team respond? By saying: Well, our football team is worth a lot of money, and as part of that value, the Redskins name is worth some money.

I mean, does Daniel Snyder have enough money? I think so, without disparaging the group of Indians we have in Nevada—22 separate tribal entities in Nevada. They do not like this. Snyder tried a couple of things—bought them a car and thought they would back off and no longer object. They saw that one coming, and they said: No, you keep the car.

What the judge did yesterday is good news. The Federal Government should not protect a team or company that takes pride in hearing a racial slur every time their name is mentioned.

While the ruling is a step in the right direction, this battle is not over. Ultimately, the response will rest with the owner, Dan Snyder, a multibillionaire. The U.S. Government cannot change his team's name; only he can. For far too long, owner Snyder has tried to hide behind tradition, but yesterday's ruling makes clear that his franchise's name only fosters a tradition of racism, bigotry, and intolerance.

I admire so very much the Republican Governor of South Carolina. She has all the conservative credentials anyone needs, and after that terrible incident at a church in her State, she said the Confederate flag is going to go. Yesterday, after a long debate, as I understand it, the South Carolina Legislature said no more public display of the flag. So tradition is not the name of the game. Fairness—not racism, not bigotry, not intolerance—is the game.

Dan Snyder should do the right thing and change the team's name. There is no place for that kind of tradition in the National Football League, and there is certainly no place for it in our great country.

Mr. President, I apologize to my friend the chairman of the committee for taking so much time.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1177, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1177) to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to ensure that every child achieves.

Pending:

Alexander/Murray amendment No. 2089, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander (for Fischer) amendment No. 2079 (to amendment No. 2089), to ensure local governance of education.

Murray (for Peters) amendment No. 2095 (to amendment No. 2089), to allow local educational agencies to use parent and family engagement funds for financial literacy activities.

Toomey amendment No. 2094 (to amendment No. 2089), to protect our children from convicted pedophiles, child molesters, and other sex offenders infiltrating our schools and from schools ''passing the trash''—helping pedophiles obtain jobs at other schools.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and the Republican leader have created an environment in which we can succeed on this bill, and I am grateful to them for that. I listened to their remarks this morning about some things that have gone on in the past in the Senate. My late friend Alex Haley, the author of ''Roots,'' used to say: Find the good and praise it. And so what I would like to do is thank the majority leader for putting the bill on the floor. Only he can do that and give us a chance to debate it. I thank the Democratic leader for creating an environment in which we can have a large number of amendments and succeed.

I thank the Senator from Washington, Mrs. PATTY MURRAY, who suggested the way we proceed today. We fell into some partisan differences in the last two Congresses that made that impossible, and she has, as much as anybody, helped solve that problem.

We are making good progress. We have adopted a number of amendments. We voted on some others. Some have passed, and some have been defeated. People have had a chance to have their say. Senator MURRAY and I have received a large number of amendments—several dozen, actually, that Senators on both sides have offered—that we have agreed to recommend to the full Senate we adopt by consent.

In addition to that, we adopted 29 amendments in the committee consideration, and many of those were amendments from Democratic Members of the Senate. So I think most Senators—in fact, I haven't heard a single one say that they haven't had a chance to have their say on No Child Left Behind.

Yesterday, I put into the RECORD an op-ed from the Washington Post by the Virginia Secretary of Education Anne Holton, who made the argument that States, like Virginia, are well prepared to accept the responsibility for higher standards, better teaching, and real accountability. Over the last 15 years, that has happened in every State.

It reminds us that this bill we are debating only provides 4 percent of the dollars that pay for our 100,000 public schools in the country. We have some other money that the Federal Government spends—4 percent or 5 percent more—for those schools, but this bill spends 4 percent. Most of the money, most of the responsibility, most of the opportunity for success is with parents, classroom teachers, and others who are close to the children.

The consensus we have developed, the bipartisan consensus—again, with the bill Senator MURRAY and I put together and improved by our committee and now being improved on the floor—is that while we keep the important measures of the accountability, so we know what children in South Dakota and Tennessee and Washington State are learning and not learning, so we can tell if anyone is left behind, that we restore to States the responsibility for figuring out what to do about the tests. That has broad-scale support.

Superintendents were in town yesterday from all over the country; they told us that. Governors are calling us; they tell us that. The major teachers organizations in the country tell us we do not need, in effect, a national school board. Those decisions need to be made by teachers who cherish the children in their classroom and the parents who put them there and school board members who care for them and Governors and legislators who are closer to home. So this bill isn't easy to do, but because of that consensus, we are making good progress.

I will submit following my remarks an article from earlier this week from Newsweek entitled, ''The Education Law Everyone Wants to Fix.'' The House of Representatives said it wants to fix it last night. The progress we are making suggests the Senate wants to fix it. We know all across the country Governors, legislators, teachers, school superintendents, and parents want to end the confusion and anxiety in the 100,000 public schools.

We will be having more votes, hopefully today just before lunch, and then we will continue with the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the article from Newsweek entitled ''The Education Law Everyone Wants to Fix'' be printed in the RECORD.

On a different subject, which I will not elaborate on today, I wish to also include, following my remarks, an article I wrote for the Wall Street Journal yesterday about the cost of going to college. I think it is unfortunate that so many politicians and pundits say that Americans can't afford college when in fact most of them can. It is never easy, but it is important for them to know that for low-income Americans, for example, the first 2 years of college are free or nearly free at a community college; and there are many other ways colleges, universities, the Federal Government, and taxpayers try to make it easy for a larger number of Americans to go to college. That is a debate Senator MURRAY and I are already working on. We will bring the reauthorization of the higher education bill before the Senate hopefully later this year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my op-ed from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. President, there are a number of Senators who wish to come to the floor to speak today. I encourage any Senator who hasn't presented their amendment to go ahead and do that. I am

hopeful that soon we will have an agreement to have a number of votes before lunch.

I yield the floor.

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

[From Newsweek, July 3, 2015]

THE EDUCATION LAW EVERYONE WANTS TO FIX

(By Emily Cadei)

When it comes to setting standards for America's public schools, there's a remarkable degree of consensus: The system the federal government has in place—known as No Child Left Behind—doesn't work. Fixing it, however, is about to set off a new round of fierce political combat in Washington, D.C., and draw in 2016 candidates as well.

Both the House and Senate are set to debate the 2001 No Child Left Behind law next week. Passed with bipartisan support—including the unlikely pairing of President George W. Bush and Massachusetts liberal Sen. Ted Kennedy—it sought to set national standards for school and student achievement, and mandated testing to make sure they were keeping up as well as funding incentives to keep schools on track.

But the goals that the 2001 law set turned out to be far too ambitious and, the chorus of critics say, too rigid. ''Teaching to the test'' is a refrain heard across the country. Test results have become an end-all, be-all, complain teachers and parents, Democrats and Republicans, alike.

No Child Left Behind ''simplified all of school accountability to be a performance on a math test or a reading test,'' says Mary Kusler, director of government relations for the National Education Association, which lobbies on behalf of teachers and other education professionals. That, Kusler says, ''has corrupted the education our children are receiving because it has reduced our schools to this reduce and punish system.''

