1993 until 2010, 6 years ago, when all of a sudden a tech company looked at it and said: Boy, it is in this subpart, but it doesn't state it in that subpart so we are not going to provide it for you anymore.

Myth: We have never asked for this. We have never had this.

No, we have had it for a long time, and until 2010, every company supplied it to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. All of a sudden, one company's general counsel said: We don't see it in this subpart; therefore, we are not bound to provide that for you.

We are either going to fight terrorism and prosecute criminals or we are not going to do it. We can take away every tool because we use this excuse that technology now forbids us from accessing information.

Let me say about this, we get no content. To get content, you have to go to a judge on a bench, and that judge has to give you permission to actually read the content. We are talking about addresses, locations, times that, in the case of reconstruction or in the case of trying to prevent an attack, could be crucial.

The one fact I heard from my colleague from Oregon is that this wouldn't have stopped San Bernardino or Orlando. He is 100 percent correct. But I hope there is no legislation we are considering in the Senate that is about a single incident. This is about a framework of tools law enforcement can use today, tomorrow, and into the future; it is not about looking back and saying: But it didn't exist here.

Let me just explain what happens if, in fact, this inadvertent change isn't made. It means the FBI goes from a 1-day process of getting this vital information to over a month. To go to the FISA Court and get approval to seek the information—over a month. If it had to do with a terrorist attack, boy, I hope the American people are comfortable with saying: As long as the FBI figures this out a month in advance, then we are OK. But when you look at the MO of attacks around the world, in most cases, we had no notice. In most cases, maybe another thread of information might have given us the preventive time we needed.

In many cases, connecting the dots is also a matter of time. Director Comey came and had a session with all Members of the Senate last week. His comment about expediting this information into the public domain was because he wanted to assure the American people that they had reviewed as much as they could to certify that there was not another cell, that the American people could sleep safe that night. Well, this is part of that process—being able to access the information you need in a timely fashion.

You know something he forgot to say is that this is the Obama administration's language. We can talk all we want to about Bush or Clinton or whatever; this is the Obama administra-

tion—the one that has the responsibility today to keep the American people safe. It is the administration that has come to the Senate, provided the language, and asked for this clarification to be made because it was inadvertently left out in 1993.

So we are here today to fix something that is broken, not to expand in any way, shape, or form the powers or to intrude into privacy, because there is no content collected. This is simply to provide law enforcement with tools that enable them to fulfill their mission, which is to keep America safe.

In addition to the ECTA fix, let me say there is a lone-wolf provision that extends the lone wolf permanently. The lone wolf provision provides the government's ability to target non-U.S. persons—foreigners only—who engage or attempt to engage in international terrorism but do not show specific links to a foreign power or terrorist organization to be under the lone-wolf provision. It is too important to let it expire.

This provision is not about addressing or responding to a single specific threat—particularly one that has already manifested itself—any more than the underlying bill is. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. The American people need it, law enforcement needs it, and the Obama administration wants it. It is what we operated under from an understanding from 1993 until 2010, when a general counsel in one company decided to buck the system and say: Spell it out for me or we are not going to do it. Let's spell it out for them and give law enforcement this tool.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ten minutes remains.

Mr. McCAIN. I won't take the entire 10 minutes. I notice the Senator from Oregon, and I would be glad to yield to him 3 minutes of the 10 minutes remaining so he can speak in his usual articulate fashion.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague for the time.

Mr. McCAIN. I yield 3 minutes of my 10 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to come back again to the argument I made earlier. The Senator from North Carolina said the FBI would have to wait around if there was something that really had the well-being of the American people at stake. That is simply inaccurate. In the USA FREEDOM Act, I was able to add a provision I feel very strongly about, which says if the FBI thinks the security and well-being of the American people are on the line, the FBI can move immediately to collect all the information we have been talking about. So there is no waiting. There is no dawdling under the amend-

ment we put in the FREEDOM Act. The government can go get that information immediately and come back and then settle up later with the judge. Frankly, that was something I felt extremely strongly about because I wanted it understood that there is not a debate about privacy versus security. This is about ensuring that we have both, and that is why that emergency provision is so important.

My colleague made mention of the fact that the FBI would be waiting around if the country's safety and well-being were on the line. No way—not because of the specific language in the USA FREEDOM Act I offered and my colleague supported. This is about ensuring that the American people can have both security and liberty.

We have heard the lone-wolf provision referred to. That was extended for 4 years in the USA FREEDOM Act. I supported that as well.

So what we are talking about today is not making the country safer but threatening our liberty. And I did draw a contrast between this and the issue with respect to guns. Our colleagues said we ought to have due process as it relates to guns. I certainly support the idea of due process, but it shouldn't be a double standard—we are going to have due process there, and we are not going to have due process as it relates to these national security letters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 3 minutes.

Mr. WYDEN. If I could have 10 additional seconds, and I appreciate my colleague's courtesy.

Mr. McCAIN. Certainly.

Mr. WYDEN. The amendment gives the FBI field office authority to scoop up all this digital material without judicial oversight. That is a mistake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, obviously I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the distinguished chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, who knows as much about this issue as any Member of Congress or anyone else, and I appreciate the great job he is doing and his important remarks.

Look, this is pretty simple. The amendment has the support of the National Fraternal Order of Police; the Federal Law Enforcement Agencies Association, which is the largest national professional law enforcement association; and the Federal Bureau of Investigation Agents Association. Literally every law enforcement agency in America supports this amendment so they can do their job and defend America.

Ronald Reagan used to say that facts are stubborn things. The fact is, according to the Director of the CIA, according to the Director of National Intelligence, right now Baghdadi, in Raqqa, is calling people in and saying: Get on this. Get on this and get back to the United States or Europe and contact us then and we will attack.

There will be more attacks, according to both the Director of the CIA and the Director of National Intelligence.

Right now there are, unfortunately, young people in this country who are self-radicalizing. And what vehicle is doing the self-radicalization? It is the Internet.

We are not asking for content here; we are just asking for usage, the same way we can do with financial records, the same way we can do with telephone records. This is an important tool.

How could anyone—and I say this with great respect for the Senator from Oregon. He is a passionate and articulate advocate for what he believes in, and he has my respect and friendship. But I ask, in all due respect, after the events of the last few days, when we know that attacker was self-radicalized—and what did he use for it? He used the Internet.

I don't know if that attack could have been prevented, but I know that attacks can be prevented because that is the view of the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Director of the CIA, and the Director of National Intelligence, who are not interested in taking away our liberties but are interested in carrying out their fundamental responsibilities, which happen to be to protect this Nation.

So all I can say to my colleagues is that we need to protect the rights of all of our citizens. We can't intrude in their lives. This constant tension will go on between the right of privacy and national security, and I think there are gray areas we need to debate and come to agreement on finally over time, but this issue is, honestly, a no-brainer.

When the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is probably one of the most respected individuals in America, admired and respected by all of us, is saying this is one of his highest priorities in order to protect America, then I think we should listen to him. When the Director of the CIA says they are planning further attacks on the United States of America and Europe, we should give them the tools they need to prevent that. When the Director of National Intelligence testifies before the Committee on Armed Services that there will be further attacks, shouldn't we give them this rudimentary tool, which, according to the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, was basically an oversight? Shouldn't we correct that, and can't we protect the rights of every individual and every American and still enact this really modest change, which, although in some ways modest, according to the Director of the FBI, is of his highest priorities?

So let's listen. Let's listen to those whom we entrust our Nation's security to after going through the confirmation process and the approval or disapproval of the Members of this body, who are then entrusted with the solemn obligation of defending this Na-

tion. They are saying unanimously that they need this authority in order to carry out their responsibilities.

Mr. President, we are going to vote here in a couple of minutes, and I would urge my colleagues to respect the views—maybe not mine, maybe not the chairman of the Select Committee on Intelligence, but let's respect the views of those who are entrusted with defending this Nation. I believe we should give them this authority.

This debate will go on, I say to my friend from Oregon. There will be other areas where there is tension between the right of every citizen to privacy and the requirement to defend this Nation because we are facing a challenge the likes of which we have never seen before, and that is this whole thing of self-radicalization and people who are sneaking into this country to commit acts of terror, which has the entire American public concerned—San Bernardino, Orlando.

I hope the Senator from Oregon and those who will vote no on this amendment understand that in the view of the experts on terrorism in this world—absolutely are convinced there will be further attacks. Shouldn't we give them this fundamental tool, this basic tool they have asked for? I believe they respect all Americans' right to privacy as well.

I urge my colleagues to vote aye on this amendment, and then we can move on to other ways to help our enforcement agencies and our intelligence agencies defend this Nation against this threat, which is not going away.

Mr. President, I believe my time has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, has all the time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. HEINRICH. I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 4787 to amendment No. 4685 to Calendar No. 120, H.R. 2578, an act making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce and Justice, Science, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Chuck Grassley, Orrin G. Hatch, John Thune, Thad Cochran, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Deb Fischer, Cory Gardner, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 4787, offered by the Senator from Kentucky for the Senator from Arizona, to amendment No. 4685 to H.R. 2578, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—58

| | | |
|-----------|-----------|------------|
| Alexander | Graham | Reed |
| Ayotte | Grassley | Reid |
| Barrasso | Hatch | Risch |
| Blunt | Heitkamp | Roberts |
| Boozman | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Burr | Inhofe | Rubio |
| Capito | Isakson | Sasse |
| Casey | Johnson | Scott |
| Cassidy | King | Sessions |
| Coats | Kirk | Shelby |
| Cochran | Klobuchar | Sullivan |
| Collins | Lankford | Thune |
| Corker | Manchin | Tillis |
| Cornyn | McCain | Toomey |
| Cotton | McCaskill | Vitter |
| Cruz | Mikulski | Warner |
| Enzi | Moran | Whitehouse |
| Ernst | Nelson | Wicker |
| Fischer | Perdue | |
| Flake | Portman | |

NAYS—38

| | | |
|------------|------------|----------|
| Baldwin | Gardner | Murray |
| Bennet | Gillibrand | Paul |
| Blumenthal | Heinrich | Peters |
| Booker | Heller | Sanders |
| Boxer | Hirono | Schatz |
| Brown | Kaine | Schumer |
| Cantwell | Leahy | Shaheen |
| Cardin | Lee | Stabenow |
| Carper | Markey | Tester |
| Coons | McConnell | Udall |
| Daines | Merkley | Warren |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Wyden |
| Franken | Murphy | |

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|----------|-----------|
| Crapo | Feinstein |
| Donnelly | Menendez |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 38.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The Republican leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

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

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

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY BILL

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the heroin and prescription drug epidemic that is tearing families apart and devastating communities in every one of the States represented in this Chamber.

I rise today for the 10th time since this body, the Senate, passed CARA—the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act—by a vote of 94 to 1. It took us 2½ weeks on the floor to get that done. It took 3 years of work to build up the right consensus, but we got it done. The House then proceeded over time to pass 18 separate bills dealing with this issue, and now we are in conference with the House.

As I have said in every speech I have given over the last 10 weeks we have been in session since that time, we need to move and move quickly, and there is no excuse for inaction. I am going to continue to come to the floor and talk to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, leadership on both sides of the Capitol, on this issue until we get it done. Why? Because this is an emergency. This is not just another issue that Congress should take up; this is one that is affecting every single community in America. Sadly, it is getting worse, not better.

Every week when I come to the floor, unfortunately, I come with new news. I come with information that has come to my attention since my previous talk on the floor about what is happening in our communities, and I will do that again today.

There is some good news, and that is that since I spoke on the floor last week, the Senate Appropriations Committee has voted to increase funding to deal with this opioid issue—this is heroin, prescription drugs, and this new fentanyl, which is a synthetic form of heroin that is gripping our communities—and the funding increase was made as a commitment by the Senate Appropriations Committee on a bipartisan basis to have a 93-percent increase in funding as compared to this year.

This year we also saw an increase in funding. Thanks to the leadership of some of the Members in this body, we increased the funding for this year, and we have increased it again for next year. That is the good news, but we have to be sure the money is properly spent.

That is what CARA is about. It is an authorization bill, and it says that going forward, let's be sure we are spending it on evidence-based treatment and recovery that actually works to make a difference to get people back on track; let's be sure we are spending it on the kinds of things that keep people from getting into the funnel of addiction in the first place—again, evidence-based prevention and education; let's be sure we are helping our law enforcement and helping our health officials.

The reason the Fraternal Order of Police strongly supports this legisla-

tion is it helps them in training how to use naloxone and Narcan more effectively and provides them the ability to have that to be able to take these overdose increases we have seen in all of our States—be able to save lives.

So this legislation is comprehensive. It is needed. We now have the funding in place. Should there be more funding? Yes, I think so. But this is an awfully good start, to have a 93-percent increase and an increase already for this year.

There is no excuse for us not getting this conference committee completed and taking the comprehensive Senate bill and merging it with the individual House bills and getting it to the President's desk for his signature. The comprehensive approach is the only way to do this.

The acting U.S. attorney for Northern Ohio said it well. Her name is Carole Rendon. She is involved with it, folks. She is in the trenches. She said: "The only way we can stem this tide is with a comprehensive approach." I couldn't agree more.

A lot of us, including my friends and allies on the outside, are interested in this issue. There are 130 national groups who have supported this legislation. Virtually every group in the country involved in prevention, education, treatment, recovery, and law enforcement has supported this. But they are concerned about the House versions—the 18 separate bills versus the comprehensive bill—because the House versions do not deal effectively with this issue of recovery. Treatment and recovery need to go hand in hand.

By the way, without recovery, the legislation is not comprehensive. It is called the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act for a reason. We know that funding the right kinds of recovery programs will work to help people get back on track and bring their families back together and keep them away from some of the aspects we all know about. The No. 1 cause of accidental death in the State of Ohio is overdoses. It is probably the No. 1 cause of accidental death in the country, from the data we recently received. We have to be sure that recovery works.

CARA offers critical resources to develop recovery support services for individuals and families working to overcome addiction. It promotes recovery programs in high schools and colleges that, sadly, are needed.

At Ohio State University, we happen to have a model recovery program. Sarah Nerad, who is a brave young woman, started it. It is something other schools are now emulating. It started with a couple of people, and it has grown and grown in Ohio State. Recovering addicts can come together and talk among themselves in a support group. These are college students. This is something that has been very helpful at the college and high school level because it is needed.

There are some good ideas in the 18 bills passed by the House that were not

in CARA, and we should incorporate those. One I like particularly is lifting the cap on Suboxone so we can expand the number of patients who can be treated by a doctor for an opioid dependency. Suboxone, like methadone, is one of the treatment methods that are used. That cap should be raised. There seems to be a bipartisan consensus about that.

I am hopeful that we can quickly resolve the differences we have between the House and Senate bills, pick up the good parts of the House bill, keep it comprehensive, and get it to the President's desk for his signature. I am encouraged that the conference is getting going. Last week I thanked Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, for naming the conferees on the Senate side. There has already been a lot of good work done, and now we have the conferees officially named on both sides. Again, there is no excuse for not moving forward.

I was very concerned yesterday when I heard a news report from National Public Radio about a White House meeting with some Democratic Members of Congress about potentially stalling CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. One White House legislative aide is quoted in the story as saying, "We need to slow down the conference enough so that the White House . . . can bring it back to the American people. . . . We need . . . help in slowing it down." The piece went on to say that some of the Democratic Members who went down to the White House "were eager to help" to slow it down. I hope that is not accurate. I can't believe it would be. Delaying might be a good way to score some political points, but it is terrible policy. It is the wrong thing to do, and it is a disservice to the millions of Americans who are suffering across this country from the consequences of addiction and who are waiting for relief. They have been patient so far, but these 130 groups I talked about are getting increasingly impatient, and I don't blame them. I am too. This bill is about saving lives. Delay means the status quo continues.

On average, 129 Americans lose their lives every day. We had 129 families come to the Capitol a few weeks ago to make that point—the CARA family group—to be able to let Members know this is something we need to act on now. Every day five Ohioans, on average, lose their lives. That is one every 12 minutes at the national level. In the 103 days since we passed CARA in this Chamber with a 94-to-1 vote, during those 103 days, that means 12,000 Americans have lost their lives to overdoses from heroin and prescription drugs.

Again, the overdoses don't tell the story. As horrific as that is, it is a much bigger story. It is about all the casualties—people who may not have overdosed and died, but they are casualties. They have been torn apart from their families. They have been torn apart from their work. They have

been driven to crime, such as theft, to support their habit. They do feel as though there is no hope for them. Nine out of ten people who are addicted are not getting treatment. This is happening right now. The price of delay is those people are not getting the help they need. The longer we delay, the longer this epidemic continues to get worse.