The two parties have very different visions for overhauling the law, however. Those in the middle, the House and Senate leaders that have drafted the legislation, are now faced with walking a tightrope between a measure that will win sufficient Republican support in the House but still get a signature from President Obama. That's no easy task—the law has technically been expired since 2007, but Congress has not been able to muster the political consensus to reauthorize it since then. It's still being implemented, though, because Congress continues to provide funding for the vast majority of its programs.

In the Senate, Tennessee Republican Lamar Alexander, a former Secretary of Education, and Washington Democrat Patty Murray have crafted a proposal that passed their Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee unanimously in April. Their legislation would maintain the testing regimen put in place by No Child Left Behind but give states more flexibility in how they use test results to measure performance. That's earned the hearty endorsement of teachers and groups like NBA, as well as business associations—which are usually on opposite sides of the education policy debate. In order to get Democrats on board, Alexander dropped one big Republican priority from the bill—a provision that would link federal funding for students from low-income areas to the individual child, rather than the school district in which they reside, which is how the system works now. Republicans argue this ''portability'' measure gives children and their families an opportunity to go to better schools but Democrats say it will just weaken already struggling schools. It's part of a broader fight over ''school choice'' and whether students can use public funds to go to the school they want—even private school—via things like vouchers. That, says Kusler, defeats the whole purpose of the law, which is aimed at improving low-performing schools and ''serving historically underserved populations.''

The House bill, sponsored by Minnesota Republican John Kline, includes the portability provision Republicans favor. That prompted a veto threat from the White House in February. But even with that provision, Kline's bill has had trouble winning conservative support. Republican leaders initially planned to hold a vote on it in late February but changed their minds at the last minute when it became apparent they didn't have enough GOP support. Members aligned with the Tea Party argue the overhaul still spends too much money and leaves too much power in the hands of the federal government. They're insisting on a vote on an amendment that would give states the option of opting out of No Child Left Behind requirements entirely, a proposal known in shorthand as A-PLUS.

''There's just no conceivable way they can bring the Kline bill onto the floor without bringing up A-PLUS,'' says Dan Holler, spokesman for Heritage Action for America, the advocacy arm of the conservative Heritage Foundation. Holler's group came out in strong opposition to the bill in February and plans to continue to oppose it unless that provision is included in the House bill. He argues that the House needs to pass the most conservative bill possible, given that they'll then have to negotiate a final text with the Senate.

Given how toxic No Child Left Behind has become, 2016 candidates on the campaign trail are going to be hard-pressed to avoid the debate. There could be 100 amendments or more filed in the Senate, which means the four Republican senators running for president will have to weigh in on plenty of thorny questions surrounding education policy as it relates to race, inequality and states' rights.

Even those candidates who won't be voting, however, are bound to be questioned on the topic. Education policy has become a litmus test on the Right, with conservatives rallying against any attempts to nationalize what they believe should be state or local decisions. They've mainly focused on plans for a national curriculum, known as Common Core, which is not part of the No Child Left Behind law. But Common Core is indirectly linked, since states have adopted it to meet the testing and accountability standards that No Child Left Behind created.

Many Republican governors that initially embraced the Common Core standards, including 2016 long shots Chris Christie of New Jersey and Bobby Jindal of Louisiana, have backed away from them amidst the conservative backlash. Former Florida Gov. Jeb Bush is one of the few (along with Gov. John Kasich of Ohio) who has stood by Common Core. He also once offered the Obama administration support in its efforts to reauthorize No Child Left Behind, according to an email the website Buzzfeed published last month. Those education stands are a big reason for conservatives' simmering distrust of this son and brother of past presidents.

The teachers' unions, meanwhile, continue to hold tremendous sway in the Democratic primary, and their endorsements remain up for grabs in 2016. Dark horse candidate Martin O'Malley, the former governor of Maryland, is clearly eyeing that vote, and is scheduled to hold an education event followed by a meeting with the NBA of New Hampshire next week.

The presidential race also offers a rationale to conservative holdouts opposed to the No Child Left Behind reauthorization, which would be effective for as long as five years. With the possibility of a Republican sweeping into the White House, some argue it's best to stick to the status quo for now, and tackle a more ambitious overhaul once a more conservative president is in office (they hope).

But Kusler, for one, is hopeful that the pressure from all sides to fix an unworkable law will ultimately force a political compromise—opposed to kicking the can down the road further. ''I am entirely optimistic that we will get this done. We have never been so close,'' she says. ''We have created a perfect storm here.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, July 6, 2015]

COLLEGE TOO EXPENSIVE? THAT'S A MYTH

(By Lamar Alexander)

Pell grants, state aid, modest loans and scholarships put a four-year public institution within the reach of most.

Paying for college never is easy, but it's easier than most people think. Yet some politicians and pundits say students can't afford a college education. That's wrong. Most of them can.

Public two-year colleges, for example, are free or nearly free for low-income students. Nationally, community college tuition and fees average $3,300 per year, according to the College Board. The annual federal Pell grant for these students—which does not have to be paid back—also averages $3,300.

At public four-year colleges, tuition and fees average about $9,000. At the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, tuition and fees are $11,800. One third of its students have a Pell grant (up to $5,775 depending on financial need), and 98% of instate freshmen have a state Hope Scholarship, providing up to $3,500 annually for freshmen and sophomores and up to $4,500 for juniors or seniors. States run a variety of similar programs—$11.2 billion in financial aid in 2013, 85% in the form of scholarships, according to the National Association of State Student Grant and Aid Programs.

The reality is that, for most students, a four-year public institution is also within financial reach.

What about really expensive private colleges? Across the country 15% of students attend private universities where tuition and fees average $31,000, according to the College Board. Georgetown University costs even more: about $50,000 a year. Its president, John DeGioia, told me how Georgetown—and many other so-called elite colleges—help make a degree affordable.

First, Georgetown determines what a family can afford to pay. It asks the student to borrow $17,000 over four years and work 10–15 hours a week under its work-study program. Georgetown pays the remainder—at a total cost of about $100 million a year.

Apart from grants, work and savings, there are federal student loans. We hear a lot of questions about these loans. Are taxpayers generous enough? Is borrowing for college a good investment? Are students borrowing too much?

An undergraduate today can get a federal loan of up to $5,500 his first year. The annual loan limit rises to $7,500 his junior and senior years. The fixed interest rate for new loans this year is, by law, 4.29%. A recent graduate may pay back the loan using no more than 10% of his disposable income. And if at that rate he doesn't pay it off in 20 years, taxpayers forgive the loan.

Are students borrowing too much? The College Board reports that a student who graduates from a four-year institution carries, on average, a debt of about $27,000. This is about the same amount of the average new

car loan, according to the information-services company Experian Automotive. The total amount of outstanding student loans is $1.2 trillion. The total amount of auto loans outstanding in the U.S. is $950 billion.

But a student loan is a lot better investment. Cars depreciate. College degrees appreciate. The College Board estimates that a four-year degree will increase an individual's lifetime earnings by $1 million, on average.

What about the scary stories of students with $100,000 or more in debt? These represent only 4% of all student loans, and 90% of the borrowers are doctors, lawyers, business school graduates and others who have earned graduate degrees.

About seven million federal student loan borrowers are in default, defined as failing to make a loan payment in at least nine months. That's about one in 10 of all outstanding federal student loans in default—although the Education Department says most of those loans eventually get paid back.

Here are five steps the federal government can take to make it easier for students to finance their college education:

Allow students to use Pell grants year-round, not only for the traditional fall and spring academic terms, to complete their degrees more rapidly.

Simplify the confusing 108-question federal student-aid application form and consolidate the nine loan repayment programs to two: a standard repayment program and one based on their income.

Change the laws and regulations that discourage colleges from counseling students against borrowing too much.

Require colleges to share in the risk of lending to students. This will ensure that they have some interest in encouraging students to borrow wisely, graduate on time, and be able to pay back what they owe.

Clear out the federal red tape that soaks up state dollars that could otherwise go to help reduce tuition. The Boston Consulting Group found that in one year Vanderbilt University spent a startling $150 million complying with federal rules and regulations governing higher education, adding more than $11,000 to the cost of each Vanderbilt student's $43,000 in tuition. America's more than 6,000 colleges receive on average one new rule, regulation or guidance letter each workday from the Education Department.

It is vital that more Americans earn their college degrees, for their own benefit and that of the country. A report by Georgetown University's Center on Education in the Workforce tells us that if we don't, we'll fall short by five million workers with postsecondary education in five years.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, 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.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, making sure our Nation's students get a quality education is critical for our ability—our country's ability—to lead the world in the years to come, and a good education can be a ticket to the middle class. It is also important for building an economy from the middle out, not just from the top down.

Of course, yesterday the House of Representatives passed their partisan bill to reauthorize the Nation's K–12 education bill. While that is another important step in the process to finally fix the badly broken No Child Left Behind law, I am disappointed that House Republicans have chosen to take a partisan approach in their bill that is unacceptable to Democrats and will never become law.

I appreciate the work that ranking member BOBBY SCOTT put into the House Democratic substitute. I am looking forward to coming together with him as well as Chairman KLINE in a conference. I truly hope House Republicans will be ready to join ranking member BOBBY SCOTT and other House and Senate Democrats, Senate Republicans, and the administration as we work to get this done in a way that works for all students and families. I am looking forward to continuing that work here today in the Senate.

Again, I truly want to thank my colleague, the senior Senator from Tennessee, for working with me on our bipartisan bill, and I appreciate Chairman ALEXANDER's cooperation in working in a bipartisan way through this process. I join him this morning in encouraging our colleagues to file their amendments so we can continue making progress on this important piece of legislation.

Our bipartisan bill, the Every Child Achieves Act, is a good step in the right direction to fix No Child Left Behind. It gives our States more flexibility, while also including Federal guardrails to make sure all students have access to a quality public education. We are not done yet. I want to work to continue to improve and strengthen the bill.

One example, today we will talk about an amendment to help shine a light on inequalities in education that still exist in our country. I thank Senator WARREN for offering her amendment. I look forward to that discussion. That amendment will help States, districts, and schools better analyze student achievement data so they can help their students achieve. So I hope our colleagues will pass that amendment.

I am looking forward to getting started again today to work through this issue and a number of others we have, and I hope to continue to work in a bipartisan way to make sure all students have access to a quality education, again, regardless of where they live or how they learn or how much money they make.

I look forward to today's discussion. Again, I thank our colleagues on the other side of the aisle for working with us to fix this badly broken bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to acknowledge the comments of the Senator from Washington. Before she was here, I commented on her leadership and on how the Democratic leader as well as the Republican leader have created an environment in which we can succeed. We govern a complex country such as ours by consensus, and I think the way we are doing things is a pretty good example of the way we can do that.

I am glad the House of Representatives acted. We have a process for this called conference. We haven't been doing conferences much lately. But she and I both talked with Chairman KLINE and Representative SCOTT. If we should succeed next week, as I believe we will, why then we will have a conference with the House of Representatives, and we will develop a bill we hope the President will be comfortable signing. We are not here just to make a speech. We want to resolve this. As I said in the article I put in earlier, this is the education law everyone wants fixed. In our constitutional system of government, we don't fix it unless the House and Senate agree and the President signs it.

So that is our goal, and we are continuing to make steps, thanks to the leadership of Senator MURRAY and others.

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. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time until 11:30 a.m. today be equally divided between the two managers or their designees and that it be in order to call up the following amendments: Daines amendment No. 2110, Warren amendment No. 2120, Brown amendment No. 2099, Portman amendment No. 2147, Manchin amendment No. 2103, Kaine amendment No. 2096, Heller amendment No. 2121, Feinstein amendment No. 2087; that the Toomey amendment be modified with the changes at the desk; further, that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with a vote in relation to the Toomey amendment, as modified, after disposition of the Brown amendment, with a 60-affirmative vote threshold for adoption of the Daines amendment, and with no second-degree amendments in order to any of the amendments prior to the votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote, and that upon the disposition of the Feinstein amendment, the Senate vote in relation to the Fischer amendment No. 2079.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2094), as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that States have policies or procedures that prohibit aiding or abetting of sexual abuse, and for other purposes)

At the end of title IX, add the following:

SEC. ___. PROHIBITION ON AIDING AND ABETTING SEXUAL ABUSE.

Subpart 2 of part F of title IX (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.), as amended by sections 4001(3) and 9114, and redesignated by section 9106(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 9539. PROHIBITION ON AIDING AND ABETTING SEXUAL ABUSE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A State, State educational agency, or local educational agency in the case of a local educational agency designated under State law, that receives Federal funds under this Act shall have laws, regulations, or policies that prohibit any person who is a school employee, contractor, or agent, or any State educational agency or local educational agency, from assisting a school employee, contractor, or agent in obtaining a new job, apart from the routine transmission of administrative and personnel files, if the person or agency knows, or recklessly disregards credible information indicating, that such school employee, contractor, or agent engaged in sexual misconduct regarding a minor in violation of the law.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—The requirements of subsection (a) shall not apply if the credible information described in such subsection—

''(1)(A) has been properly reported to a law enforcement agency with jurisdiction over the alleged misconduct; and

''(B) has been properly reported to any other authorities as required by Federal, State, or local law, including title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (20 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) and the regulations implementing such title under part 106 of title 34, Code of Federal Regulations, or any succeeding regulations; and

''(2)(A) the case has been officially closed or the prosecutor with jurisdiction over the alleged misconduct has investigated the allegations and notified school officials that there is insufficient information to establish probable cause that the school employee, contractor, or agent engaged in sexual misconduct regarding a minor;

''(B) the school employee, contractor, or agent has been charged with, and exonerated of, the alleged misconduct; or

''(C) the case remains open but there have been no charges filed against, or indictment of, the school employee, contractor, or agent within 4 years of the date on which the information was reported to a law enforcement agency.

''(c) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not have the authority to mandate, direct, or control the specific measures adopted by a State, State educational agency, or local educational agency under this section.