Maybe some of those who want to delay CARA don't realize how urgent this crisis is. I know there is a lot going on right now, and maybe they are distracted by other issues. Maybe they don't know the statistics. Maybe they don't know the stories of the families broken up, the lives cut short, or those who are casualties to this. Maybe they don't know the faces behind these statistics.

Again, just since last week when I spoke last time, we have new information that is troubling. We know now that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention is warning that the heroin epidemic is actually driving the threat of HIV and hepatitis C, including in my own area of Southwest Ohio. We now know that. So this is about heroin and prescription drugs, but it is also about hepatitis C, and it is also about HIV.

Maybe they don't know about the drug traffickers sentenced last week in Lima, OH, for trafficking \$300,000 worth of heroin and 20,000 injections' worth of heroin.

Maybe they don't know about Stosh Simcak of Euclid, OH, outside Cleveland. He was a star athlete in soccer and football. He was a charismatic, talented, and joyful young man. In high school, he started to experiment with drugs. He started with marijuana and ecstasy and prescription pain killers. He got addicted to opioids and then turned to heroin because it is less expensive and more available. His relationship with his family suffered, of course, as it almost always does. The drug becomes everything. At times, his relationship was broken altogether. He had a hard time getting a job and keeping a full-time job. Finally, he agreed he needed help. His parents unsuccessfully tried to get him into five different rehabilitation centers. Often there was no room. He was arrested with a felony drug charge. He posted bond and was released. He told his dad Steve in a text message:

I don't want to lose my family. I lost enough already. . . . I want to be the son you can be proud of if it's not too late.

That was the last time Steve ever heard from his son. Within 48 hours, he died of an overdose.

Maybe those who support delaying CARA don't know about Dan Durbin from Delphos, OH. It is a small town. He reports setting up on the front lawn for his daughter's high school graduation party recently and seeing in the alley right next door a heroin deal taking place in front of these high school students.

I know it is an even-numbered year, meaning it is an election year. There is

always another election. But delaying CARA is unacceptable. Partisanship is not going to help people who are suffering to find treatment. It is not going to heal our families. It is not going to educate our kids so they don't become addicted. If we want to show the American people we can accomplish something that really makes our communities better, we will get CARA to the President as soon as possible.

We have kept this legislation completely nonpartisan, not just partisan. We brought in major experts from around the country. We had five conferences over a 3-year period. We gathered ideas from Democrats and Republicans. If anyone had a good idea, we didn't ask where it came from. We asked if it was a good idea, if it would help to address this problem. That is the way things are supposed to work.

We had strong help from the White House Director of National Drug Control Policy, Michael Botticelli, who has stated repeatedly we need a comprehensive solution and was quoted as saying:

There is clear evidence that a comprehensive response looking at multidimensional aspects of this that are embedded in CARA are tremendously important. . . . We know that we need to do more, and I think all of those components put forward in CARA are critically important to make headway in terms of this epidemic.

That is the White House drug czar. I hope the White House staffer who was quoted as saying "Let's delay" actually talks to the drug czar.

Nearly every Democrat in this Chamber voted in support of CARA, and I commend them for that. Democrats were indispensable in crafting it. They were involved at the very start.

SHELDON WHITEHOUSE is the coauthor of this legislation with me. He has a real passion for this. He has a heart for it. He understands the pain these families who lost a loved one feel. He understands the casualties of this epidemic. He gets it.

AMY KLOBUCHAR has also been very involved, KELLY AYOTTE on our side, and others. This has been something from the start—again, not just partisan but nonpartisan. It has been a group effort. That is one reason I think we have received so much good support because we came up with the right ideas. These groups around the country who worked for us on that realize it is going to make a difference.

I have been involved with this issue of drug abuse and addiction for more than two decades. Twenty-two years ago, a mom came to my office and said her son had just died of an overdose. What was I doing? That got me engaged. I am the author of the Drug-Free Communities Act, the Drug-Free Media Campaign Act, and the Drug-Free Workplace Act.

In this Chamber I have been the author of other legislation, including with DIANNE FEINSTEIN, to stop these synthetic drugs and to make sure they are scheduled as illegal drugs. In terms

of prescription drug monitoring, we have tried to help pass legislation on interstate prescription drug monitoring.

But this legislation, this CARA legislation, is what is needed now. There is no good reason to keep these families who are affected waiting.

We can have a conversation about funding. Again, I am for more funding. I have voted that way. This 93-percent increase in funding this year and in the next appropriations bill for next year is a great step forward.

Respectfully, let me just say again that this issue is not like everything else we face around here. This is urgent. We have to move, and we have to move now.

Will it solve the problem? No. The problem is not going to be solved from Washington, but Washington can be a better partner in addressing the issue right now, and it is a growing issue.

Whether I am in a suburb, a rural area, or the inner city in Ohio—no matter where I am, I hear from people about this issue. I have a tele-townhall tonight. I will hear about it.

A few weeks ago in our tele-townhall, a gentleman called in and wanted to talk about the treatment options in CARA. He seemed to know a lot about it. I asked him why he knew so much about this, if he wouldn't mind talking about it, reminding him there were probably 25,000 people on the call at the time and that he was being heard by a lot of people. He told his story, which unfortunately was a story you hear way too commonly in my State of Ohio. His daughter—in and out of treatment and, in her case, in and out of the criminal justice system—had decided to seek treatment. She went, she couldn't get in, and 14 days later she died of an overdose.

According to one poll, 3 in 10 Ohioans know someone who is struggling with an opioid addiction. Family members, friends, coworkers, fellow parishioners, their neighbors—those family members are hurting too. It is almost unbearable to watch a loved one suffer through this disease, and it is a disease in that it requires treatment.

Ohioans are taking action—and appropriate action too. I commend them for that.

In Warren, OH, the Braking Point Recovery Center recently held its annual Walk Against Heroin. Nicholas Story and Emily Smith, who are in recovery from addiction, bravely spoke at that rally about their experiences and how this epidemic is affecting them. Nicholas spoke about how much happier he is now that he is in recovery, saying: "My life has improved so much it is amazing." Emily talked about how her mother, some of her cousins, and friends have suffered from addiction. Some have died of overdoses. I commend them for having the courage to speak up and to spread awareness about this epidemic.

Raymond Sansota of Euclid, OH, also spoke about losing his son, Josh, to a

heroin addiction. He was a star athlete, played point guard, and was a 4-year letterman in high school. He was an acolyte in his Catholic parish. He was known for his sense of humor, for his musical and artistic talents. He had a good job at a rubber company in Middlefield, OH, but he became addicted to prescription drug painkillers. Eventually, like so many others, he switched to the less expensive, more accessible option, which was heroin. He overdosed at the age of 31.

Raymond, thank you for speaking up. At Barnesville High School in Barnesville, OH, OhioHealth Services, Barnesville Hospital, and Crossroads Counseling Services held a townhall about the heroin epidemic, bringing together doctors, lawyers, law enforcement, and public health officials.

Judge Frank Fregiato spoke there, and he said: "Rich, poor, black, white, educated, non-educated, political, non-political, whatever you are, your family is at risk."

He is right. That is why we can't afford to delay.

Today I was talking to two high school principals who came to me at our weekly coffee in Ohio. They informed me they had lost six of their recent graduates to this issue and that they are holding a townhall on this subject soon at that high school.

On Saturday, in Stark County, dozens of motorcyclists participated in the second annual Families Against The Heroin Epidemic Rally in Stark. Families Against The Heroin Epidemic Rally is also F.A.T.H.E.R.S.; F.A.T.H.E.R.S. is the acronym. These fathers and those who support them raised money for addiction treatment, for treatment for education, and for law enforcement. I thank everyone who participated in this motorcycle ride and everyone who is doing their part to stop this epidemic.

That event was founded by Larry and Kara Vogt of Perry Township. Their sons had recovered from a heroin addiction, and he is in transitional housing. As Larry puts it: "If you aren't affected by this now, you will be."

I know the scope of this epidemic can sometimes feel overwhelming, but there is hope. There are many stories of people who have found themselves in the funnel of this addiction, the grip of this addiction, and have found hope through treatment and recovery. There are many who are now helping others to get treatment.

Michael Evans of Columbus, OH, is an example of that. He had chronic back pain. He had Percocet and OxyContin and became addicted. Now he is helping others. He has been clean and sober for more than a year. He is beating it because he got treatment.

Again, it is time for us to act. Again, I have told stories just from the last week of what is happening around the country and in my home State of Ohio. There is no excuse. We need to act quickly to find common ground, to get a comprehensive bill to the President

so it can start to help those millions who are struggling. Delay is not an option.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for such time as I may consume as in morning business.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me just say that my friend from Ohio is truly passionate.

In the years I have been here, I have not heard of anyone who is stronger and has a better understanding of this issue than the Senator from Ohio. I find myself listening as he speaks and reflecting.

I hear the same things. It is not just in Ohio; it is in my meetings that I have in Oklahoma. I am glad he has that passion, pleased he does, and I wish him success.

Mr. PORTMAN. I thank the Senator.

MASS SHOOTING IN ORLANDO AND FIGHTING
TERRORISM

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have to get on the record after the events of the last week and the claims that some of my colleagues made on the Senate floor and that the mainstream media have published about the horrific event in Orlando.

Before we had all the facts about what happened in Orlando last Sunday, people on the left were blaming Congress, and people on the left were blaming Republicans. They were blaming all gun owners who were out there, and they were blaming anyone they could think of for this terrorist attack. The actual person responsible for killing 49 people that day is Omar Mateen, an Islamic terrorist.

There is something wrong with this aversion they have to talking about the real cause of these tragedies that are going on right now around the Nation. By immediately politicizing this act of terrorism, the left has denied the victims, their families, and their friends our full attention and our care. They have denied the Nation a period of mourning for those we lost at the hands of a terrorist who pledged allegiance to the Islamic state.

Last week my colleagues on the other side of the aisle participated in a filibuster against gun rights, and they have continued to demonize those who still believe in the Constitution and the rights that it protects. I am not just talking about gun rights, I am talking about the right to due process, the right to be innocent until proven guilty.

In fact, in their effort to twist this act of terrorism into a need to curtail our constitutional rights, the Washington Post—we are talking about the Washington Post. That is not one of the more conservative publications around. They gave the arguments that they were using against guns three out

of four Pinocchios for the way that they falsely twisted information to fit their narrative. Pinocchio means they have studied it, they have looked at it, and they have decided what they said wasn't true.

The left was given a chance for the Senate to vote on their gun control proposals, which would not have prevented this terrorist act from happening, and their proposals ultimately failed to progress in the Senate. Meanwhile, Democrats voted against the amendments that would strengthen our gun laws and keep guns out of the hands of terrorists while protecting the rights of due process.

Over the past week, you have heard my friends on the left say that if you can't fly, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. Well, this sounds good, and a lot of the media has kind of bought into this idea, but you can't take away the fact that flying is a privilege in this country and gun ownership is a right that is guaranteed by the Constitution. That is a huge difference. You cannot take away a constitutionally protected right without notice and a fair and impartial hearing.

Denying someone their civil rights based on secret lists is unconstitutional. I think everyone knows that, and it will be struck down by the courts. Everybody knows that, but it sounds so good right now to say everyone is going to want to be for gun control. One of the things people forget is they are trying to pass laws that are going to offend the rights of gun owners when, by definition, a criminal breaks laws, a terrorist breaks laws. Consequently, you would have only those individuals who are law-abiding citizens complying with the law.

It is a very simple concept. Again, everyone knows that, but given the irrefutable evidence of Mateen's motivations, many wonder why the administration, supported by the Democrats, is so focused on policies that don't address the core cause of this horrific act—terrorism and the influence of radical Islam here in the United States of America.

The answer is simple. Focusing on the root cause and Mateen's motivations will only further expose the fact that the policies of this administration, supported by most of his own party in Congress, have been a complete failure. Time and again, the President's rhetoric on ISIL, terrorism, and the threat to America is proven wrong in reality.

In January of 2014, the President referred to ISIL as a JV squad and downplayed their threat and influence. Yet just 4 days before he dismissed ISIL as a minor player in the Middle East, they had captured and raised the flag over Fallujah, where our marines fought and died.

My State director is Brian Hackler. I first met Brian Hackler when I was in Fallujah. That was right after—we all remember; I am sure the Presiding Officer remembers—they were taking the

fingerprints of the heroic people who were risking their lives to vote over there, and we won in Fallujah. It was like World War II, door-to-door combat. We actually won.

Brian Hackler came back. I hired him after he came back. He is doing a great job for me now. When I called him and I had to tell him that we had lost Fallujah after we had Fallujah in our hands, he literally cried. He had friends who died over there.

Furthermore, the President failed to recognize the threat posed by the Muslim Brotherhood. President Obama created the vacuum in the Middle East that gave rise to ISIL.

He downplayed Benghazi. I remember he tried to blame it on a video. I can remember that because I talked to James Clapper, and I talked to all of the intelligence people right after that happened. I did so because of my position at that time as ranking member on the Armed Services Committee. They all said at the time of Benghazi they knew that it was a terrorist attack. It had nothing to do with the video.

The President also said that ISIL was contained hours before the attack on Paris.

The threat to our country and our security is increasing—Fort Hood, Boston, San Bernardino, and now Orlando. The attacks are not the fault of the West, they are the fault of radical Islam. Somehow the administration can't say it. They can't say radical Islam.

Most recently we heard from the White House that ISIL is retreating. This is from President Obama—that ISIL is retreating, it is declining and losing territory and losing funds, but just last week CIA Director John Brennan testified before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, and he said: "Our efforts have not reduced ISIL's terrorism capability and global reach." Furthermore, Brennan went on to say: "ISIL is probably exploring a variety of means for infiltrating operatives into the West, including the refugee flows, smuggling routes and the legitimate methods of travel."

That is a quote from him. So we have the President on one hand saying it is contained, we are successful, ISIL is disappearing, at the same time the CIA Director he appointed is telling us the truth—that we are losing, and this is serious.

I have looked back wistfully at the good old days of the Cold War. I never thought I would say "the good old days of the Cold War," but in reality we are in a much greater threatened position today than we ever were in the Cold War. In the Cold War, we had two superpowers. We knew what they had. They knew what we had. We were predictable. It was mutually assured destruction. That doesn't mean anything anymore. These people want to break the law.

It was incredible testimony John Brennan gave before the Senate com-

mittee, in light of the administration's talking points, and it should have all of us seeking ways to ensure they are not successful. However, policy proposals to combat these threats—extra vetting of the refugees, pausing the refugee program, the stepping up of border protection and enforcing our immigrations laws through visa enforcement—are all ignored by this administration. They would rather paint us, the Republicans, as arms dealers to terrorists and yet remain silent on the President's deal with Iran, the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism.

I can remember when the President, with the Secretary of State, put together the deal with Iran. This was going to see Iran all of a sudden change. Today, Iran is still the chief supplier of terrorist activity around the world. Yet we released billions of dollars to them through this deal that was made.

It is interesting. I happened to be on the USS—I can't remember which one it was, one of the aircraft carriers in the Persian Gulf at the same time this deal was being put together by the President and by the Secretary of State. That is when we found that there was an Iranian ship that was carrying weapons from North Korea to Yemen at the very time they were pledging their love for us and they were working with us in this program.

Their deal with Iran is giving them the resources necessary to support terrorism. ISIL and similar radical groups seek to extinguish our freedoms and to terrorize, kill, and oppress anyone who lives counter to their extreme ideology. No matter how they carry out their evil, their mission will always be superseded by our Nation's laws. We have to protect the Constitution, support law-abiding citizens' rights to due process and to bear arms and to focus on the real threat: Islamic terrorism, radical Islam.

I just wish the administration would talk about this—this greatest threat to our Nation. We are doing something—though this is totally unrelated, but it is something that happened in my State of Oklahoma earlier this week. Earlier this week, the county commissioners in my city of Tulsa and in my State of Oklahoma voted to renew a memorandum of understanding with ICE—that is Immigration and Customs Enforcement—to detain their inmates and train local deputies to refer threats of violent criminals to the Federal authorities.

Entering into a memorandum of understanding—an MOU—had been a routine procedure until last week, when it was derailed by illegal immigrant activists—the same type of activists we see across the country pushing sanctuary policies, policies to give sanctuary to terrorists and policies to protect criminal aliens, allowing them to continue committing crimes against our citizens such as the one we saw with the murder of Kate Steinle in San Francisco almost a year ago.