''(d) Construction.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent a State from adopting, or to override a State law, regulation, or policy that provides, greater or additional protections to prohibit any person who is a school employee, contractor, or agent, or any State educational agency or local educational agency, from assisting a school employee who engaged in sexual misconduct regarding a minor in violation of the law in obtaining a new job.''.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, we expect the first four amendments in this series to require rollcall votes, with the rest of the amendments being adopted by a voice vote.

I thank the Senator from Washington for working with us to create this agreement.

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. TOOMEY. 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. 2094, AS MODIFIED

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to speak about my amendment, which is part of the unanimous consent agreement that was just agreed to. I have a number of thank yous I need to go through.

I will start by thanking the cosponsors of this amendment, starting with Senator MANCHIN, who has been with me in this battle for a very long time now. But I wish to thank the other cosponsors, including Senators MCCONNELL, ALEXANDER, COTTON, CAPITO, GARDNER, HELLER, INHOFE, JOHNSON, MCCAIN, ROBERTS, and VITTER.

I am on the floor of the Senate to explain to people what we have done and are going to vote on later today. I believe that this amendment is very constructive, and I am very optimistic and hopeful this will pass.

This amendment is based on a bill that I introduced with Senator MANCHIN over a year and a half ago, which was called the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act. I have spoken about this a number of times because I feel very strongly about this. The fact is that while the overwhelming majority of our school employees across America are wonderful people and some of the great role models of our lives, it is also a fact that there are predators in our schools. That is a sad fact, but it is true. We know this for many reasons, not the least of which is that last year alone there were 459 school employees arrested across America for sexual misconduct with the kids that they are supposed to be protecting.

So far this year we are on a path of arresting people at a rate that exceeds that of last year. We know this is a huge problem.

It came to my attention because of the absolutely horrific story of a young boy named Jeremy Bell. Sadly, that story began in Pennsylvania, where a teacher was molesting the students under his charge. He was molesting little boys. The school figured out what was going on and reported it to the authorities. But as much as they wanted to, the authorities were never able to assemble enough evidence to mount a prosecution. So the school did something despicable. What the school decided to do was to make this predator someone else's problem. So they wrote a letter of recommendation and said: You just leave, take this letter with you, and find employment elsewhere.

Well, this is a pedophile. This is a predator they did this for, and of course he left and became someone else's problem. He was hired in West Virginia as a schoolteacher. Eventually, he became principal, and of course, he serially molested the children in that school, finally culminating in the rape and murder of a little boy named Jeremy Bell.

The practice of sending a letter of recommendation on behalf of a known predator is so appalling that most of us can't imagine anyone would do it. But the sad truth is that it has happened so frequently that it even has a name. It is called passing the trash. In prosecution circles and in the circles of people who are advocates for children who are victims of these horrendous crimes, they know this all too well. Passing the trash is all too common a practice as a way for schools to make these predators someone else's problems.

Well, the initial amendment that I filed this bill, mirroring the legislation that Senator MANCHIN and I introduced, attempted to deal with this problem in two ways. One, in the first place, was to establish a thorough Federal standard for background checks for school employees, and the second was to have a prohibition against passing the trash—to make it illegal for someone to knowingly recommend for hire a sexual predator.

As for the first part, the background check part, we have had disagreements among ourselves as to how to do that and whether to do that. There have been deep disagreements, and despite many conversations with my colleagues, we have not been able to reach an agreement on how to proceed on that. I am disappointed that we have not reached an agreement, but I understand that we don't have the votes to pass that portion. So I have agreed to put that aside for now. I have not agreed to abandon this cause of establishing the most rigorous possible background checks, but we will have that fight another day and hopefully at a time when we have the votes to pass it.

What is really terrific news is that we have reached an agreement on the other part of our legislation, the part that prohibits this despicable, horrendous practice of passing the trash—the very action that enabled the predator to get the job that enabled him, in turn, to rape and kill young Jeremy Bell. Having reached this agreement, I am confident that we will be able to pass this amendment later today. If we do, it will be the first time that the Senate has established that this despicable practice will no longer be tolerated anywhere in the country.

This is a huge victory for America's children. It is as simple as that. When we pass this in the Senate, and when it eventually becomes law, which I am confident it will, the fact is our kids are going to be safer. There are a lot of States that already have some legislation that prohibits passing the trash within their State, but no State can force another State to forbid this practice from coming across the line and into their State. That is why this always needed a Federal response, and I am really thrilled that today I think we are going to have that Federal response.

I need to thank a lot of folks. I see my colleague from West Virginia has joined us, and I will start with him. Senator MANCHIN has been a great partner in this effort since we started over a year and a half ago. I am sure he will have something to add about this entire process.

I also wish to thank the chairman of the committee, Senator ALEXANDER, and Ranking Member MURRAY for all of the help they have provided in getting us to this place. In particular, I have to thank Senator ALEXANDER and his staff, together with my staff. I also have to mention Dimple Gupta, who has worked tirelessly on this issue.

We had many long and often difficult conversations. We started in what seemed like irreconcilable differences about this topic. But because we persisted and everybody approached this in a cooperative fashion, despite the stiff opposition that there was at times, we were able to find common ground.

I also need to acknowledge some outside groups that made it possible for us to find this common ground: the National Children's Alliance, the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, many child advocate groups across Pennsylvania and across the country, law enforcement groups, and prosecutors. Even the American Academy of Pediatricians has been helpful in getting us here.

I will close with this: This is exactly the way the Senate is supposed to work. This is the way it is supposed to happen. As people who share a common vision, we all want to make sure our kids are in the safest possible environment when they go to school. We started with wildly different views about how to get there. When the Senate is working well, it works exactly as it is working now with regular order on the Senate floor, going through the committee process, and having a ranking member and a chairman who are willing to work with individual Members on their priorities. People came together to figure out where their common ground was, how to get this done, and how to put the interest of their constituents, the American people—and in this case our kids and grandkids—ahead of political considerations.

I am really thrilled that I think we have reached that point on this really important amendment. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment. I hope it will have very broad support. I want to say thanks to all of the colleagues who helped to make this happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first of all, let me say to my colleague, Senator TOOMEY from Pennsylvania, that I have enjoyed working with him on many ventures, if you will, but this is one that is particularly gratifying now that we have finally come to an agreement. I think it is bipartisan all the way. I think it will pass. It makes all the sense in the world. It was Jeremy Bell from my State of West Virginia who was the victim of this tragic crime that could have been prevented if we had just known. That is what this is all about. As Senator TOOMEY has said, we are not going to give up on making sure we can find out who these perpetrators are, if they have a record we can follow and trace and keep them out of the school system before they ever begin their careers. That is a situation on which we will continue to be very vigilant.

Again, I thank Senator TOOMEY for his commitment and his hard work. His staff and our staff enjoyed working together. We will continue to work on many endeavors that will benefit most importantly the children of this great country of ours in our respective States.

I thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY for including my amendment—another amendment I will be speaking about—to promote volunteerism and community service. This is an issue about which I feel very strongly. I go all over the State of West Virginia and speak in different parts of the country, and I speak to young people and ask them if they feel as if they own the country.

I say: Do you have ownership? Do you believe this is your country?

They look at me very strangely. They really don't feel as though they have ownership.

I ask them: In the Constitution and in the preamble where it says a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, whom are we speaking about? It is you. It is your government. You own it. What have you done to invest in it? Are you taking care of it? Are you doing preventive maintenance?

I am often reminded of the five promises that were made, which were started by Colin Powell and his five promises committee. It is an idea that my wife and I, when I was Governor of West Virginia, endorsed. We have a five promise program that we still support in West Virginia.

The five promises are simply these:

Every child when they are born into this world should have a loving, caring adult in their life, somebody who unconditionally loves them. Sometimes, unfortunately, it is not always the biological parents or the biological family, but every child deserves to have unconditional love.

Second, every child must have a safe place where harm can't enter their life, where they know they will be kept safe. Every child deserves that.

Third, every child deserves a healthy start. We know that nutrition is important and basically the ability to provide good nutrition. Sometimes, because of economic conditions, the opportunity doesn't always exist. That is a responsibility we have as the greatest country on Earth, the superpower that we are. Every child should have a healthy start.

Fourth, every child should grow to earn a skill, learn a skill, be able to obtain a skill that will carry them to be a successful adult in life.

I will speak about the fifth promise in just a moment.

Giving back to our communities, contributing our time and services to improve our world—this is something everybody can do. We can't use the excuse of ''I am sorry, my family is not wealthy enough for me to do something''—that is not an excuse—or ''I am sorry, I live in a rural area where I just don't have that available to me.'' There is a need everywhere in the world. In every part of this great country, there is a need for people to give something back and do something to contribute, to reach out and help somebody of lesser means, or maybe they don't have any assistance whatsoever in their life. There is an opportunity for every person to give.

I learned from my grandparents. I watched them open up their home and make sure there was always a bed for a stranger, make sure there was always food, and make sure there were a few rules we had to live by. You couldn't swear when there were too many young children around, you couldn't drink, and you had to work and provide something. If that was the case, then my grandparents took care of you and they wanted to share with you. They are pretty simple rules to live by.

Unfortunately, true public service is not there. We for some reason have thought it was somebody else's responsibility to take care of—just offer a government program, a Federal or State program. What happened to reaching across the room, if you will, or reaching across your town or your community or your State to help people? Our world is different, but our commitment to our neighbors shouldn't be. That is one value that doesn't change. One person can still have a meaningful impact on another person's life. We know that.

My amendment with Senator SHAHEEN basically aims to counter this trend by giving every school the flexibility to use their Federal funding on programs that promote volunteerism and community service. That is all. It is optional. It is not mandatory. But if one believes that is such an intricate part of our responsibility as an educator, to make sure these young people have a chance to get into a food bank or a food pantry or a homeless shelter or a senior citizen opportunity to help people in need, or a nursing home—given that chance, they can use some of those resources they will have through this updated bill we are about to pass, which I think is historical and much needed—this amendment will allow them to do that. That is all we have asked for.

I am very appreciative that both Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY have accepted this.

My amendment today is part of keeping General Powell's fifth promise. I

spoke about the four promises. The fifth promise is this: Every child should grow to be a loving, caring adult and give something back. We can't teach that one. People have to earn that one. People have to learn that for themselves. Sometimes people are able to get it from where they live, the family they live with, the community around them. Sometimes people see it and they know it is the right thing to do. This is going to provide an opportunity in an educational setting to find one's lot in life, to be able to give something back, to be able to grow into a loving, caring adult. That is what this is all about.

So I believe very strongly in this amendment. I believe very strongly that it is going to help the youth of America to be able to be Americans and what is expected of us as Americans—to help one another.

I would say that an investment in community service pays off both for our students and our communities. In 2013, that 1 year, U.S. taxpayers invested $1.7 billion in our national service programs that we have to date. The total social return on this investment is estimated to be $6.5 billion—almost a 4-to-1 return in the value we receive back as a society. I don't think we can get a better return on an investment than having the youth of America being able to give something back and learn that fifth promise to be a caring, loving adult and be able to carry this tradition on.

With that, I appreciate very much the chairman and the ranking member accepting this amendment. I think it will greatly help the school systems of America to be able to be involved in volunteerism, without social media but truly hands on. So I think this is something we need. I am appreciative, and I thank my colleagues.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from West Virginia. He was just speaking about a need for us to support our young people. In essence, what he was saying is they can use their God-given abilities to be able to give back, and that is what the amendment I wish to speak to is all about.

I appreciate the fact that the chairman and ranking member have agreed to take a look at this amendment. In fact, my understanding is that Senator ALEXANDER is going to be offering this amendment later. This amendment has to do with substance abuse. It has to do with our young people. Unfortunately, we are seeing a younger and younger age of first use of drugs. We are seeing also, unfortunately, more and more young people who struggle with addiction.

In the legislation and in the underlying law, there are provisions for prevention, and that is incredibly important. If we can get our young people not to go down this road, we can avoid some devastating consequences to them and to their future, to their families, and to their communities.

If we look at the use today, in my home State of Ohio—I was just home the day before yesterday at a conference on this issue of heroin use and prescription drug use by our young people. It is growing. It is a huge problem. The No. 1 cause of death now in Ohio is overdose from these drugs. It is no longer car accidents, as it has been in the past. We must focus on this issue, and the most effective way, of course, is through prevention and education, which I strongly support, and it is in the underlying bill.

What is not in the bill, though, is to provide support services for our young people should they be struggling with addiction. This is incredibly important. So the legislation I am offering along with Senator WHITEHOUSE simply provides recovery and support services for our young people who fall victim to the dangers of drugs. We have a responsibility to do this, in my view, again not just to focus, as the underlying legislation does, on drug prevention and early intervention but also to focus on providing these important recovery services to students in schools and communities so they could overcome their addiction and achieve their God-given abilities and again be productive members of society, which the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia were speaking about. I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment.

The second amendment I wish to speak about that I understand also may be offered later and included in a package—and I appreciate the chairman and ranking member taking a look at this—has to do with homeless youth. This is an amendment which basically enables us to streamline the current process, where it is very difficult to establish that somebody is homeless. In fact, under our current law, one has to go through quite a process with HUD, the Department of Housing and Urban Development. I am told there are sometimes up to maybe 10 or 12 different documents one has to go through. This streamlines the process and allows the counselors who are already in the schools to be able to make the determination to help get services to these kids.

Homeless youth in America is now at an alltime high. We are told that 1 in 45 children is homeless each year. By the way, that is 1.6 million children. So I hope this amendment, which is amendment No. 2087, to help homeless youth will also be one we will be able to take up here on the floor. Senator FEINSTEIN and I are offering it together. It is one that is bipartisan, and it is one that will help foster greater community collaboration between agencies and departments by streamlining the process and allowing these counselors who are already in the schools to get the training they need to be able to support these kids, to more quickly identify them and provide the services they need.

I thank my colleague from Montana for allowing me to speak about these two very important amendments. I thank Senator MURRAY and Senator ALEXANDER for giving this very serious consideration in the legislation. I hope these amendments can be adopted on a bipartisan basis.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 2110 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2089

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 2110.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is set aside.