Law enforcement across the country takes part in this program so they can do their job of keeping criminals off the streets. However, their efforts are continually frustrated by liberal activists seeking to shield those same criminals from the consequences of their actions. We should stand with our friends in law enforcement, in their communities, who are working every day to ensure our safety and the safety of others.

Whether criminal immigrants are here illegally or legally, it should not be controversial to deny them the privilege of staying in our country, and we should remove them from our communities until they are removed from our country. When we refuse to do it, we reward their behavior and give them an opportunity to continue to commit violent crimes.

Why is this such a big deal? In 2014—and people heard this way back in 2014 but they have forgotten it. During the year of 2014, the Obama administration released over 30,000 criminal aliens from custody, and by July of last year—so now we are talking about in the first 6 months after they released 30,000 criminal aliens—1,800 of them went on to commit over 2,500 new crimes.

That may not be believable, and because it is not believable, a lot of people don't believe it, but it actually happened. It is a fact the Obama administration released over 30,000 criminal aliens, and 6 months later, 1,800 of them—that we know of, probably more than that—went on to commit crimes. Instead of deporting people who shouldn't be here, the administration released them back onto our streets, where they committed new, preventable crimes, including assault, sex offenses, kidnappings, and even homicide.

Between 2010 and 2015, we had 135 preventable homicides occur in our communities across the country by criminal aliens who had been released by this administration. Now, this is very difficult to believe, and certainly it is not acceptable. The excuse the administration uses is two little known Supreme Court cases that determined criminal aliens cannot be detained in the United States for more than 6 months while awaiting deportation. However, there are many factors which can prevent a deportation from taking place within the 6-month period.

It is interesting that excuse is being used, and in order to take away this excuse, I introduced the Keep Our Communities Safe Act during the past two Congresses, and I am introducing it today as an amendment—amendment No. 4732—to the CJS appropriations bill. This legislation would allow the Department of Homeland Security to petition the courts to hold a criminally convicted alien for a renewable 6-month period until deportation occurs, if the Secretary deems the alien would be a threat to national security or the safety of the community, among other reasons.

We are talking about communities. This is back home. This is my community. This is where this is happening and throughout America. Some organizations, such as the ACLU and other liberal organizations, believe this bill amounts to indefinite detention, in violation of a criminal's due process rights. However, in addition to the specified circumstances of continued detention I just mentioned, this bill requires the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security—that is what they are supposed to be doing—to recertify the person is a threat every 6 months. In other words, if this person is a threat, rather than automatically turning them loose in 6 months, he can recertify the fact they are a threat and every 6 months continue to keep them. Furthermore, an alien can submit evidence for review of his or her detention and will still have access to our courts, giving judges a say in the process.

We were unable to get this added in the last 2 years. I can't imagine, after all the things that have happened just this year—and of course right on the heels of the disaster that just happened—I can't imagine people wouldn't want to do this, do everything they can to keep from turning these people loose.

I go back and repeat that this administration turned loose 30,000 criminal aliens onto the streets—this was in the year of 2014—and in the first 6 months in the following year, they had actually committed more crimes.

So there is this thing about turning people loose. It is very similar to what the administration is doing in Gitmo. We passed a law, actually in the committee.

Let me make an inquiry of the Chair. Are we on a time requirement here?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). No, Senator, we are not.

Mr. INHOFE. The Presiding Officer is a member of the Committee on Armed Services who may very well remember when we passed a law, and that law said the President was not going to be able to release anyone from Gitmo until 30 days' notice is given to the Senate Committee on Armed Services. The President signed that bill and a matter of hours later released the Taliban Five.

Everybody remembers the Taliban Five. They were the most egregious of all the terrorists who were in Gitmo. We don't know what they are doing now. Supposedly they are in Qatar or someplace under some supervision, but it happens that the recidivism rate of those who have been released from Gitmo is 30 percent. In other words, 30 percent of those released are back trying to kill Americans again.

It is unacceptable, and it is very similar to this. Whether it is releasing people—terrorists from Gitmo—to go out and kill Americans or releasing people who are criminal aliens from our cities and towns, it is a problem, a serious problem, and we are going to have to address this problem, and we are going to address it.

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

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

COMPROMISE GUN LEGISLATION

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to discuss the pending legislation that would prevent terrorists from being able to legally purchase guns. This general topic of background checks for legal firearms sales is not new to me. It is an issue I have been wrestling with for some years now. Shortly after the horrific murders at Sandy Hook Elementary School, my Democratic colleague, Senator JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia, and I teamed up and worked together and produced a bipartisan bill designed to ensure that we would do background checks for commercial gun sales. So if someone wants to buy a firearm through a commercial mechanism—not a private transaction, like from a sibling or a neighbor or friend, but a commercial sale—they would be subject to a background check so that for the very criminals who have forfeited their Second Amendment rights and those who are dangerously mentally ill who also should not have guns, we would find a mechanism to prevent the sales. That was legislation that I worked on with Senator MANCHIN. As I said, it was bipartisan. It still marks the closest the Senate has come to passing legislation dealing with background checks in a meaningful way in quite some time. But we were not successful. It did not pass.

Then on June 12, we saw the worst terror attack on American soil since 9/11, an unbelievable massacre in Orlando that left 49 people dead and another 53 grievously wounded. It has raised the question of whether now there is an opportunity to do something to make it illegal—make it more difficult, if not impossible—for a terrorist whom we already deem to be too dangerous to board a plane to buy a firearm.

There are other things we need to be doing—a lot of other things we need to be doing—to keep us safe from the terrorists who want to kill Americans. We need to take stronger measures to keep them from entering the United States in the first place. We need to make sure they can't escape detention and capture. We need to make sure that local law enforcement is cooperating with Federal law enforcement and DHS folks. There are a lot of things we can do.

But one of the things we can do is the very simple measure that the Collins legislation addresses. This is too important an issue to be partisan. I took to the Senate floor last week to urge my colleagues. We had a number of our

Democratic colleagues engaging in a filibuster, in an impassioned series of speeches about how important it was that we do something. My message was simply this: Let's stop talking, and let's actually do it. Let's actually find the mechanism, find the solution here.

There are two aspects we need to consider, in my view, in this legislation. One is that we want to block a terrorist from buying a firearm. I don't think that should be terribly controversial. But the second thing that is also very important to me—and I think to many of our colleagues—is to make sure that an innocent American who is wrongly put on the list has the opportunity to clear his or her name so that their Second Amendment rights are not infringed upon. That is the challenge, it seems to me, and it is not rocket science. This is something we can do.

So I actually drafted a bill that does that. I think the bill works very, very well. Senator COLLINS took a different approach and used a different mechanism for getting the same result. In the end, Senator COLLINS has legislation now that has significant bipartisan support. It is a compromise bill that I think strikes the right balance. As I announced yesterday, I intend to support her legislation. There is no question—it is an objective fact—that if Senator COLLINS' legislation becomes law, the Attorney General will have a tool that the Attorney General does not have today. It is a tool that will stop terrorists from being able to legally buy a gun. It is as simple as that. That is what it does. Importantly, to me and to many of my colleagues, it also provides the mechanisms whereby an innocent law-abiding American who is wrongly put on a no-fly list will be able to clear his or her name. I think that is very, very important.

The starting point for the Collins legislation is that if you are on the no-fly list, then you don't get to buy a gun. Now, let's think about this. If we deem a person to be so dangerous that we deny them the opportunity to board a commercial plane, should we really allow that person to walk down the street, walk into a firearms dealer, and buy an AR-15? I don't think that makes sense. I think most of us probably agree. That is a short list, actually, of people we deem to be so dangerous that we don't let them board a plane. It is pretty sensible, from my point of view, to also preclude a firearms purchase.

Then we have the selectee list. That is a separate list that subjects people to enhanced scrutiny because there is serious suspicion. It doesn't quite rise to the level of the no-fly list, but there is serious suspicion. So those people also would be denied a firearm. Now, as with the approach that I took, Senator COLLINS' legislation has a whole series of procedures, policies, and mechanisms to ensure that if someone is wrongly put on this list, they will have a way to get off the list. We know for

a fact that eventually some people will be put wrongly on the list because people make mistakes. Governments make mistakes. In fact, someone could even try to abuse the list. So we need to have a mechanism to make sure that an innocent person can have their name taken off. Senator COLLINS, I think, achieves that. She creates an adversarial challenge mechanism in court where the burden of proof is on the Federal Government to prove that the individual who has been denied the opportunity to buy a gun should be denied that—in other words, that the person is properly on the list. As in my legislation, if the individual succeeds in his challenge—if he says: I was denied the opportunity to buy this firearm; I am not the John Smith that you think I am and here is my proof—and the person wins, the U.S. Government would pay all of his reasonable attorney's fees and costs, as should be the case. The person shouldn't be financially penalized for simply clearing his or her own name.

Also, there needs to be a meaningful deadline for a court to make a decision. In the case of the Collins legislation it is 14 days. Otherwise, a court case could go on indefinitely. That wouldn't be right, either.

So the bottom line is simple. This legislation is a sensible, reasonable way to achieve the balance that I have been calling for—to make it illegal for a suspected terrorist, someone we won't allow to board a plane, to buy a gun, and, at the same time, to create a mechanism for someone wrongly put on the list to clear their name.

Last week we had quite a number of our colleagues down here on the Senate floor. As I said, they were giving impassioned speeches about how essential it was that we do something. What we are going to find out is whether that was sincere or whether that was political. That is what we are going to find out because this legislation achieves exactly what our colleagues said they wanted. It may not do it in exactly the same fashion in every little detail. It is not exactly the same as the legislation I have proposed. But it is bipartisan.

There are, at last count, at least five Members of the Democratic caucus who are on this bill. There are at least a comparable number of Republicans. There are probably more who are going to support this. It is really going to be a test of whether this body is serious about what it says it is serious about—whether the folks who came down here and gave impassioned speeches about how important it is we do something really want to get something done, or do they want a political message to run ads about? I hope it is the former.

I hope we are going to be able to get something done. As to Senator COLLINS and the other Senators she worked with, I appreciate the input she took from me and my office to craft a sensible, workable compromise bill that has bipartisan support that will achieve those two important goals of

making sure that the bad guys can't buy guns and the good guys get a chance to clear their name and don't have their Second Amendment rights infringed. That is what this is about.

We need to have a vote on this, and we need to have a vote soon. I hope we will have a vote this week. But this is an opportunity for this body to take a big step forward and get something done with a bipartisan compromise bill that makes a lot of sense. We are going to have a test, and I hope this Chamber will pass the test.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to start by thanking my colleague, Senator MIKULSKI, for her leadership in the fight for equal pay for equal work. It has been 50 years since the signing of the Equal Pay Act. But despite how far women have come, despite all the progress women have made and the ways women contribute across our economy, women still only make 79 cents on the dollar. The gap is even wider for women of color: for African-American women, 60 cents on the dollar; for Native American women, 59 cents on the dollar; and for Hispanic women, 55 cents on the dollar.

This status quo is not only deeply unfair to women, but it is also bad for families and it is bad for our economy because today 60 percent of working families rely on wages from two earners. We have to do better. That is why I was so pleased when earlier this year the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission took a very important step in the right direction with a modest proposal to collect pay data on a form that employers already submit in order to accomplish one goal—making sure that we have solid information about how employers pay their male and female workers.

This proposal is pretty straightforward. It brings new and much needed transparency to workplaces and might even help businesses address pay gaps that they weren't even aware existed. It would also make enforcement of pay discrimination laws more effective and efficient. Especially when it comes to an issue like wage discrimination, I would like to think it would be hard to argue against more transparency and more effective enforcement because when women are not getting equal pay for equal work, we should be able to find out about it and we should be able to fix it.

It is disappointing that Republicans in both the House and the Senate are opposing that proposal. That is absolutely the wrong approach. What makes this even more surprising is that just weeks ago I was very proud to stand right here to introduce a resolution in the Senate calling for equal pay for equal work for the U.S. women's national soccer team. It was a resolution that recognized the impact of the wage gap on women and the need to fix it, and it passed by voice vote.

Given that the Senate was able to agree on the seriousness of this problem, I would like to give all my colleagues an opportunity today to take another step forward—not backward—on equal pay for equal work. I have filed an amendment that would provide much needed new resources to ensure this important proposal can be implemented and finalized as quickly as possible. I urge our colleagues to support the amendment and oppose efforts by some in the Republican Party to stand in the way of better information and enforcement on pay equity.

It should go without saying, but if a woman still isn't getting equal pay in the 21st century, she deserves to know and she deserves action. This rule would take critical steps in the right direction for women, families, and our country as a whole, and I hope that our Republican colleagues will not stand in its way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I rise as an enthusiastic supporter of the Murray amendment requiring the EEOC to implement the change recommended by President Obama that would add compensation data to its employment data form, and also to provide it with \$1 million to be able to pay for its implementation.

First, I would like to salute the Senator from Washington State, who has been a longstanding and assertive advocate of equal pay for equal work for women. I thank her for her ongoing, persistent advocacy.

I so admire this amendment, which insists we develop even better tools to pinpoint those companies with over 100 employees in terms of their pay.

The Senator from Washington State was right there when we passed the Lilly Ledbetter bill. She has been right there as we tried to move to the next step on the Paycheck Fairness Act, and now today she is here to implement the EEOC rule that would also help to do the kind of work we need to do to ensure that the Equal Pay Act of 1963, a major civil rights law which guaranteed equal pay for equal work, is enforced. We spent days talking about enforcement of civil rights laws. Let's enforce the law passed over 50 years ago to guarantee equal pay for equal work.

Here is a quick history. The Lilly Ledbetter bill kept the courthouse door open for when people wanted to file wage discrimination based on gender claims. That courthouse door was slammed in the face of Lilly and other women who found out too late about what they were paid. We kept the courthouse door open. Then, we introduced the Paycheck Fairness Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act would get rid of the other barriers to women getting equal pay for equal work.

One of the biggest barriers is that pay is kept a secret. One of the biggest secrets in the United States, other than national security, is what women

get paid in the workplace. Let's keep it our little secret, they say. In fact, in many instances, you have to sign an agreement in order to be hired that you will not disclose your pay to another worker. If you do, you can be fired.

We are not talking about small businesses. We are not talking about those mom-and-pop stores like my dad's grocery store. But I can assure you that my father paid equal pay for equal work to my mother. But in January, our President—President Obama—announced that the EEOC would add compensation data to its employment data form that companies must submit annually that will help shed light on the wage gap across geographic regions and industries.

Our colleague from Tennessee, the distinguished Senator, Mr. ALEXANDER, has introduced an amendment preventing this change from going into effect. We had dueling amendments. I am for the Murray amendment. It requires the EEOC to implement the Obama change and provides \$1 million to do it.

What is the EEO-1 form? It is the employer information report that requires companies to submit information annually about their employees based on race, ethnicity, gender, and job category. So it is equal pay, equal work. The form helps identify and prevent discrimination and protects employees' civil rights.

In January, President Obama announced that companies with over 100 employees—remember, this is over 100 employees—must include compensation data on their EEO-1 form that would identify the wage gap based on gender and ethnicity across regions. This change has been strongly supported by many of us, and I support it.

Much is said about the President overreaching. I don't get it. Sometimes—often, the President is being criticized on the other side of the aisle for not doing too much—that he is not a leader, that he is not a fighter, that he is not a champion. I take exception to that. I think he is a leader. I think he is a fighter, and I think he is a champion, and he certainly has been that on behalf of the empowerment of women and girls. What did he do? He exercised his Executive authority to declare that the EEOC action on pay data collection would do this. The EEOC, in partnership with Department of Labor, has a proposal to annually collect summary pay data—as I said, in addition to gender, race, and ethnicity, which it already collects—from companies with over 100 employees. This proposal would cover 63 million employees. It stems from a recommendation of the President's Equal Pay Task Force in a Presidential memorandum issued in 2014. It will help focus public enforcement of equal pay laws and provide better insight into discriminatory pay practices across industries.

Today the EEOC is proposing revisions to its longstanding form to require these companies, not just con-

tractors, to provide this information. It would go across 10 job categories and 12 pay bands, but it would not require the reporting of specific salaries of individual employees. Remember, the report is on the basis of job category and pay band. We won't know if Suzy Smith gets paid more or less than Sam Jones. What we will know is what they are paying computer operators. We will know what they are paying lab technicians. These are jobs that tend to be gender neutral. We will know if you are working in a call center or a firm that employs 100 people that you would be able to do it. Remember, it covers 63 million people.