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. DAINES] proposes an amendment numbered 2110 to amendment No. 2089.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow a State to submit a declaration of intent to the Secretary of Education to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of students)

After part B of title X, insert the following:

PART C—A PLUS ACT

SECTION 10301. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE; DEFINITIONS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This part may be cited as the ''Academic Partnerships Lead Us to Success Act'' or the ''A PLUS Act''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purposes of this part are as follows:

(1) To give States and local communities added flexibility to determine how to improve academic achievement and implement education reforms.

(2) To reduce the administrative costs and compliance burden of Federal education programs in order to focus Federal resources on improving academic achievement.

(3) To ensure that States and communities are accountable to the public for advancing the academic achievement of all students, especially disadvantaged children.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided, the terms used in this part have the meanings given the terms in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801 et seq.).

(2) OTHER TERMS.—In this part:

(A) ACCOUNTABILITY.—The term ''accountability'' means that public schools are answerable to parents and other taxpayers for the use of public funds and shall report student progress to parents and taxpayers regularly.

(B) DECLARATION OF INTENT.—The term ''declaration of intent'' means a decision by a State, as determined by State Authorizing Officials or by referendum, to assume full management responsibility for the expenditure of Federal funds for certain eligible programs for the purpose of advancing, on a more comprehensive and effective basis, the educational policy of such State.

(C) STATE.—The term ''State'' has the meaning given such term in section 1122(e) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6332(e)).

(D) STATE AUTHORIZING OFFICIALS.—The term ''State Authorizing Officials'' means the State officials who shall authorize the submission of a declaration of intent, and any amendments thereto, on behalf of the State. Such officials shall include not less than 2 of the following:

(i) The governor of the State.

(ii) The highest elected education official of the State, if any.

(iii) The legislature of the State.

(E) STATE DESIGNATED OFFICER.—The term ''State Designated Officer'' means the person designated by the State Authorizing Officials to submit to the Secretary, on behalf of the State, a declaration of intent, and any amendments thereto, and to function as the point-of-contact for the State for the Secretary and others relating to any responsibilities arising under this part.

SEC. 10302. DECLARATION OF INTENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State is authorized to submit to the Secretary a declaration of intent permitting the State to receive Federal funds on a consolidated basis to manage the expenditure of such funds to advance the educational policy of the State.

(b) PROGRAMS ELIGIBLE FOR CONSOLIDATION AND PERMISSIBLE USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) SCOPE.—A State may choose to include within the scope of the State's declaration of intent any program for which Congress makes funds available to the State if the program is for a purpose described in the Elementary and Education Secondary Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301). A State may not include any program funded pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

(2) USES OF FUNDS.—Funds made available to a State pursuant to a declaration of intent under this part shall be used for any educational purpose permitted by State law of the State submitting a declaration of intent.

(3) REMOVAL OF FISCAL AND ACCOUNTING BARRIERS.—Each State educational agency that operates under a declaration of intent under this part shall modify or eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers that prevent local educational agencies and schools from easily consolidating funds from other Federal, State, and local sources in order to improve educational opportunities and reduce unnecessary fiscal and accounting requirements.

(c) CONTENTS OF DECLARATION.—Each declaration of intent shall contain—

(1) a list of eligible programs that are subject to the declaration of intent;

(2) an assurance that the submission of the declaration of intent has been authorized by the State Authorizing Officials, specifying the identity of the State Designated Officer;

(3) the duration of the declaration of intent;

(4) an assurance that the State will use fiscal control and fund accounting procedures;

(5) an assurance that the State will meet the requirements of applicable Federal civil rights laws in carrying out the declaration of intent and in consolidating and using the funds under the declaration of intent;

(6) an assurance that in implementing the declaration of intent the State will seek to advance educational opportunities for the disadvantaged;

(7) a description of the plan for maintaining direct accountability to parents and other citizens of the State; and

(8) an assurance that in implementing the declaration of intent, the State will seek to use Federal funds to supplement, rather than supplant, State education funding.

(d) DURATION.—The duration of the declaration of intent shall not exceed 5 years.

(e) REVIEW AND RECOGNITION BY THE SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall review the declaration of intent received from the State Designated Officer not more than 60 days after the date of receipt of such declaration, and shall recognize such declaration of intent unless the declaration of intent fails to meet the requirements under subsection (c).

(2) RECOGNITION BY OPERATION OF LAW.—If the Secretary fails to take action within the time specified in paragraph (1), the declaration of intent, as submitted, shall be deemed to be approved.

(f) AMENDMENT TO DECLARATION OF INTENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State Authorizing Officials may direct the State Designated Officer to submit amendments to a declaration of intent that is in effect. Such amendments shall be submitted to the Secretary and considered by the Secretary in accordance with subsection (e).

(2) AMENDMENTS AUTHORIZED.—A declaration of intent that is in effect may be amended to—

(A) expand the scope of such declaration of intent to encompass additional eligible programs;

(B) reduce the scope of such declaration of intent by excluding coverage of a Federal program included in the original declaration of intent;

(C) modify the duration of such declaration of intent; or

(D) achieve such other modifications as the State Authorizing Officials deem appropriate.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment shall specify an effective date. Such effective date shall provide adequate time to assure full compliance with Federal program requirements relating to an eligible program that has been removed from the coverage of the declaration of intent by the proposed amendment.

(4) TREATMENT OF PROGRAM FUNDS WITHDRAWN FROM DECLARATION OF INTENT.—Beginning on the effective date of an amendment executed under paragraph (2)(B), each program requirement of each program removed from the declaration of intent shall apply to the State's use of funds made available under the program.

SEC. 10303. TRANSPARENCY FOR RESULTS OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State operating under a declaration of intent under this part shall inform parents and the general public regarding the student achievement assessment system, demonstrating student progress relative to the State's determination of student proficiency, as described in paragraph (2), for the purpose of public accountability to parents and taxpayers.

(b) ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM.—The State shall determine and establish an accountability system to ensure accountability under this part.

(c) REPORT ON STUDENT PROGRESS.—Not later than 1 year after the effective date of the declaration of intent, and annually thereafter, a State shall disseminate widely to parents and the general public a report that describes student progress. The report shall include—

(1) student performance data disaggregated in the same manner as data are disaggregated under section 1111(b)(3)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311(b)(3)(A)); and

(2) a description of how the State has used Federal funds to improve academic achievement, reduce achievement disparities between various student groups, and improve educational opportunities for the disadvantaged.

SEC. 10304. ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amount that a State with a declaration of intent may expend for administrative expenses shall be limited to 1 percent of the aggregate amount of Federal funds made available to the State through the eligible programs included within the scope of such declaration of intent.

(b) STATES NOT CONSOLIDATING FUNDS UNDER PART A OF TITLE I.—If the declaration of intent does not include within its scope part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6311 et seq.), the amount spent by the State on administrative expenses shall be limited to 3 percent of the aggregate amount of Federal funds made available to the State pursuant to such declaration of intent.

SEC. 10305. EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION OF PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

Each State consolidating and using funds pursuant to a declaration of intent under this part shall provide for the participation of private school children and teachers in the activities assisted under the declaration of intent in the same manner as participation is provided to private school children and teachers under section 9501 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7881).

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as a fifth-generation Montanan, a product of Montana public schools, a husband of an elementary school teacher, and the father of four children, including one of them who has a degree in elementary education, I understand how important a first-rate education is to our kids' future.

As I meet with parents and educators across Montana, they frequently share concerns about the one-size-fits-all student performance and teacher qualification metrics that currently dictate Federal funding as part of No Child Left Behind. While well-intended, many of these metrics have proven difficult for schools in rural areas to achieve.

As the Senate debates the Every Child Achieves Act to reform our Nation's education policies, one of my priorities will be fighting to increase local control over academic standards and education policies and working to push back against burdensome Federal regulations that often place our schools in a straitjacket.

For example, the U.S. Department of Education has incentivized States to adopt common core standards by offering exemptions from No Child Left Behind regulations and making extra Federal education funds accessible through programs such as Race to the Top to States that adopt common core. However, as are many Montanans, I am deeply concerned that the Federal Government's obvious efforts to back States into adopting such programs is an inappropriate interference in education policy decisions that should be made by the States, should be made by the parents, by the teachers, and local school boards.

If we are serious about wanting to make future generations as fortunate as ours, it is critical that we prepare our children to excel in a globally competitive economy. Our children should

receive a well-rounded education that focuses on core subjects, including reading, writing, science, and math, as well as technical and vocational disciplines and training in the arts.

It is clear that the Federal Government's one-size-fits-none approach isn't working. That is why I am introducing the academic partnerships lead us to success amendment, or A-PLUS for short. It is an amendment to the Every Child Achieves Act. I thank the chairman and the ranking member, Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY, for allowing a vote on this amendment today.

This measure will help expand local control of our schools and return Federal education dollars where they belong—closer to classrooms. With A-PLUS, the States should be freed and will be freed from Washington unworkable teacher standards. States would be free from Washington-knows-best performance metrics. States would be free from Washington's failed test requirements. States would be held accountable by parents and teachers because a bright light would shine directly on the decisions made by State capitals and local school districts.

With freedom from Federal mandates comes more responsibility, transparency, and accountability from the States. It would empower our States, our local schools, our teachers, and our parents to work together to develop solutions that best fit the unique needs of each child. The A-PLUS amendment goes a long way toward returning responsibility for our kids' education closer to home and reduces the influence of the Federal Government over our classrooms.

I thank Senators GRASSLEY, CRUZ, VITTER, JOHNSON, LEE, LANKFORD, BLUNT, CRAPO, RUBIO, and GARDNER for sponsoring my A-PLUS amendment, and I ask my other Senate colleagues to join us in empowering our schools to serve our students, not DC bureaucrats, and support this important amendment.

I see my colleague Senator LEE of Utah is here, and I yield my time for his comments on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the work the Senate is engaged in this week is long overdue. The last time the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was updated was 14 years ago. Congress gave the country No Child Left Behind, a policy that by all accounts has been a failure. That is why in 2012 the Obama administration began offering waivers to States, allowing them to opt out of the coercive and ineffective requirements that No Child Left Behind imposed on America's school districts and classrooms. But State and local school boards quickly learned, just as parents and teachers did, these so-called waivers didn't solve the fundamental problems created by No Child Left Behind; they further entrenched that problem. These weren't waivers in any meaningful sense because they came with a new set of strings attached that only reinforced the authority of Washington, DC, to micromanage the policies and the curriculum of classrooms all around the country. They did not give State and local policymakers the freedom and flexibility to use education funding in a way that would best meet the needs of students and truly empower every child to succeed. No. Instead, they forced teachers, school boards, and State officials to choose between the lesser of two evils—either, on one hand, abide by the Federal mandates of No Child Left Behind or, on the other hand, accept the Federal mandates prescribed by common core and Race to the Top.

The underlying bill we will vote on next week makes the same mistake, and unless it is amended, we can expect it in turn to have the same disappointing results. More kids will be trapped in failing schools, their opportunities in life predetermined by their parents' ZIP Code rather than their God-given talents and their own individual desire to learn and succeed. More teachers can be rewarded on the basis of the number of years they have been on the job rather than on the basis of the number of kids they have helped to graduate. And more parents will regrettably but understandably lose faith in the public education system, knowing it is designed to serve the ideological whims of Federal politicians and Federal bureaucrats instead of the educational needs of their children.

That is why I am here this morning to offer my support and to encourage my colleagues to offer their support for an amendment to the proposed reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, an amendment that would help us avoid the serious mistakes of the past.

The basic premise, the basic animating principle behind the bill before the Senate, as it now stands, and the basic premise, basic principle behind No Child Left Behind and common core is that when it comes to running the classroom, Washington bureaucrats and politicians know better than America's teachers, parents, and local school boards. The principle behind the A-PLUS amendment is essentially the opposite; that no one is in a better position to make decisions about a child's education than his or her parents, guardians, teachers, counselors, and principals. If you believe in this principle as I do—and as experience instructs all of us to do—then you must support the A-PLUS Act because it empowers every child's parents, guardians, teachers, counselors, and principals to make the greatest impact on their education and on their lives, and it would do so without eliminating any Federal mandates—coercive and ineffective though they may be—and would simply give States the choice to opt out of them, no strings attached.

Here is how the A-PLUS act works. If a State's legislators determine that the Federal Government's approach to education reform has not improved academic achievement in their State, they have an alternative. They can submit to the U.S. Department of Education a declaration of intent outlining their State-directed education reform initiatives. In States that choose to opt out, education officials will no longer have to spend all of their time complying with onerous one-size-fits-all Federal mandates. Instead, they will have the freedom and flexibility to listen and respond to the needs and recommendations of parents, teachers, principals, and school boards. They will be able to make their education funds go further by consolidating programs and funding sources, and they will be able to improve the educational opportunities to disadvantaged children by designing their State's policies to be more responsive and more targeted.

This amendment isn't about States' rights so much as it is about children's rights, such as the right to a good education. It would secure those rights by empowering America's teachers and parents to pursue innovative policies, such as charter schools and school vouchers and pay-for-success initiatives that have proven to be successful in classrooms all around the country.

The bill the Senate will vote on next week may be well-intentioned in its reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but it misdiagnoses the problem of the status quo. Our education system needs to be reformed, not in spite of excessive Federal control but because of it. The A-PLUS Act recognizes this fact, and it takes critical steps to rebuild our education policy around it.

I urge my colleagues to support the A-PLUS amendment. The success of America's children depends upon it.

I thank my friend and distinguished colleague from Montana and yield my time back to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I thank the Senator from Utah for his remarks and his insights to empower schools, parents, and States to have more control over their children's future through education. This measure will help expand local control of our schools. It will return Federal education dollars to where they belong; that is, close to the classrooms.

Just before I came down to the floor to speak, I was in my office with some high school students from Montana from communities like St. Regis, Hobson, Missoula, Clyde Park, Stevensville. They are the bright future of our State. As I chatted with them about this amendment, they, too, agreed that by shifting control back to the States, to the local school boards, to the parents, that individual and effective solutions can be created to address the multitude of unique challenges facing our schools and our students across the

country. Through these laboratories of democracy, Americans can watch and learn how students can benefit when innovative reforms are implemented at the local level.