The proposal is broader than one that was originally published by the Department of Labor, and it lays important groundwork for progress towards achieving equal pay. It will encourage and facilitate greater voluntary compliance by employers dealing with existing Federal pay law. It will also assist the EEOC, and in case of contractors, in better focusing investigations on employers that are unlawfully short-changing workers based on gender, race, or ethnicity. It wouldn't go into effect until September 2017.

Why is this important? It covers only companies of 100 or more employees. It will affect 63 million people. Nobody's personal privacy will be impinged upon because it is information with job category and pay band. But it will show, first of all, which are the good-guy companies. These become the best places to work. My gosh, this can be a small recruitment tool. You go to work for X company, and they do pay equal pay for equal work. But if it has been a persistent pattern of egregious violation of unequal pay for doing the same job, it enables sparse resources at the EEOC to be targeted.

One, I say cheers to President Obama for taking leadership to get to the real facts of the matter, and to pinpoint who the egregious violators are that employ more than 100 people. So, again, there is no negative impact on small business, and it gives no personal information, but does give corporate information. I think the Obama action was outstanding, and I think the Murray amendment defending the Obama action is exactly what is needed on this bill to take the very important steps of ensuring the enforcement of civil rights laws passed by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson that said equal pay for equal work.

I am sure there will be additional debate on this issue.

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

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

CLIMATE CHANGE AND FOSSIL FUELS

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, global warming is the most grave concern facing human civilization on this planet. We are the first generation to see the impact, and that impact is occurring in so many ways right before us.

In my home State of Oregon, we are seeing the impact on our forests, which has resulted in a longer and drier fire season that burns more acreage and has more lightning strikes. We are seeing smaller snowpacks, and that is having an impact on our agriculture and trout streams. Everyone realizes that a smaller, warmer stream is not a pleasant place for trout to thrive. We are even seeing it in our Pacific Ocean oysters. The oysters are having trouble reproducing. They are having troubling reproducing because the ocean is more acidic. Because of the wave action, the oceans have absorbed a lot of the carbon dioxide, which has become carbonic acid, and the carbonic acid affects the formation of shells. These impacts are having a steady, detrimental impact, and it is occurring right before our eyes. It is affecting our fishing, farming, and forestry, and it is an assault on our resources. It is incumbent on all of us, this generation, to address these issues.

What we know is that the impacts we have seen in Oregon are being echoed in States across the country and nations across the globe. If you go to the Northeast, you might hear folks talking about how the moose are dying because the ticks aren't being killed by winters that are cold enough. You might hear about the migration of lobsters going north to find colder water, and so on and so forth. We are seeing it everywhere.

We know that in order to prevent the temperature of the planet from going up more than 2 degrees Centigrade, which is about 3.6 degrees Fahrenheit, we have to leave the vast bulk of our proven fossil fuel reserves in the ground. In other words, we have seen a 1-degree increase in temperature Centigrade, which is about 1.8 degrees Fahrenheit—almost 2 degrees—and that has come from burning fossil fuels. If we keep burning them, it will have a devastating impact and will burn up the planet. We have to stop and quickly pivot off of fossil fuels.

We have identified vast reserves of gas, oil, and coal across the planet, which is worth a lot of money, so of course the owners want to pull it out of the ground and sell it to be burned. Somehow we have to find the political will to take this on and leave 80 percent of those proven fossil fuel reserves in the ground. That is the magnitude of the challenge, and we can do all kinds of things that will help. We can produce more renewable energy, we can produce more conservation, and we can proceed to find ways to pull carbon out of smokestacks and store it in the ground, or at least we can try. We need to approach it from every possible angle.

I will keep coming to the floor, as I have before, to talk about keeping it in the ground. I especially wanted to emphasize that because when we simply talk about saving energy—like putting more insulation in a building, installing double-pane windows, or better mileage for cars—we aren't embracing the size of the challenge we are facing. It is an extraordinarily difficult challenge, and it is up to our generation to address it.

When I come to the floor, sometimes I will be speaking about the math behind the temperature increase, such as how the amount of carbon dioxide and methane in the air is changing the atmosphere of our planet. Other times I will be talking about the calamities we are seeing on the ground, things I have already mentioned, such as the pine beetles that are thriving because the winter is not cold enough to kill the pine beetles and ticks or the coral reefs that are bleaching across our planet. I will also highlight emerging technologies because we have to realize that as much as we talk about the problem, we also have to talk about efforts to address the problem. I will pick out various ideas and efforts that are appearing in our newspapers and scientific literature, and that is what I will do today.

The first innovation I will highlight today is about a strategy in Iceland to store carbon dioxide in the ground. This is one of the carbon capture strategies. This is not easy to do, and there are many different scientists working on different ways to attempt to capture carbon, but this is a new one, so I thought it merited discussion.

Scientists at Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University invented a way to store carbon dioxide. It was invented here in America at Columbia University. They have found a way to store carbon dioxide by first dissolving the gas in water and then storing that water in rocks, where it reacts to form the mineral calcite. The calcite will then store the carbon dioxide as a solid deep underground.

This project at Columbia University being experimented with in Iceland is called CarbFix. They pumped about 250 tons of carbon dioxide, which was mixed with water, into rocks in 2012. When they came back in 2014, they found that 95 percent of the carbon dioxide had become calcite. While there are some very specific requirements to make this particular technology work, such as the right kind of rock, the right amount of water, and the carbon dioxide being generated close to the right kind of rocks, it is an example of innovative technology that could prove useful as another tool in the fight against climate change.

A second idea that is starting to expand is to recognize that we can put solar panels in a variety of places—not just on the ground and on our rooftops but also on bodies of water. This was reported in May 2016. This is referred to as floating solar.

Here we have a lake, and we can see these floating solar panels. Floating solar panels have several potential advantages over land-based panels. One advantage is more efficient cooling, and a second is that they might create less of an eyesore for the public. They might prevent surface water from evaporating, which can be a side effect that would be useful.

Japanese, Australian, and U.S. companies are currently pursuing this technology.

There is a planned array—50,904 panels floating on the Yamakura Dam reservoir in Japan. It would generate 16,000 megawatt hours annually, or to translate that to something more understandable, they could power 5,000 homes for a year, so it is significant. In the United States, there is a winery in California, and it goes by the name of Far Niente. They have combined both land and water arrays, and that combination produces 477 kilowatts of electricity at its peak. It is expected to pay for itself by 2020, or maybe sooner, so it has a high rate of return. These floating panels provide an opportunity for cheaper, out-of-the-way energy generation that has the potential to protect reservoirs from evaporation and water loss.

We must continue to invest and encourage innovative technologies—floating solar panels are one example—to make renewable energy adaptable to all environments, usable all over the world.

I thought I would highlight a third technology. One of the biggest uses of fossil fuel is vehicles. Vehicles burn gasoline and diesel. Oftentimes when the vehicle finally gets up to speed, it suddenly has to brake for a red light. Let's say you are traveling at 35 miles per hour on an urban road and you suddenly stop. You are wasting enormous amounts of energy. All of the momentum with that mass—that car or truck—traveling down the road is then converted primarily into heat through your brakes. That heat is lost, and it is not recaptured.

Along the way, as different companies started exploring electric cars, they said: We already have electric motors. We already have a battery sizable enough to accommodate quite a bit of electricity. Why don't we try to capture that energy from the braking process and put it back in the battery?

What they do is they utilize magnets, and as the magnets go through a field, that field creates resistance, it produces a current, and that current—those electrons are stored in the battery. This is called regenerative braking, and we have seen this on a variety of electric cars. It just makes sense, since they already have an electric drive and they have the batteries to accommodate it.

We have seen a lot of interest in electric cars. Recently, Tesla put out an invitation for people to put down \$1,000 and get in line to buy their Model 3. They had the Roadster, they had the

Model S, and now the Model 3. The Model 3 will be cost competitive with the Chevy Volt. It is going to be much cheaper than their previous cars. Their waiting list has already grown beyond 400,000 people—an enormous, unprecedented response.

Tesla cars, like the Volt and other electric cars, use regenerative braking, but what I wanted to highlight today is an effort to apply this in new ways.

UPS, the United Parcel Service, has a fleet of delivery trucks and they have invested in hybrid electric vehicles and they have used regenerative braking. Last October, they announced the deployment of 18 new delivery vehicles that use regenerative braking to reach pretty much close to a zero-emissions status. They have to take into account the source of the initial electrons that are used to charge the trucks.

In their announcement, they estimated those 18 delivery trucks, by using clean technologies, would save 1.1 million gallons of diesel fuel over 20 years. When we start talking about anything that includes the word "million," such as 1 million gallons, that is a lot of savings from just 18 delivery trucks.

Even more recently, we have an article in which Mack Trucks is developing the ability to use regenerative braking on garbage trucks. They have developed a new electric hybrid garbage truck. It incorporates a powertrain technology developed by Wrightspeed.

Wrightspeed powertrains use electric motors to drive the wheels of the trucks, and the motors are powered by batteries on board the trucks, which are then recharged from the regenerative braking when the garbage truck comes to a stop.

The point is, when you have a very heavy truck that accelerates and stops often, it wastes a vast amount of energy, and now they are working to design an effective drive train to recapture that energy. The founder of Wrightspeed, Ian Wright, says this new technology can power these vehicles for a substantial distance, and very heavy vehicles—66,000 pounds—it can power them up pretty steep hills. A 40-percent grade is a very steep hill.

The main point is, it is capturing that energy that would otherwise be lost every time they stop. If you have watched a garbage truck go down the street, it stops, the men and women on board jump off, pick up the garbage cans, dump them into the truck, and then they accelerate and four houses later they are stopping again. So this is a very appropriate application.

I wonder how much energy would be saved if every car in America had regenerative braking. Almost every car is used in an urban setting where there is lots and lots of braking. How much would be saved if our light pickups had regenerative braking? How much energy would be saved if every delivery van that is heavy and starts up and stops many times—how much would be saved? At some other point, I want to

try to put together a calculation of that because it could be a substantial contributor.

Each of these technologies I have mentioned today—a new strategy on storing carbon dioxide underground, a new way of deploying solar panels through floating solar panels, an expansion of the use of regenerative braking—represent modest efforts in this effort to take on this large challenge of global warming. Added together, they can make a great difference and other technologies to come will make a great difference.

It is our challenge. It is our generation's responsibility to pivot quickly off of fossil fuels, and these strategies can help.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Wyoming.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, flags across the country were lowered to half-staff to honor the 49 lives which were lost in the terrorist attack in Orlando. The American flag also flew at half-staff following terrorist attacks in Brussels in March, in San Bernardino last December, and in Paris last November.

The flag is a symbol. It has great meaning and so do words. When we talk about the enemy, the words we use have meaning too, but now is not the time to talk. Now is the time to act. We must take action to stop the terrorists here and abroad.

That is why last week Republicans were eager to get to work on appropriations bills that give the FBI more of the resources they need to stop the threats on American soil. The bill that would give law enforcement officials more tools to help prevent terrorist attacks was brought up and discussed on the floor, but what did the Democrats do? They came to the floor and staged a campaign-style publicity stunt.

When Democrats were talking on the floor, Republicans attended a briefing by the FBI Director to listen—not to lecture, as Democrats were doing—but to listen and to get the facts about the specifics of what happened in Orlando. When Democrats held press conferences and sent out tweets, Republicans were pushing for the Defense Authorization Act that finally passed. This legislation actually does something by helping our military take on terrorist threats. It is directed at organizing the Pentagon to confront new threats. Democrats actually tried to block the legislation, and President Obama has threatened to veto it.

President Obama went out and gave a speech last week in which he said ISIL is on the defense. We remember when he compared ISIL to the JV team. Well, now the President says they are on defense. He bragged about all the success he has had fighting terrorists.

Then, his CIA Director, John Brennan, came to Capitol Hill. He came to speak to the Senate Intelligence Com-

mittee about what is happening with ISIS. He said, "Our efforts have not reduced the group's terrorism capability and global reach."

Does the President not believe his own CIA Director?

The CIA Director said that ISIS is adapting to our efforts, "and it continues to generate at least tens of millions of dollars in revenue per month." He said that ISIL "will intensify its global terror campaign."

Why does the President of the United States—the Commander in Chief—refuse to accept the words of the CIA Director—his own CIA Director? The CIA Director came to the Senate and said that "ISIS is training and attempting to deploy operatives for further attacks."

Why does the President intentionally try to deceive the American people in terms of thinking about what the attacks are and what is happening? Why does the President want to say all is well?

The CIA Director said that ISIL "has a large cadre of Western fighters who could potentially serve as operatives for further attacks."

The President seems to suggest the problem is not coming from the terrorists but coming from the Second Amendment of the Constitution.

Whom should we believe, the President of the United States or his CIA Director? Somebody asked the CIA Director at the hearing last week if ISIL would be weaker if they didn't have a safe haven in Syria and in Iraq. The CIA Director replied:

That is a big, big part of it. We need to take away their safe haven.

Terrorists use these safe havens to train, to raise money, and to plot more attacks. That should be the focus of President Obama and the Obama administration in response to Orlando.

The administration and the President want to pretend it is succeeding in getting rid of the safe havens abroad. That is simply not true. The terrorist army of ISIL controls a significant amount of territory across the globe, and it is not just ISIL. There are also additional terrorist groups.

The Director of National Intelligence testified to Congress earlier this year that Sunni violent extremists have more safe havens "than at any other point in history." He added that Al Qaeda affiliates "are positioned to make gains" this year. According to the United Nations, the Taliban now controls more ground in Afghanistan than at any point since 2001.

Extremist groups like ISIL need the territory they control because it gives them safe havens and because the territory makes them more powerful. It helps them inspire more of their followers to launch attacks around the world. It makes it seem like the ideology of radical Islam is winning the battle of ideas. So it is imperative that we have a real strategy to defeat ISIL and other terrorist groups abroad.

We need to make sure someone in the United States or France or anywhere

else in the world with an Internet connection does not see this radical Islamic ideology as victorious. That is why we need to pass the appropriations act that is on the floor today. Nobody believes that using the term "radical Islam" will magically defeat the enemy, but words do matter.

It is interesting. I note that in the New York Times op-ed page last Friday, an editorial written by David Brooks—he is a columnist. The President listens to him. He has him into the White House, and he is someone the President says he turns to.

David Brooks' column last Friday starts like this:

Barack Obama is clearly wrong when he refuses to use the word "Islam" in reference to Islamic terrorism. The people who commit these acts are inflamed by a version of an Islamic ideology. They claim an Islamic identity.

But the President will not say it.

Brooks goes on—and I think it is very informative seeing that it is David Brooks who is writing this: "Obama is using language to engineer a reaction rather than to tell the truth, which is the definition of propaganda."

The definition of propaganda. That is what we have.

Well, if the President refuses to correctly name our enemy, he can't effectively fight the enemy because Democrats don't understand the enemy, and it seems they just want everyone to get along. The world does not work that way. So the Democrats tried to change the topic from terrorists to going after our Second Amendment rights. When they do this, they are not confronting the real threat, which is the ability of ISIL to inspire terrorists to act.

If you want to stop the terrorist threat, you need to address the real problem. We must give law enforcement the support they need to stop the terrorists here at home. We must give our military the strength to deprive the terrorists of their safe havens abroad. The Defense Authorization Act and this Justice appropriations legislation are important steps toward doing that.

Symbolic acts like lowering our flag matter, and so do words. Words matter.

President Obama seems to want to take a victory lap for his efforts so far. Well, there will be no time for victory until ISIL is no more.

Maybe President Obama really doesn't understand the truth about this threat from radical Islamic terrorists. Maybe he is just not being honest with the American people about it. Either way, Congress has been told the truth by the CIA Director. And it is up to us to do something about it. The CIA Director said it himself to the Senate last week. He said that ISIL "would have to suffer even heavier losses of territory and money for its terrorist capacity to decline significantly."

Our response to the Orlando attack should be to step up the fight against ISIS where they live. We need a real strategy to defeat the radical Islamic

terrorists and the resolve and the strength to carry it out.

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

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

The Senator from Arizona.

FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, in the last several days the conversation and the dispute and the rhetoric has been devoted to the issue of guns, which is certainly a worthy cause, but, unfortunately for the American people, the issue of how we got here has been ignored. Guns don't fire themselves. Guns and weapons are fired by people. They are fired by people, and in the cases of Orlando, San Bernardino, Paris, and others, they are fired by people who have been radicalized or trained or in some coordinated fashion have inflicted murder, death, and mayhem on innocent people.

While we in all our righteous indignation talk so strongly and so passionately about what we have to do about the weapons, we are ignoring exactly how all of this happened and why it happened, and it is because of the policies of this President and this administration from the beginning. From the beginning this President wanted to get out of Iraq, wanted to get out of Afghanistan, believing in some delusional fashion that if we got out of these conflicts, the conflict would end. Obviously, that has not been true.

I want to go forward and with the Senator from South Carolina, I want to go through a chronology of events very quickly.

President Obama in October 2011 said:

The tide of war is receding. . . . The long war in Iraq will come to an end by the end of this year. . . . We're also moving into a new phase in the relationship between the United States and Iraq.

We'll partner with an Iraq that contributes to regional security and peace. . . . Just as Iraqis have persevered through war, I'm confident that they can build a future worthy of their history as a cradle of civilization.

President Obama, December 2011: "We're leaving behind a sovereign, stable and self-reliant Iraq."

President Bush, July 2007:

To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would be dangerous for Iraq, for the region and for the United States. It would mean surrendering the future of Iraq to Al Qaeda. It would mean that we'd be risking mass killings on a horrific scale. It would mean we allow the terrorists to establish a safe haven in Iraq to replace the one they lost in Afghanistan. It would mean we'd be increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous.

I know my colleagues have not missed it. American troops have had to

return to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous, and those are the words of President George W. Bush in July of 2007.

In October of 2011, at the same time that the President said that "the tide of war is receding," I, myself, said:

[T]his decision will be viewed as a strategic victory for our enemies in the Middle East, especially the Iranian regime, which has worked relentlessly to ensure a full withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq.

[A]ll of our military commanders with whom I have spoken on my repeated visits to Iraq have told me that U.S. national security interests and the enduring needs of Iraq's military required a continued presence of U.S. troops in Iraq beyond 2011 to safeguard the gains that we and our Iraqi partners have made.

Nearly 4,500 Americans have given their lives for our mission in Iraq. Countless more have been wounded. . . . I fear that all of the gains made possible by these brave Americans in Iraq, at such grave cost, are now at risk.

That is what I said in October of 2011. As the situation worsened in December of 2011, I said:

[Domestic] political considerations in [the United States and Iraq] have been allowed to trump our common security interests. All of the progress that both Iraqis and Americans have made, at such painful and substantial cost, has now been put at greater risk.

Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM in December 2011:

If Iraq slides back into sectarian violence, the consequences will be catastrophic for the Iraqi people and U.S. interests in the Middle East, and a clear victory for al Qaeda and Iran. A deterioration of the kind we are now witnessing in Iraq was not unforeseen, and now the U.S. government must do whatever it can to help Iraqis stabilize the situation. We call upon the Obama Administration and the Iraqi government to reopen negotiations with the goal of maintaining—

Reopen negotiations with the United States of America—

with the goal of maintaining an effective residual U.S. military presence in Iraq before the situation deteriorates further.

What we were saying is, we didn't have to pull everybody out of Iraq. We could have stayed. What they kept saying is: What we need is a status of forces agreement. The fact is that now there is no mention of a status of forces agreement, and there are 4,500 Americans there and possibly more.

President Obama, January of 2014: "The analogy we use around here sometimes, and I think is accurate, is if a jayvee team puts on Lakers uniforms that doesn't make them Kobe Bryant."

He went on to say they are the JV team; ISIS is the JV.

Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM in October of 2013 wrote:

By nearly every indicator, the situation in Iraq has worsened dramatically since the beginning of the conflict in Syria and the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq in 2011. . . . What's worse, the deteriorating conflict in Syria has enabled al Qaeda in Iraq to transform into the larger and more lethal Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), which now has a major base for operations spanning both Iraq and Syria. It may just be a matter of time until al Qaeda seeks to use its new

safe haven in these countries to launch attacks against U.S. interests.

That was what Senator GRAHAM and Senator MCCAIN said in October 2013.

Senators MCCAIN and GRAHAM, January 2014:

Reports that Al-Qaeda fighters have taken over Fallujah and are gaining ground in other parts of Iraq are as tragic as they are predictable.

The Administration's failure in Iraq has been compounded by its failed policy in Syria. It has sat by and refused to take any meaningful action, while the conflict has claimed more than 130,000 lives—

It has now taken more than 400,000 lives, by the way.

Driven a quarter of the Syrian population from their homes, fueled the resurgence of Al-Qaeda, and devolved into a regional conflict that now threatens our national security interests and the stability of Syria's neighbors, especially Iraq.

As the situation worsened in April of 2014, I said:

It is reality check time in Iraq, where the Syria-Iraq border has turned into a major highway and safe haven for transnational terrorist groups. The black flags of al-Qaeda fly over the city of Fallujah, where hundreds of U.S. troops were killed and injured. Violence across the country has reached the same levels as at the height of the Iraqi insurgency in 2008, and the country is creeping dangerously close to a reignition of civil conflict.

President Obama, September 2014: "We will degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL."

JOHN MCCAIN, September 2014:

The President's plan will likely be insufficient to destroy ISIS, which is the world's largest, richest terrorist army. To destroy ISIS, create conditions for enduring security in the Middle East, and protect the American people, additional steps are necessary.

Half measures against ISIS only make it stronger and will not lead to its destruction.

That was almost 2 years ago.

Senators GRAHAM and MCCAIN, October of 2014:

We continue to urge the Administration to quickly adopt a comprehensive strategy [against ISIL] and avoid the perils of gradual escalation.

Degrading and ultimately destroying ISIS will require additional actions that we have long advocated, such as the deployment of U.S. Special Forces and military advisers on the ground to direct air strikes and advise our local partners; the expansion of assistance for moderate Syrian forces, and the establishment of safe zones protected by no fly zones in Syria. . . . That is ultimately what it will take to destroy ISIS and keep America safe, and we cannot avoid to delay any longer.

That was nearly 2 years ago.

The list goes on and on. I will make it a part of the RECORD.

My friend is here.

All during this time, while Senator GRAHAM and I were warning time after time, using every means possible to warn the American people and our colleagues that this thing was going to escalate because the President of the United States did not have a strategy, his policies failed. Now we have attacks on the United States of America. I have been pilloried because I used the

word “personal.” I said I misspoke. But have no doubt about why we are where we are today, and that is because this administration, this President, called ISIL the JV, saying that if a JV team puts on Lakers uniforms, that doesn’t make them Kobe Bryant. Does anybody today believe that ISIS is JV?

The list goes on and on.

I want my colleague Senator GRAHAM to speak for a moment, and I will go on with these because we can see the competing statements between the administration and the President and Senators GRAHAM and MCCAIN. They are starkly different.

What else has happened there? The echo chamber, as was described by Mr. Rhodes, one of the President’s chief advisers—the echo chamber of Krugman, of Zakaria, of Friedman, of Ignatius, all the echo chambers out there saying: He’s doing fine. Everything is fine. This guy is leading great and not to worry. Things are really great. The echo chamber that Mr. Rhodes described in an article in *The Atlantic* about how they were able to orchestrate the Iranian agreement is out there.

So as we warned—as we warned and predicted—I wish we had been wrong. I would love to stand on the floor of the Senate and say: Senator GRAHAM and I were wrong. We didn’t have to worry about ISIS. They were the JV.

We were right, and we continue to be right, and we still don’t have a strategy. But there is the echo chamber out there. The echo chamber that goes on and on.

My friends, I believe the American people deserve better than what they are getting from this echo chamber, who are the Obamaphiles that can incredibly—incredibly—praise all of these mistakes.

Finally, I urge my colleagues—and I will go through some more of these—but my colleagues, I warn that unless we get a real strategy and stop this incrementalism, we are going to see—perhaps we will retake Fallujah, as we had. We may even retake Mosul. But this ISIS is still metastasizing and spreading throughout the world, and there is no better expert than the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, who basically said that in a hearing to not only the Members of Congress but the American people.

I would like to yield for some comments to my friend, the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. I wish we were wrong too. The worst is yet to come. I hate to be saying this all the time, but as they are losing territory in Iraq, which they are, and they are being hurt some in Syria, which they are, they are becoming a lethal terrorist organization. They are a terrorist army now holding territory. All I can say is that you could see this coming a mile away if you spent any time looking.

The biggest flaw of the President of the United States, I believe, is that he doesn’t think we are at war. He thinks this is a counterterrorism problem, that these are wayward souls or religious fanatics, and he doesn’t embrace the fact that radical Islam is loosely associated throughout the globe. They have an agenda to destroy our way of life, to purify their religion, to destroy the State of Israel. It is on the Sunni and the Shia side. It represents a small minority of the Islamic faith.

When you talk about radical Islam, you are not slandering those who are fighting radical Islam. They don’t feel slandered. I have been to Iraq and Afghanistan with Senator MCCAIN over 37 times. I have yet to have one leader in that part of the world tell me: Would you quit using the term “radical Islam.” They appreciate the fact that we understand the threat and that what we have been proposing would actually work.

The JV team here is in the White House. I really don’t mean to slander JV teams. The bottom line is that the people in the White House have proven they are not up to the task of defending this Nation, destroying radical Islam, and coming up with a plan to make us safe and protect our allies. How much more has to happen before you realize the people running this war, No. 1, don’t realize we are at war. It is hard to win a war when you don’t realize you are in one.

What happened in Orlando breaks your heart, but the Attorney General went down yesterday—and I like her very much—to offer sympathy to the victims, and she made a statement: We will never know what motivated this man.

Excuse me. We do. All you have to do is listen to what he said. He pledged allegiance to al-Baghdadi in the middle of the slaughter. He went to the other side.

In every war America has been in, we have had Americans side with the enemy. It is an unfortunate event, but it happens in all wars. Radical Islamic groups like ISIL are trying to turn American citizens against us. This man joined their cause. He called 911 and said: I am now a soldier in the army of ISIS. I pledge allegiance to al-Baghdadi—not to the citizens of the United States and the country in which he was a citizen. And he slaughtered a bunch of people.

Madam Attorney General, I know why he did it. The fact that you cannot understand why he did it bothers me as far as your view of the fight we are in.

But let’s go back to the time ISIL was created. Al Qaeda in Iraq was decimated by the surge. It is fair to criticize the Bush administration. President Bush did make mistakes. Senator MCCAIN called for the removal of the Secretary of Defense under President Bush’s watch, Secretary Rumsfeld, because he believed Secretary Rumsfeld did not appreciate the deteriorating security environment in Iraq.

As the Middle East deteriorates, I don’t remember anybody on this side of the aisle standing up and saying: President Obama, you need to reconsider what you are doing.

Senator MCCAIN, when the Republicans were in charge, President Bush was Commander in Chief, challenged the construct that all things were going well in Iraq when they were not. So I want to give some credit to Senator MCCAIN. It is not just Obama; when he sees a problem, he speaks up.

The bottom line is that President Bush made an adjustment. He doubled down on the surge. He sent more troops into Iraq under General Petraeus. Guess what. The new strategy worked.

By 2011, President Obama was claiming this to be a successful operation, that we could leave Iraq whole, free, secure, and stable. Vice President BIDEN said it may be the biggest accomplishment of the Obama administration, to withdraw our forces from Iraq because we are in such a good spot. The *New York Times* held the security environment in Iraq as a major achievement.

What we were trying to say, along with our military commanders, was that if they pull out now, the gains we fought for are going to be lost.

This is what I said on April 3, 2011, as this negotiation was going on:

If we’re not smart enough to work with the Iraqis to have 10–15,000 American troops in Iraq in 2012, Iraq could go to hell.

I’m urging the Obama Administration to work with the Maliki Administration in Iraq to make sure we have enough troops, 10 to 15 thousand, beginning in 2012 to secure the gains that we have achieved. . . . This is a defining moment in the future of Iraq . . . and in my view they are going down the wrong road in Iraq.

When the administration tells you that the Iraqis would not accept a residual force, they are lying. I don’t use that word lightly because it is a harsh word. They are intentionally misleading you. They are lying. Let me tell you why I know.

I was there. I got a phone call from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton asking me—along with Senator MCCAIN and Senator Lieberman—to go to Iraq to see if we could talk to the Iraqis about a residual force. We met with Barzani, the President of the Kurdish element of Iraq. Not only would he have accepted 15,000, he would have accepted 250,000. Anybody who knows anything about the Kurds, they are not resistant to American troops in Iraq. They would put them all in Kurdistan if we would let them.

Then we went to Maliki, who was a Prime Minister, head of a Sunni block. He said the Sunni members of this political block realize that without an American follow-on force, Iran will come in, fill the vacuum, and the Sunnis will feel threatened because the political achievements will all be at risk because the balance of the military power will change.

Then we went to Maliki. I can remember it like it was yesterday. It was Senator MCCAIN, Senator Lieberman,

and I. It was always us three, and I am at the end of the line, as I should be. There was Ambassador Jeffries and General Austin, who was the commander of our forces in Iraq.

When it was my time, I looked Maliki in the eye and said: Would you support a residual force to maintain the gains we have achieved jointly?

He looked me in the eye and he said: How many troops are you talking about?

I turned to General Austin and Ambassador Jeffries, and General Austin said: We are still working on that number.

We went back to talk to the Vice President. The military had recommended 18,000—General Austin had—and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs said we could get by with 10,000, but they wouldn't go below 10,000. According to General Dempsey, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the administration kept reducing the number below 10,000, and it got to almost 1,500.

This cascading of numbers of troops did not come from the Iraqis saying that was too many; it came from the White House, which really wanted to get to zero. So when you try to blame the Iraqis for your mistake, you are lying.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for a colloquy with Senator GRAHAM.

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

Mr. MCCAIN. May I also add that at the same time, this President and his administration were saying that we can't get a status of forces agreement with the Iraqi Government; that has to go through the Parliament. Is there any mention today of this same President who says it is absolutely necessary for us to have a status of forces agreement as we incrementally increase our troop strength in Iraq?

Mr. GRAHAM. Isn't it kind of odd that we have not 4,500, we have over 5,000 troops. They are playing with the numbers again. I know this. There are over 5,000 troops. About 1,000 are off the books. They are there; they are just not being counted.

This incessant desire by the President to say we are not in combat offends the heck out of me. Tell that to the family of the Navy SEAL who was killed. They don't want to admit we are in combat because that means we are at war. They don't want to admit we are at war, and I don't know why because this guy in Orlando certainly was at war with us.

We have a presence in Iraq, and isn't it unusual that no one is saying that we need approval from the Iraqi Government now? This was never the problem. The problem was that President Obama sincerely wanted to end both wars. He saw an opportunity in 2011 to fulfill a campaign promise because America is war weary, and I understand that. But at the end of the day, he ignored sound military advice, and everything that Senator MCCAIN and I

and others have said has come true in spades.

Let me tell you about a comment by the President yesterday that our military strategy regarding ISIL is hitting on all cylinders. Mr. President, you need to get out of the White House and take a new look at what is going on in the world.

Yesterday there was testimony by a Yazidi woman in the Homeland Security Committee.

Last week the U.N. issued a report that ISIL is engaged in genocide against the Yazidi people. This is a people who mix Christianity and Islam, and they have a unique religion. ISIL is in the process of destroying the Yazidi community that has been in existence for thousands of years.

Yesterday this woman testified that eight members of her family, including her mother, were killed by ISIL. She was gang-raped. She said: Don't feel sorry for me; they are doing this to girls as young as 8 years old.

So, Mr. President, go tell that young woman that your military strategy when it comes to ISIL is working on all cylinders. The U.N. Special Envoy to Syria estimates that 400,000 people have been killed in Syria, where ISIL's headquarters exist.

Mr. President, go tell the people, the families of the victims of ISIL in Syria, that your military strategy is working on all cylinders. How do you explain the fact that there are now up to 8,000 ISIL fighters in Libya?

I had a conversation yesterday with AFRICOM Commander Waldhauser, who is an incredibly gifted man. I asked him: Is ISIL in Libya?

He said: Yes.

Are they a threat to our homeland?

He said: Yes.

Are we doing anything militarily to engage them?

He said: Virtually nothing.

I asked him: How many airstrikes have there been against ISIL soldiers in Libya?

He said: Zero.

The bottom line, Mr. President, is we are not hitting on all cylinders. We are making some gains, but you don't have an overall strategy to secure these gains. Leaving Assad in power is the worst possible outcome for the United States because the Sunni Arabs see him as a puppet of Iran, and he is the one who has killed most of the 400,000, not ISIL. The Syrian people are never going to accept him as their leader.

Russia and Iran have come to the aid of the Butcher of Damascus, Assad. They have bombed the people we have trained to fight not only ISIL but Assad. The Russian people have killed the people the American President tried to recruit to our cause, and we are not doing a darn thing about it.

Mr. President, your military strategy is not working. Tell that to the King of Jordan, where there are more Syrian refugees today than there has ever been in the history of Jordan. Two weeks ago there was a report that

there were more refugees in the world now than there were post-World War II. Tell it to the people of Lebanon, where one out of five children in the primary schools is a Syrian refugee child. Tell that to the people of Turkey.

Mr. President, the bottom line: You always underestimate the threat. You try to undersell what is going on, and you oversell our successes.

I hope the people in this body will realize that some of the votes we are going to take in the coming weeks will correct this course, and I hope you realize that the war is not going as well as the President says it is. I want it to go better. I want to destroy ISIL. I promise you this: The strategy we have in Syria will never lead to ISIL's destruction. The people we are training to fight ISIL are mostly Kurds, and the Kurds do not have the ability to go into Raqqa, Syria, which is an Arab town, and take it away from ISIL and hold it. And the people we are training are Communist, Marxist Kurds. Their acronym is YPG. They are associated with the PKK, which is a terrorist organization in Turkey. I appreciate their help, but the future of Syria should not lie in the hands of a bunch of Communist, Marxist Kurds who could never ever bring about stability in Syria.

We don't have a game plan to end this war. We don't have a diplomatic strategy. If you don't believe me, ask the 50-plus Foreign Service officers who wrote a letter publicly urging the President to change his strategy in Syria because it is not working. You can discount Senator MCCAIN and me if you would like, but these are 50 people who dedicated their lives to understanding the Middle East. They said in an open letter that we should be taking the Assad regime on because if he stays in power, this war will never end. He is literally getting away with murder. And our strategy of appeasing Assad because of Russia and Iran's involvement is going to lead not only to the destruction of Syria but also to a change in the power balance in the Middle East that is harmful to us.

It is not just us saying it is not working. Mr. President, your military strategy is not working on all cylinders. The Yazidi community is being decimated on your watch. Some 400,000 people have been murdered on your watch, and we haven't even gotten to the mistake you made in Syria yet. As we withdrew our forces from Iraq against sound military advice, the people of Syria rose up against Assad, demanding the freedom all of us take for granted. There was a moment in time when Assad was on the ropes. The people of Syria rose up as part of the Arab spring. Every person in the administration advised President Obama to help the Free Syrian Army while they were intact, and he said no. When he said no, Hezbollah, which is an agent of Iran, the Shia militia, sent 5,000 troops to support Assad. Russia eventually got in on Assad's side, and the entire mess

in Syria has exploded. His unwillingness to help the Free Syrian Army take Assad out created the vacuum inside of Syria that ISIL filled.

So to those who look at Orlando as a gun control problem, I think you are missing the story of Orlando. Orlando is about ISIL being seen as a winner by people over here who are sympathetic to their cause. ISIL is being seen throughout the world as a winning team, not a JV team. What we see in Orlando is someone who was recruited to their cause and our intelligence systems failed.

I am not blaming the FBI, but the fact of the matter is we interviewed this guy a couple of times, he was on our watch list, and he fell through the cracks.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I also point out to my friend that the President and members of the administration continuously say: We only have two choices. One is do nothing or very little, or we have to send 200,000 troops. You know, I grow so weary of that straw man being set up by the President of the United States, because it is intellectually dishonest.

What we have called for—I am not sure this President can lead and do it because he has no credibility in the Middle East anywhere. When he decided that they had crossed the redline and we were going to take military action and then did nothing, that had a profound effect throughout the Middle East. There is no trust or confidence in the United States. But if there were, it would be approximately 100,000 troops—about 10,000 Americans, the Sunni Arabs, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and the other Gulf countries—a force that would go to Iraq today and take out ISIS.

I want to assure my fellow Americans that as long as ISIS has a geographic base in Raqqa, they will be exporting terror into the United States and Europe. Baghdadi, we know, is sending people with these devices—secure encrypted devices. We know there is self-radicalization taking place as we speak. We know they are being inserted into the refugee stream. We know these things. As long as they have a capital and we have no strategy for retaking that capital, there will be further attacks, as the Director of the CIA has said, as the Director of National Intelligence has said. There will be further attacks on the United States of America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD these statements by the President and by Senator GRAHAM and myself.

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

OBAMA ON WITHDRAWAL FROM IRAQ
PRESIDENT OBAMA, OCTOBER 2011

“The tide of war is receding . . . The long war in Iraq will come to an end by the end of this year . . . We’re also moving into a new phase in the relationship between the United States and Iraq . . . We’ll partner with an

Iraq that contributes to regional security and peace . . . Just as Iraqis have persevered through war, I’m confident that they can build a future worthy of their history as a cradle of civilization.”

PRESIDENT OBAMA, DECEMBER 2011

“We’re leaving behind a sovereign, stable and self-reliant Iraq.”

PRESIDENT BUSH, JULY 2007

“To begin withdrawing before our commanders tell us we are ready would be dangerous for Iraq, for the region and for the United States. It would mean surrendering the future of Iraq to Al Qaeda. It would mean that we’d be risking mass killings on a horrific scale. It would mean we allow the terrorists to establish a safe haven in Iraq to replace the one they lost in Afghanistan. It would mean we’d be increasing the probability that American troops would have to return at some later date to confront an enemy that is even more dangerous.”

SENATOR MCCAIN, OCTOBER 2011

“This decision will be viewed as a strategic victory for our enemies in the Middle East, especially the Iranian regime, which has worked relentlessly to ensure a full withdrawal of U.S. troops from Iraq . . . all of our military commanders with whom I have spoken on my repeated visits to Iraq have told me that U.S. national security interests and the enduring needs of Iraq’s military required a continued presence of U.S. troops in Iraq beyond 2011 to safeguard the gains that we and our Iraqi partners have made . . . Nearly 4,500 Americans have given their lives for our mission in Iraq. Countless more have been wounded . . . I fear that all of the gains made possible by these brave Americans in Iraq, at such grave cost, are now at risk.”

As the situation worsened . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, DECEMBER 2011

“[Domestic] political considerations in [the United States and Iraq] have been allowed to trump our common security interests. All of the progress that both Iraqis and Americans have made, at such painful and substantial cost, has now been put at greater risk.”

SENATORS MCCAIN AND GRAHAM, DECEMBER 2011

“If Iraq slides back into sectarian violence, the consequences will be catastrophic for the Iraqi people and U.S. interests in the Middle East, and a clear victory for al Qaeda and Iran. A deterioration of the kind we are now witnessing in Iraq was not unforeseen, and now the U.S. government must do whatever it can to help Iraqis stabilize the situation. We call upon the Obama Administration and the Iraqi government to reopen negotiations with the goal of maintaining an effective residual U.S. military presence in Iraq before the situation deteriorates further.”

OBAMA: ASSAD MUST GO

PRESIDENT OBAMA, AUGUST 2011

“For the sake of the Syrian people, the time has come for President Assad to step aside.”

OBAMA ADMINISTRATION OFFICIAL IN THE NEW YORKER, DECEMBER 2015

“The meaning of ‘Assad has to go’ has evolved.”

SENATOR MCCAIN, DECEMBER 2015

“So why has the meaning of ‘Assad has to go’ evolved? Because this Administration was overpowered, outplayed, and out-matched. This Administration consoled themselves with the mantra of ‘there is no military solution,’ rather than facing the reality that there is a clear military dimension to a political solution in Syria. That is what Russia and Iran have demonstrated. They

have changed the military facts on the ground and created the terms for a political settlement more favorable to their interests. And I believe as a result, the conflict will grind on, ISIL will grow stronger, and the refugees will keep coming.”

WHITE HOUSE: ASSAD’S FALL IS INEVITABLE
WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY JAY CARNEY,
JANUARY 2012

“Assad’s fall is inevitable . . . It’s important to calculate into your consideration the fact that he will go. The regime has lost control of the country and he will eventually fall.”

SENATOR MCCAIN, MARCH 2012

“The Administration’s approach to Syria is starting to look more like a hope than a strategy. So, too, does their continued insistence that Assad’s fall is ‘inevitable.’ Tell that to the people of Homs. Tell that to the people of Idlib, or Hama, or the other cities that Assad’s forces are now moving against. Nothing in this world is pre-determined. And claims about the inevitability of events can often be a convenient way to abdicate responsibility.”

Warning about sectarian conflict in Syria . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, MARCH 2012

“The surest way for Al-Qaeda to gain a foothold in Syria is for us to turn our backs on those brave Syrians who are fighting to defend themselves. After all, Sunni Iraqis were willing to ally with Al-Qaeda when they felt desperate enough. But when America gave them a better alternative, they turned their guns on Al-Qaeda. Why should it be different in Syria? . . . As we saw in Iraq, or Lebanon before it, time favors the hard-liners in a conflict like this. The suffering of Sunnis at the hands of Assad only stokes the temptation for revenge, which in turn only deepens fears among the Alawites, and strengthens their incentive to keep fighting. For this reason alone, it is all the more compelling to find a way to end the bloodshed as soon as possible.”

SENATOR MCCAIN, JUNE 2012

“If we fail to act, the consequences are clear. Syria will become a failed state in the heart of the Middle East, threatening both our ally Israel and our NATO ally Turkey. With or without Assad, the country will devolve into a full-scale civil war with areas of ungoverned space that Al-Qaeda and its allies will occupy. Violence and radicalism will spill even more into Lebanon and Iraq, fueling sectarian conflicts that are still burning in both countries. Syria will turn into a battlefield between Sunni and Shia extremists, each backed by foreign powers, which will ignite sectarian tensions from North Africa to the Gulf and risk a wider regional conflict. This is the course we are on in Syria, and we must act now to avoid it.”

OBAMA: RUSSIAN SYRIA INTERVENTION WILL BE QUAGMIRE

PRESIDENT OBAMA, OCTOBER 2015

“An attempt by Russia and Iran to prop up Assad and try to pacify the population is just going to get them stuck in a quagmire and it won’t work.”

SECRETARY KERRY, MARCH 2016

“Russia is now helping with the cessation of hostilities. And if Russia can help us to actually effect this political transition, that is all to the strategic interest of the United States of America.”

Warning of foreign intervention . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, MARCH 2012

“Increasingly, the question for U.S. policy is not whether foreign forces will intervene

militarily in Syria. We can be confident that Syria's neighbors will do so eventually, if they have not already. Some kind of intervention will happen, with us or without us . . . We also hear it said, including by the Administration, that we should not contribute to the militarization of the conflict. If only Russia and Iran shared that sentiment. Instead, they are shamelessly fueling Assad's killing machine. We need to deal with reality as it is, not as we wish it to be—and the reality in Syria today is largely a one-sided fight where the aggressors are not lacking for military means and zeal. Indeed, Assad appears to be fully committed to crushing the opposition at all costs. Iran and Russia appear to be fully committed to helping him do it."

On the nature of Russian intervention . . .
SENATOR MCCAIN, OCTOBER 2015

The Administration has accepted "Russia's expanded role in Syria, and as a consequence, for Assad's continued brutalization of the Syrian people. It is simply incomprehensible that the Administration is taking such great pains to offer Russia a 'constructive' role in Syria, pretending that Russia has the slightest interest in anything other than propping up the murderous Assad regime. That is what Russia has been doing for four years as Assad has slaughtered more than 200,000 Syrians, and that is what Russia is doing now."

What has happened since . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, APRIL 2016

"Last year, Vladimir Putin moved to fill the strategic vacuum that the United States has left in the Middle East. In its first out-of-area military since the time of the czars, Russian forces moved into Syria, doubled down on the Assad regime, and decimated the moderate Syrian opposition groups that America and our allies said we were supporting. Russia has used Syria as a live-fire exercise for its modernizing military. Despite predictions of a Russian quagmire, Putin has instead used limited military means to achieve distinct political goals. Despite Putin's pledged withdrawal from Syria, Assad's forces, backed by Russia, now appear poised to retake Aleppo. Meanwhile, advanced Russian military capabilities remain in Syria, enhancing Putin's ability to project power beyond the region."

OBAMA UNDERESTIMATING ISIL
PRESIDENT OBAMA, JANUARY 2014

"The analogy we use around here sometimes, and I think is accurate, is if a jayvee team puts on Lakers uniforms that doesn't make them Kobe Bryant."

SENATORS MCCAIN AND GRAHAM, OCTOBER 2013

"By nearly every indicator, the situation in Iraq has worsened dramatically since the beginning of the conflict in Syria and the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq in 2011 . . . What's worse, the deteriorating conflict in Syria has enabled al Qaeda in Iraq to transform into the larger and more lethal Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), which now has a major base for operations spanning both Iraq and Syria. It may just be a matter of time until al Qaeda seeks to use its new safe haven in these countries to launch attacks against U.S. interests."

ISIL captured Fallujah three months later . . .

SENATORS MCCAIN AND GRAHAM, JANUARY 2014

"Reports that Al-Qaeda fighters have taken over Fallujah and are gaining ground in other parts of Iraq are as tragic as they were predictable . . . The Administration's failure in Iraq has been compounded by its failed policy in Syria. It has sat by and refused to take any meaningful action, while

the conflict has claimed more than 130,000 lives, driven a quarter of the Syrian population from their homes, fueled the resurgence of Al-Qaeda, and devolved into a regional conflict that now threatens our national security interests and the stability of Syria's neighbors, especially Iraq."

As the situation worsened . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, APRIL 2014

"It is reality check time in Iraq, where the Syria-Iraq border has turned into a major highway and safe haven for transnational terrorist groups. The black flags of al-Qaeda fly over the city of Fallujah, where hundreds of U.S. troops were killed and injured. Violence across the country has reached the same levels as at the height of the Iraqi insurgency in 2008, and the country is creeping dangerously close to a reignition of civil conflict."

OBAMA ON LEAVING ISIL UNCHECKED
PRESIDENT OBAMA, SEPTEMBER 2014

"So ISIL poses a threat to the people of Iraq and Syria, and the broader Middle East—including American citizens, personnel and facilities. If left unchecked, these terrorists could pose a growing threat beyond that region, including to the United States."

SENATORS MCCAIN AND GRAHAM, AUGUST 2014

"Americans need to know that ISIS is not just a problem for Iraq and Syria. It is a threat to the United States. Doing too little to combat ISIS has been a problem. Doing less is certainly not the answer now . . . ISIS presents Mr. Obama with a similar challenge, and it has already forced him to begin changing course, albeit grudgingly. He should accept the necessity of further change and adopt a strategy to defeat this threat . . . If he does not, ISIS will continue to grow into an even graver danger to our allies and to us."

Nearly two years into the campaign to "check" ISIL . . .

ISIL has metastasized to Yemen, Egypt, Lebanon, Afghanistan, and Libya.

As of the end of April 2016, CNN reported that ISIL had conducted or inspired at least 90 terrorist attacks in 21 countries other than Iraq and Syria.

That, of course, doesn't account for the 49 Americans murdered in Orlando by a terrorist who pledged allegiance to ISIL.

If it wasn't clear then, ISIL's threat to our homeland is real, direct, and growing.

OBAMA ON DESTROYING ISIL
PRESIDENT OBAMA, SEPTEMBER 2014

"We will degrade and ultimately destroy ISIL."

SENATOR MCCAIN, SEPTEMBER 2014

"The President's plan will likely be insufficient to destroy ISIS, which is the world's largest, richest terrorist army. To destroy ISIS, create conditions for enduring security in the Middle East, and protect the American people, additional steps are necessary . . . Half measures against ISIS only make it stronger and will not lead to its destruction."

Urging a comprehensive plan . . .

SENATORS MCCAIN AND GRAHAM, OCTOBER 2014

"We continue to urge the Administration to quickly adopt a comprehensive strategy [against ISIL and avoid the perils of gradual escalation . . . Degrading and ultimately destroying ISIS will require additional actions that we have long advocated, such as the deployment of U.S. Special Forces and military advisers on the ground to direct airstrikes and advise our local partners; the expansion of assistance for moderate Syrian forces, and the establishment of safe zones

protected by no fly zones in Syria . . . That is ultimately what it will take to destroy ISIS and keep America safe, and we cannot afford to delay any longer."

SENATOR MCCAIN, NOVEMBER 2014

"Applying a half-hearted bombing campaign without seriously undertaking complementary efforts to train and assist local forces and protect civilians in Syria is simply doomed to fail. It is time for this Administration to stand by our Syrian allies, as it has done for other communities in Iraq and Syria, and move quickly to support moderate opposition forces fighting against ISIS and Jabhat al-Nusra and protect the Syrian people from Assad's deadly air campaign. Until such actions are taken, I fear that the threat posed by ISIS will continue to metastasize."

OBAMA ON CONTAINING ISIL

PRESIDENT OBAMA, NOVEMBER 2015

"We have contained them."

The day after this statement, ISIL attacked in Paris . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, NOVEMBER 2015

"What should now be clear is that ISIL is determined to attack the heart of the civilized world, Europe and the United States—that it has the intent to attack us, the capability to attack us, and the sanctuary from which to plan those attacks. What should now be clear is that our people and our allies will not be safe until ISIL is destroyed—not just degraded, but destroyed; not eventually, but as soon as possible."

GENERAL JOSEPH DUNFORD, DECEMBER 2015

"We have not contained ISIL."

Further warning that ISIL is not contained . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, DECEMBER 2015

"As long as this caliphate exists in Raqqa, they are going to be able to orchestrate attacks and metastasize and maybe even move to Libya."

ISIL's scored its biggest victory in Libya in June 2016 when it captured Sirte. Today, ISIL still has over 5,000 fighters in Libya.

In January 2016, ISIL was so contained that the Obama Administration approved targeting ISIL in Afghanistan nearly a year after they had arrived on the battlefield . . .

SENATOR MCCAIN, JANUARY 2016

"Now the administration seems to be waking up to the fact that more than a year into the U.S. military campaign, ISIL's reach is global and growing. We can only hope it won't take so long for the administration to realize that conditions on the ground in Afghanistan simply don't warrant a dangerous, calendar-driven withdrawal of U.S. forces."

As of today, the Obama administration is moving forward with plans to cut U.S. forces in half by the end of the year.

Mr. MCCAIN. I would point out that, as long ago as August 2014, Senator GRAHAM and I said:

Americans need to know that ISIS is not just a problem for Iraq and Syria. It is a threat to the United States. Doing too little to combat ISIS has been a problem. Doing less is certainly not the answer now . . . ISIS presents Mr. Obama with a similar challenge, and it has already forced him to begin changing course, albeit grudgingly. . . . If he does not, ISIS will continue to grow into an even graver danger to our allies and to us.

It was obvious.

Here is a quote from President Obama from November 2015: "We have contained them."

Really? We have contained them?

Again, General Dunford said, in a further warning, that ISIL is not contained.

I said in December of 2015: “As long as this caliphate exists in Raqqa, they are going to be able to orchestrate attacks and metastasize and maybe even move to Libya.”

Guess what. They moved to Libya.

The list goes on and on.

From August 2011, here is one of my favorites from President Obama: “For the sake of the Syrian people, the time has come for President Assad to step aside.”

An Obama administration official said in the New Yorker in December 2014, 4 years later: “The meaning of ‘Assad has to go’ has evolved.”

“The meaning of Assad has to go has evolved.”

Anyway, the list goes on and on.

President Obama said in October 2015: “An attempt by Russia and Iran to prop up Assad and try to pacify the population is just going to get them stuck in a quagmire and it won’t work.”

“In a quagmire, and it won’t work.”

Secretary Kerry said in March of 2016:

Russia is now helping with the cessation of hostilities. And if Russia can help us to actually effect this political transition, that is all to the strategic interest of the United States of America.

And now, what did they do? They bombed the people we trained and equipped. They murdered. Bashar Assad has murdered so many more than ISIS with his barrel bombs and the indiscriminate killing of men, women, and children. He has never paid a penalty for the use of sarin gas, with which he gassed thousands of innocent men, women, and children in Syria.

Does anybody believe that Assad is leaving power anytime soon? Of course not.

So again, we have been talking about this, and we have been warning about it. By the way, Senator GRAHAM and I are always described in the liberal media this way: “Senator GRAHAM and Senator MCCAIN, among Obama’s harshest critics.” They do not mention that we called for the removal of President Bush’s Secretary of Defense.

No, we are not his harshest critics. We are the ones who have been telling the truth to the American people ever since this debacle began, because we have an obligation—we have an obligation—to those men and women in uniform serving in the longest wars in our history. We have an obligation to the families of those who have been killed and wounded. We have an obligation to try to force this President to understand that we have failed. We are failing, and we have failed.

Yes, we are making some gains with the retaking of Fallujah, after two battles—by the way, where American troops were wounded and killed. There is some small success. But the fact is that none of this had to happen, and that is the great tragedy of the last few years. None of it had to happen, and this President didn’t lead because he believed all we needed to do was get out and those conflicts would end.

So I say directly to my colleagues: The President’s policies are responsible for the deaths, untold deaths, the quagmire we are in, the metastasizing of ISIL and the rise of Russia as a new power in the Middle East and the retention of Bashar Assad ensconced as a ruler of Syria—the same person about whom the President of the United States said: It is not whether Bashar Assad leaves power; it is when.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I may, just to wrap this up, 50 diplomats who served in the Mideast wrote an open letter to the world to say that we have let Assad get away with murder. Assad will be in power when Obama is gone. Russia and Iran have gone to Assad’s aid. The biggest winners of Obama’s strategy in Syria have been Russia and Assad. The biggest losers have been our allies—Arab allies, in particular and the people in Syria.

About our willingness to help, I was in a multiperson primary back in 2014. The President basically reached out to Senator MCCAIN and myself after Assad had crossed the redline the President drew regarding chemical weapons. It was Labor Day. I will never forget it as long as I live. I flew up with Senator MCCAIN, and we met with President Obama in the Oval Office and Susan Rice. They informed us of what Assad did, and were seeking our support to basically hit him militarily as punishment for crossing the redline.

The goal was to degrade Assad’s capability on the battlefield, upgrade the ability of the opposition to fight him and change momentum on the battlefield. Senator MCCAIN and I went out in front of the Oval Office in the driveway and said: We stand with the President in his efforts to deal with Assad for crossing the redline, to upgrade the opposition, degrade Assad, and change the momentum on the battlefield.

This was right around Labor Day. It was supposed to happen in a couple of days—airstrikes from the sea and land. Nothing happened. By the end of the week, the President decided to go to Congress, and, unfortunately, Congress didn’t respond well. So there is some blame in the body. But President Obama has yet to call us and tell us that.

Now, I am in the middle of a primary and people are war weary, and I just really thought the President was doing the right thing to hold Assad accountable. So I want to help him where I can.

I have tried to put money in the budget to help secure the gains we have achieved in Iraq. I hope Fallujah falls, and I think it will, but I said 8,000 to 10,000 U.S. soldiers would be necessary to destroy ISIL inside Iraq. We are over 5,000, and we have to go to Mosul, which is a city of a million people. If we don’t have more American ground components, then we are not going to retake Mosul, and the Shia militia, which are controlled by Iran, are going to have way too much to say in terms of the future of Iraq.

So inside Syria there is no strategy to destroy ISIL. I think President Obama is passing this on to the next President, not wanting to break his promises, not recommitting troops, and he is just ignoring good sound military advice. The bottom line is—and I hate to say this—if there is a JV team on the field in the War on Terror, it is in the White House. The bottom line is they are at war with us, but we are really not at war with them. We can’t even say “combat.”

So I want to help this President where we can. We have had a very contentious debate about guns. Things have been said on both sides of the aisle that I think are, quite frankly, out of bounds. I don’t want to sell guns to ISIL; I want to destroy them.

I think we have several choices here. We are going to fight them in their backyard or ours. I choose to fight them in their backyard—with partners. The Arabs want to help us because they are in the crosshairs of ISIL. But they are not going in to fight ISIL in Syria and wind up giving the whole country to the Iranians by keeping Assad in power. They have told us.

The King of Saudi Arabia told us: You can have our army. But they want to make sure that when we finish the job in Syria, the Iranians are not in control of Syria. They are dominating four Arab capitals and the Arabs are tired of this.

The bottom line is Iran is running wild, ISIL is a growing threat to the homeland, and we don’t have a strategy to destroy ISIL and secure the gains and stabilize Iraq and Syria. When it comes to Iran, we have empowered the most tyrannical regime on the planet, I think, by giving them \$150 billion to put in their war machine. They will have a pathway to a bomb and a missile to deliver it even if they do not cheat under this agreement.

So the next President of the United States is going to have a mess on their hands, but we still have a long way to go with this President.

So, Mr. President, send a couple thousand more troops into Iraq and make sure we liberate Mosul and can hold the place. Up your game in Syria. Work with our Arab partners who will go in on the ground with you. Tell Assad he has to go, and tell the Russians, if you want to fight for the Butcher of Damascus, you are welcome to do so—and they won’t. Let the Syrian people rebuild Syria, pick their leader, and not have the Russians or the Iranians pick their leader.

There is a way forward. It is going to take more effort on our part but not 100,000 troops. We are talking less than 10,000 to get this job done. But we do need a different approach to Syria particularly or this will never end.

Here is what I worry about the most. The thousands of foreign fighters who have joined the jihad have Western passports, and people on my side of the aisle were saying some pretty crazy things, quite frankly. You can’t seal

America off from the world. People do travel, and they do trade. So the ability to penetrate the homeland exists. The bottom line is that the sooner we can destroy ISIL, the safer we will be and the quicker we can live in peace in the region—and we don't have a plan to do it.

I hope the President will make an adjustment. President Bush adjusted. It is not easy for a President to adjust. I can get that. But he made a decision to listen to his commanders and he adjusted. This President is making some adjustments, but they are incremental in nature. He downplays the adjustments he is making. He downplays the threats we face. When the Attorney General says: I really don't understand what motivated this man, that really breaks my heart because I think most of us do.

Here is what I worry the most about. It is taking too long to take these guys out over there. They are reaching into Libya, and another 9/11 is on the way if we don't put these guys on the defensive. I want to hit them before they hit us. I want partners. I don't want to fight this war alone. I want to keep the war over there. It is coming here. No matter what you do, it may come here anyway, but we are allowing them to come here quicker and faster than they should be allowed to come here. We are allowing them to stay stronger—longer than they should.

In the wake of this foreign policy debacle, we have lost an entire group of people called the Yazidis, who have been basically wiped off the face of the planet. There have been hundreds of thousands of people displaced—millions displaced—and they are going to look at America and say: You can't count on America. Every young child in a refugee camp who was driven to that camp because of our failure to deal with ISIL, allowing Assad to barrel-bomb his or her family, is going to grow up not liking us. One day we are going to have to confront them.

The effects of this strategy of failed foreign policy are going to be generational. Mr. President, there is still time to adjust, if you will adjust your strategy and not just listen to us but listen to the 50 people who wrote the letter and listen to your military commanders. If you make these adjustments, we will be there with you.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to summarize, the reason Senator GRAHAM and I came to the floor at this time is because it is pretty obvious the debate now is over guns, and there should be a legitimate debate over the use and availability of weapons. I hope we could reach a reasonable compromise so we can act.

I want to emphasize, we would not be having this debate if it were not for the failed policies that led to where we are today, where a young man—either instructed or self-radicalized—took the lives of nearly 50 brave Americans. That was not like a hurricane. It was not like an earthquake. It was because

this President has failed to lead. Look at the world as it was in the times when I was talking and look at the world today. We have to have a strategy to defeat ISIS, and we cannot stand to have this brutal dictator named Bashar al-Assad continue to slaughter his own people. We have to stand with our allies and stand with our friends, but what is most important is, we have to have a strategy to defeat this enemy, which has proven at least twice it has the ability to attack the mainland of the United States of America. That is not there today.

AMENDMENT NO. 4787

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. McCAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would say to my friend from Arizona, before lunch we had a vote on a very important amendment the Senator sponsored, along with the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, that received a majority vote of the Senate but not enough to get us to the 60-vote threshold. I know the majority leader has put in a motion to reconsider, which will allow him to bring that up because of some absenteeism.

I want to ask my friend, during the time the shooter in Orlando was under surveillance by the FBI and was actually put on a watch list, the authority they had to gather information about him and particularly his computer usage by issuing a subpoena to the Internet service provider in order to identify IP addresses and perhaps email addresses, not content—they were denied the opportunity to get that kind of information. Does the Senator have any idea whether perhaps the FBI might have been tipped to the fact that this shooter—let's say he was accessing YouTube videos of Anwar al-Awlaki like Nidal Hasan in Fort Hood was before he committed his terrorist attack there, or let's say one of the email addresses they were able to collect was one of a known terrorist or somebody the FBI suspected was complicit in terrorism, obviously, under the Senator's amendment, in order to get the content of that, the FBI would have to go to the FISA Court and establish probable cause.

Does the Senator have an opinion whether that kind of information, to which the FBI was blinded by the lapse in this authority—whether that would be helpful information in identifying potential threats like we saw in Orlando?

Mr. McCAIN. I say to my friend and colleague who has done so much hard work on trying to achieve a careful balance and compromise that all of us could agree to on the issue of weapons, I appreciate the question and I appreciate his work.

I can't specifically state I know for a fact that the failure of the ability of the FBI to monitor and know about use of the Internet—not content but use of the Internet, such as the Senator men-

tioned IP addresses and others. I can't say that would have prevented it. What I can say, and the Senator knows, the Director of the FBI said this is the most important tool he needs to defend this country against further attacks. Is there anyone now in America who doesn't believe there is going to be another self-radicalized or instructed individual who will try to attack the United States of America? Of course not.

In their wisdom, a majority of my colleagues over there and a group of my colleagues over here have rejected the urgent request from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I have seen a lot of strange votes around here, I would say to my friend from Texas, but to see Republicans, who advertise themselves as trying to protect the people of this Nation, not give the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation the tool he needs the most to counter what is clearly coming, frankly, is one of the most puzzling and disappointing actions that have been taken by my colleagues on this side of the aisle.

Mr. CORNYN. I thank the Senator.

I would merely add, this is not a partisan issue. As the Presiding Officer and as the Senator from Arizona knows, the Intelligence Committee has voted in a bipartisan way, with only one Senator dissenting in the Intelligence reauthorization bill, to reinstate this very authority the amendment of the Senator from Arizona pertained to. I believe, of all the votes we have had this week, the vote on Senator McCAIN's amendment was the one with the greatest potential to stop future terrorist attacks like we saw in Orlando—because we all know the shooter in Orlando was under two separate FBI investigations and he was put on a watch list. With so much discussion about watch lists, he was no longer on a watch list so the FBI was not notified when he went in and purchased the two firearms he used in this attack. We also know he was a licensed security guard, and he actually had a license to own firearms.

This is a complicated and complex and confusing picture we have all been presented, and we are all trying to figure out what is the solution or what could we do to help reduce the possibility that something like this might happen in the future? I can guarantee one thing. It is not to limit the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. That is not going to stop future terrorist attacks. If we fail to give law enforcement and counterterrorism authorities the means by which to identify these self-radicalized terrorists before they kill—if we don't do that, then shame on us. This is not partisan, as I said, because a bipartisan majority—with one dissenting vote—on the Intelligence Committee voted for this provision, but we need to get serious about this. I know, because of some absenteeism today—necessary, I am sure—we didn't have every Senator here present and voting.

I hope in the interim, from the time of that failed cloture vote on the McCain-Burr amendment until the time we vote on this again when the majority leader moves to reconsider, we can have some serious discussions and serious efforts at trying to make our country safer and protecting innocent Americans from terrorist attacks on our own soil.

If we deny the FBI Director the No. 1 legislative priority of the agency, as he has told us time and time again—most recently in the SCIF, in the secure facility. Obviously, that part is not classified, but he said this is a very important tool. If we are going to ask the FBI and our counterterrorism authorities to connect the dots, well, they can't connect the dots unless they can collect the dots. Again, this is with proper and appropriate regard, under the Fourth Amendment, for American citizens when it comes to searches of their property or seizures. Under the Fourth Amendment, we know there has to be established probable cause that a crime has been committed, established before an impartial judge. We are not talking about the content. We are saying, if there are enough dots to connect together to raise a reasonable suspicion on the part of our counterterrorism authorities, they ought to then have the opportunity to go to a judge and get the content of that communication under appropriate constitutional Fourth Amendment procedures. If they don't even have access to the basic information, then they can't connect the dots because they can't collect them.

So of all the votes we have had this week, I believe the vote on the McCain-Burr amendment was the most important because I think it was the one most likely to produce additional tools that our counterterrorism authorities could use in an investigation to identify self-radicalized terrorists in the United States before they strike. It is too late after they strike, when we are all asking the question: What can we possibly do in order to prevent something like this from happening again? We now know what we can do. It may not be a panacea, but it is making sure our law enforcement authorities, such as the FBI, have the tools they need in order to conduct these investigations, again to collect the dots so they can connect those dots.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, there is a lot going on around here. Before lunch, we finished a vote that I was very disappointed did not reach the 60-vote threshold so we could proceed to debate

and vote on what I think is one of the more important issues we are dealing with; that is, our ability to stop terrorist attacks.

As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, we have had the opportunity to meet several times with Director Comey, the head of the FBI, asking him if they have the tools necessary to prevent terrorist attacks against innocent Americans. Simply because of changes in technology, a tool they had before—and by “tool,” a method they had before to try to determine who is trying to do us harm—works for one type of technology, but new technology, basically because of an omission in the language that was never intended by the Congress, does not give us the ability to so-call connect the dots to give us the opportunity to then go and seek a warrant for further investigation.

This was the vote we had on the floor. We came up just one or two votes short. I know the majority leader made a motion to reconsider so we will be taking this up again. I hope my colleagues who did not vote for this will take the opportunity as a Member of the U.S. Senate to come to the Intelligence Committee to sit down, look at the classified information, and assure themselves this does nothing that invades anyone's privacy rights.

There seems to be a lack of information as to what is being asked for. In that regard, hopefully during this next few days, we will have the opportunity for our colleagues to come and understand this. Frankly, it is something many had voted for but were not aware of this glitch in the language that has put us in this particular position. I will be happy to accompany any of my colleagues to a place where we can look through, on a classified basis, why this is so important.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. President, I want to do what I have been doing now for about 46 weeks in the Senate in this cycle; that is, to discuss the waste of the week. The waste of the week is something we have been talking about. While I deeply regret we have not been able to fashion a long-term program dealing with our debt and our deficit, which is so critical for the future of this country, the least we can do is look at the way we currently spend taxpayer money, and in doing so, weed out those programs that simply don't justify the use of taxpayer money.

I was going to do this last week, and after the tragic events of Orlando, I didn't think it was the appropriate time to do so. So today I am doing two wastes of the week to make up for last week and this week.

This week, the Senate is considering legislation that funds a number of agencies, including the National Science Foundation. When Congress created the National Science Foundation, the agency's goals were to promote progress in science, help secure our national defense, and advance na-

tional health, prosperity, and welfare. That is a great goal.

I am not here today to question the validity of the National Science Foundation. There is no question that research funded by the NSF has led to remarkable discoveries in that the majority of the work they do, their research, is worthwhile. However, thanks to the work started by my former colleague Senator Tom Coburn, it has now become clear that the National Science Foundation has funded some research that truly falls in the category of a waste of taxpayer dollars—either because the research has questionable benefit or because it is research that should more appropriately be conducted by the private sector or perhaps it doesn't even need to be conducted.

By the way, these are all documented. Inspectors general—the Government Accountability Office goes in and does audits and they look at how money is spent. Then they report this back to us. We look at this and say: How in the world did this ever get approved? Who agreed to spend this kind of money on this kind of research project when we are running deficits, when we are deeply in debt here as a nation? Is this a wise way to spend hard-earned tax dollars?

We are trying to bring these to light in a transparent way so our Members will say: Let's crack down on this kind of stuff. I don't want to go home and tell my constituents their tax dollars are going toward this kind of stuff.

We had another example several months ago about—you can't make this stuff up—whether, if people are hungry, they are more disposed to be a little curt or a little angry with their spouse. Somebody came up with the idea: Let's test this out. The expenditure was considerable for this research. I can't remember exactly what it is right now, but they gave husbands and wives voodoo dolls and a bunch of pins. They said: Every time you feel a bad feeling or want to say something mean to your spouse, you take your voodoo doll—you have your voodoo doll that looks like your wife and your wife has one that looks like her husband—and you take a pin and stick it in the voodoo doll. When you did this, you were asked the question: Were you hungry at the time? If you were hungry at the time, they said to count all the pins and say: Well, OK, we have proven the fact that if you are hungry, you are more likely to be upset with your spouse than if you are not hungry.

To come here and explain this, people say this can't be true. Tell me, tell me tax dollars are not used for something like this out of an agency as respected as the National Science Foundation. Yet they defended this process as a legitimate grant, expenditure of taxpayer dollars, and used a new word, “hangry.” It is the combination of being hungry and angry, and it is hangry. Are you hangry? And if you are, you might be upset with your spouse a little more quickly because

the pins in the voodoo dolls prove that. I promise you, I am not making this up. This is documented. This is what the research project included.

Today, I want to name two additional examples. I am not picking on the NSF, but we keep reading about this. Here are two examples that cost taxpayers nearly \$2.2 million. The first example is a \$171,000 grant to research how monkeys gamble. Yes, you heard that correctly. Researchers actually taught monkeys to gamble to see if they could develop a hot-hand mentality.

Now let me put my cards on the table and explain what this means. Researchers taught monkeys to keep gambling and keep playing, despite potential risk, in order to maximize their rewards. Instead of earning money, which the monkeys weren't going to take the money to a store and spend, the monkeys were rewarded with food. It turns out the monkeys tried to get as much food as possible from their gambling game. In other words, knowing there was going to be the reward of more food if they kept gambling, the monkeys kept gambling.

First of all, I didn't know monkeys could gamble so I guess we learned something there. Secondly, my bet is that taxpayers agree with me that there are much more pressing issues that deserve Federal funding.

The second example I want to talk about is the nearly \$2 million grant to Cornell University for a study on popular landmark photos. This money was used to study photos that have been posted—I think we have a chart here. We actually found a picture of the monkeys gambling. Here are their chips. Somehow they taught them to gamble. They were rewarded with food. The monkeys figured out pretty quickly that if they kept gambling, they could get more food.

It is not unlike my dog. We wake up in the morning, and the first one up in our house—my wife or myself—feeds the dog. If we forget to tell each other that we fed the dog—I go off to work, catch a plane to come back to Washington—I get a call from my wife: Did you feed the dog? Yes, I did feed the dog. Well, she is sitting here begging, looking like, “Poor thing, I didn't get anything to eat this morning”—soulful eyes on Honey Hoosier. That is our dog, soulful eyes looking at you, “Oh, if you could just give me something to eat.” My wife says: I fed the dog because I thought you surely didn't feed the dog because she looked so sad.

Hey, she is gaming the whole program here. She is very successful with me because I look at her and say: Oh, you poor thing. Let me give you some food. And then my wife comes out later and says: You know, I fed the dog. I hope you didn't feed her again.

Anyway, the animals figured it out pretty quickly, and I don't know what this leads to as a conclusion. All I know is, why should the taxpayer be paying for stuff like this? These are fun

things maybe to do for somebody if they want to do them, I suppose, but the conclusions they come to, it may benefit society, but does it have to be done with taxpayer dollars? So on and on we go.

The second issue here is this Cornell study on photos. The researchers claim they searched the 40 billion pages of Web sites with photos to make photo archives available to social science for research. In reality, the researchers examined photos that had been uploaded to a popular photo-sharing site called Flickr and then determined some of the top photograph sites in the world. What did they find? Unsurprisingly, the most popular sites included the Eiffel Tower, Big Ben, the Empire State Building. Unfortunately, the Indianapolis Motor Speedway was not included, which is disturbing to me. They also found that the Apple store on Fifth Avenue in New York City is more popular on Flickr than the White House. You can come to your own conclusions as to what you might think about that, but we have to ask ourselves: Was this basic Internet research really worth \$2 million of taxpayer money? The researchers said it is because the work can help with online travel guides and improve social media sites' ability to guess where a photo was taken. Helping improve online travel guides and social media geolocation services is not exactly part of the NSF's original mission, which I read to you.

What can Congress do about these kind of things? One problem with Congress's inability to crack down on wasteful spending is the lack of transparency, and what we are doing here is trying to be transparent. We are exposing to my colleagues, we are exposing to the American public the kind of waste that is going on with their hard-earned tax dollars. They sent their hard-earned tax dollars to Washington thinking that it would be invested in building new roads, infrastructure, providing for our military defense, or the veterans who have come home and need support. No, instead it goes to grants that go to these kinds of crazy things. That is why I submitted an amendment to this week's bill to require the National Science Foundation to publish the full documents submitted by NSF grant recipients outlining what the research will entail. We can no longer trust the decisionmaking process of the National Science Foundation. We want them to publish and provide documentation to the Congress so we know who is and why they are making these decisions and where this money is going.

As of today, the NSF provides only short summaries of the proposals that are awarded funds, but these summaries are very limited, and, of course, they are written in a way that makes it look as though it is legitimate and something that we really need to do. We cannot appropriately fix the problem without all of the information and a clear understanding of the intent of

the research grants that are awarded by the National Science Foundation. Taxpayers have a right to know how their money is being spent.

Our ever-growing accumulation of wasted taxpayer dollars can now add over \$2 million for gambling monkeys in a photo popularity contest, bringing our pricetag to nearly \$176 billion of taxpayer money wasted on projects that really provide little or no benefit to the American people. That is what the inspectors general at the Government Accountability Office and others have determined, and this is not small change. People work really hard to raise this kind of money and are then taxed at a level of \$176 billion only to see every dollar and every penny of that essentially wasted through fraud or abuse.

I will keep coming to the floor, so stay tuned for next week's revelation. I could probably come down and do this every day when the Senate is in session because I am just scratching the surface. We will keep pointing out how the people's money is being spent, and hopefully on the basis of that, Congress will take action to make sure it no longer falls under the category of waste, fraud, and abuse.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

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

VETERANS FIRST ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleagues from the Veterans Affairs' Committee for their work on the Veterans First Act. I just left the committee, where Senator ISAKSON and Senator BLUMENTHAL are in their typical bipartisan way working together with the VA to improve veterans' health care. I am appreciative of that. They will be on the floor later this afternoon to urge the Senate to move quickly on this important legislation for our Nation's heroes.

This comprehensive, bipartisan bill will grant vets and their families expanded benefits that will ensure that the VA has resources to provide veterans with the highest quality of care. No veteran should face exploitation by for-profit colleges, inadequate care, or life on the street. We address all these issues with this bill.

This bill will expand educational opportunities for veterans and their families, including my constituent, Melissa Twine. Ms. Twine is an Air Force veteran from Batavia, east of Cincinnati, in Clermont County. Her husband Philip Twine died serving our country in the Air Force.

The Fry Scholarship provides GI bill benefits to surviving spouses and children of servicemembers who have died in the line of duty since 9/11. However, when Congress extended the benefit to spouses in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, a 15-year limitation was put on these benefits. Captain Twine passed away in 2002, meaning that now, as his wife tries to go back to school to pursue her master's degree, she and so many other surviving spouses don't have the time to use this benefit. This bill will fix that and give veterans' families the opportunity to further their education.

In addition to expanding the Fry Scholarship, the bill will expand the VA's Yellow Ribbon Program to help students with out-of-pocket tuition and fees and to include all spouses and children of servicemembers who gave their lives fighting for our country. The bill also incorporates legislation I helped to introduce to restore GI benefits of veterans who lost credit or training time because their school permanently closed. We have heard too many stories of shady, for-profit colleges that close abruptly, leaving students and many veterans in limbo. This ensures the veterans don't lose their GI benefits.

We know that, shamefully, too many veterans don't have a roof over their heads or a place to call home. The legislation incorporates elements of the Veteran Housing Stability Act, which would increase veterans' access to permanent housing options.

This is an issue that we have been working on for years. Last year, I visited organizations around Ohio that are doing terrific work to give veterans the support they need to get back on their feet and find permanent homes. With this bill we will give veterans the support they need. Even one veteran on the streets means Congress isn't doing nearly enough to tackle this problem.

The legislation also helps ensure whistleblowers at the VA can disclose concerns relating to veterans care without fearing retaliation.

It expands a critical program to support veteran caregivers.

As a country, we made a promise to care for veterans in return for their service to this country. Far too often people in this body are willing to vote billions of dollars for defense but then not do what we should with veterans. This bill helps to change that. Right now, 9/11 veterans and their families already take advantage of this critical support. This bill will make the same support available to families and veterans of all generations.

I urge my colleagues to move quickly in this important legislation to protect and honor our Nation's heroes.

CONGRATULATING THE CLEVELAND CAVALIERS FOR WINNING THE 2016 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION FINALS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I know I will be joined in a few moments by my colleague from Ohio, Senator PORTMAN.

I rise to make some remarks on a resolution Senator PORTMAN has submitted with me.

Mr. President, journalists and sports fans like to describe victories as "historic," and often that is a bit of hyperbole. But in the case of the Cleveland Cavaliers' NBA championship win on Sunday, the word "historic" is warranted.

Today, several hundred thousand people gathered in downtown Cleveland. Senator PORTMAN and I talked about how we would have liked to have joined in. But we have these day jobs, and we just figured we couldn't really go back. Today, literally hundreds of thousands of people are in downtown Cleveland. Some estimates were as high as almost all the adult population of Cuyahoga County. The numbers are pretty spectacular. The word "historic" is warranted in this Cavaliers victory on Sunday night.

No other team in NBA history has come from a 3-to-1 series deficit in the finals, until now. No other major American city has gone so long as Cleveland has without winning a major league sports championship.

It is fitting for my city—my wife and I call Cleveland home—that this championship came down to game 7. The series played out like a metaphor for what this means in Cleveland—ever the underdog, down 3 games to 1.

To understand what this victory means for our Midwestern city on the lake, think about the last time we won a championship in a major sport. None of the pages sitting here were born. In fact, some of their parents might not have yet been born. It was 1964.

Lyndon Johnson was President. Martin Luther King, Jr., was in the middle of a very successful civil rights campaign. Robert Kennedy, who sat at this desk on the Senate floor, was still alive, campaigning for civil rights and economic justice. America was beginning to hear more and more about Vietnam on the evening news. We had no idea of the nightmare that it would become.

The Beatles had just come to America. We had three TV channels in Cleveland—channels 3, 5, and 8. The most popular shows were "Bonanza" and "Bewitched."

As a boy growing up in Mansfield—not far from Cleveland, about 70 miles—I watched with pride a little more than 2 years before that when Ohio's John Glenn orbited the Earth in *Friendship 7*. The moon was still a distant dream, and none of us had heard of astronaut Neil Armstrong.

The Cleveland Browns with Jim Brown brought home the NFL championship for us that December. It wasn't even called the Super Bowl back

then. That is how long ago this was. It was called the NFL championship. Little did any of us know that we wouldn't see another trophy for another half century.

I was 12 years old at the time.

The Cleveland Cavaliers did not exist. The NBA was much smaller. Three years earlier, the Indians had traded the beloved outfielder, the hero of all young fans, Rocco Colavito was traded away to Detroit. The Indians were in the midst of losing season after losing season. Within a year or 2, they put together a top-line four-person starting pitching staff—Sonny Siebert, Luis Tiant, Sam McDowell, Steve Hargan—but still the Cleveland Indians didn't win.

As a 10-year-old, a 12-year-old, and a 15-year-old, my dad would take us up old U.S. 42, often to see a double-header, back when they played those kinds of double-headers on Sunday.

My dad would never take us to see the New York Yankees, a team he despised, because he knew that 15 or 20 cents of our ticket price would go to Mickey Mantle or Roger Maris and Yogi Berra and other Yankees.

Every year I was naive to think the Indians would win the pennant. Never in those years would they even get close. By July, or certainly by August, it was clear even to this 12-year-old boy that the Indians were not going to win the pennant.

For the next 52 years after the 1964 Browns championship, we were challenged in the city of Cleveland. The manufacturing economy that sustained Northeast Ohio eroded with decades of policy choices that closed factories and shipped jobs overseas. Too often there was bad trade policy and bad tax policy. The population of the city shrank to almost half its population from my boyhood, from my early years.

Beginning in 1995, Ohio had 14 years of consecutive foreclosure increases, each year more than the year before.

But today, downtown Cleveland is coming back, not just because hundreds of thousands of people are in downtown Cleveland celebrating this first NBA championship, but it is coming back. My wife and I moved into the city 3 years ago. We wanted to be a part of this renaissance, and we have seen the city beginning to return to its glory.

Nothing has embodied the hope and the determination and the grit of our city like this team. We know that sports teams are far more than the sum of their parts. They are a point of connection for people in every walk of life in the city. There is a reason we have begun to call it Believeland.

On Monday, a native Clevelander who had to move away from his hometown posted this on Facebook:

We draw so much from our teams. It's wound up in our identity—a token of the pride we have for the local tribe from which we came.

My wife Connie reposted the man's words that night, and hundreds chimed