I thank my colleagues, and I urge my Senate colleagues to join us in empowering our schools to serve their students, not DC bureaucrats, and support this important amendment.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2147 AND 2121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2089

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask to set aside the pending amendment to call up the following amendments en bloc: Portman amendment No. 2147 and Heller amendment No. 2121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. ALEXANDER] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 2147 and 2121 to amendment No. 2089.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2147

(Purpose: To promote recovery support services for students)

On page 422, line 22, insert ''recovery support services,'' after ''referral,''.

On page 439, line 16, insert ''recovery support services,'' after ''mentoring,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2121

(Purpose: To ensure timely and meaningful consultation between State educational agencies and Governors in the development of State plans under titles I and II and section 9302)

On page 800, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

SEC. 9115A. CONSULTATION WITH THE GOVERNOR.

Subpart 2 of part F of title IX (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.), as amended by sections 4001(3), 9114, and 9115, and redesignated by section 9106(1), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 9540. CONSULTATION WITH THE GOVERNOR.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency shall consult in a timely and meaningful manner with the Governor, or appropriate officials from the Governor's office, in the development of State plans under titles I and II and section 9302.

''(b) TIMING.—The consultation described in subsection (a) shall include meetings of officials from the State educational agency and the Governor's office and shall occur—

''(1) during the development of such plan; and

''(2) prior to submission of the plan to the Secretary.

''(c) JOINT SIGNATURE AUTHORITY.—A Governor shall have 30 days prior to the State educational agency submitting the State plan under title I or II or section 9302 to the Secretary to sign such plan. If the Governor has not signed the plan within 30 days of delivery by the State educational agency to the Governor, the State educational agency shall submit the plan to the Secretary without such signature.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2120, 2099, 2103, 2096, AND 2087 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2089

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up the following amendments en bloc as provided for under the previous order and ask that they be reported by number: Warren No. 2120, Brown No. 2099, Manchin No. 2103, Kaine No. 2096, and Feinstein No. 2087.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendments by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mrs. MURRAY] proposes amendments en bloc numbered 2120, 2099, 2103, 2096, and 2087 to amendment No. 2089.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2120

(Purpose: To amend section 1111(d) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding the cross-tabulation of student data)

On page 75, strike line 1 and all that follows through line 4 on page 76 and insert the following:

''(iii) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—Upon request by a State or local educational agency, the Secretary shall provide technical assistance to States and local educational agencies in collecting, cross-tabulating, or disaggregating data in order to meet the requirements of this paragraph.

''(C) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each State report card required under this subsection shall include the following information:

''(i) A clear and concise description of the State's accountability system under subsection (b)(3), including the goals for all students and for each of the categories of students, as defined in subsection (b)(3)(A), the indicators used in the accountability system to evaluate school performance described in subsection (b)(3)(B), and the weights of the indicators used in the accountability system to evaluate school performance.

''(ii) Information on student achievement on the academic assessments described in subsection (b)(2) at each level of achievement, as determined by the State under subsection (b)(1), for all students and disaggregated and cross-tabulated in accordance with the following:

''(I) Such information shall be disaggregated by each category of students described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xi), homeless status, and status as a child in foster care and, within each category of students described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xi), cross-tabulated by—

''(aa) each major racial and ethnic group, gender, English proficiency, and children with or without disabilities; and

''(bb) any other category of students that the State chooses to include.

''(II) The disaggregation or cross-tabulation for a category described in subclause (I) shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in the category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results of such disaggregation or cross-tabulation would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

''(iii) For all students and disaggregated by each category of students described in subsection (b)(2)(B)(xi), the percentage of students assessed and not assessed.

''(iv)(I) For all students, and disaggregated and cross-tabulated in accordance with subclauses (II) and (III)—

''(aa) information on the performance on the other academic indicator under subsection (b)(3)(B)(ii)(II)(aa) used by the State in the State accountability system; and

''(bb) high school graduation rates, including 4-year adjusted cohort graduation rates and, at the State's discretion, extended-year adjusted cohort graduation rates.

''(II) The information described in subclause (I) shall be disaggregated by each of the categories of students, as defined in subsection (b)(3)(A), and, within each such disaggregation category, cross-tabulated by—

''(aa) each major racial and ethnic group, gender, English proficiency, and children with or without disabilities; and

''(bb) any other category of students that the State chooses to include.

''(III) The disaggregation or cross-tabulation for a category described in subclause (II) shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in the category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results of such disaggregation or cross-tabulation would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.

On page 89, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

''(5) CROSS-TABULATION PROVISIONS.—

''(A) CROSS-TABULATION DATA NOT USED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require groups of students obtained by cross-tabulating data under this subsection to be considered categories of students under subsection (b)(3)(A) for purposes of the State accountability system under subsection (b)(3) or section 1114.

''(B) CROSS-TABULATED DATA IMPLEMENTATION.—Information obtained by cross-tabulating data under this subsection shall be widely accessible to the public in accordance with paragraph (1)(B)(i)(III) and, upon request, by any additional public means that the State determines.

AMENDMENT NO. 2099

(Purpose: To amend part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to allow funds provided under such part to be used for a site resource coordinator)

On page 447, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

''(X) designating a site resource coordinator at a school or local educational agency to provide a variety of services, such as—

''(i) establishing partnerships within the community to provide resources and support for schools;

''(ii) ensuring all service and community partners are aligned with the academic expectations of a community school in order to improve student success; and

''(iii) strengthening relationships between schools and communities; and

AMENDMENT NO. 2103

(Purpose: To enable local educational agencies to use funds under part A of title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for programs and activities that promote volunteerism and community service)

On page 444, strike line 2 and insert the following:

school; or

''(iii) promote volunteerism and community service;''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2096

(Purpose: To add career and technical education as a core academic subject)

On page 759, line 3, insert ''career and technical education,'' after ''music,''.

AMENDMENT NO. 2087

(Purpose: To provide for additional means of certifying children, youth, parents, and families as homeless)

On page 813, line 8, insert before the semicolon the following: ''; and provide training on the definitions of terms related to homelessness specified in sections 103, 401, and 725 to the personnel (including personnel of preschool and early childhood education programs provided through the local educational agency) and the liaison''.

On page 827, strike line 22 and insert the following:

nator.

''(E) CERTIFYING HOMELESS STATUS.—A local educational agency liaison or member of the personnel of a local educational agency who receives training described in subsection (f)(6) may certify a child or youth who is participating in a program provided by the local educational agency, or a parent or family of such a child or youth, who meets the eligibility requirements of this Act for a program or service authorized under title IV, as eligible for the program or service.''; and

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam 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. WYDEN. Madam 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 Oregon.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1740 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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. ALEXANDER. Madam 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. 2110

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2110, offered by the Senator from Montana, Mr. DAINES, which is subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, the academic partnerships lead us to success amendment—also called A-PLUS—gives States greater flexibility in allocating Federal education funding and ensuring academic achievement. Here is what it does. States would be allowed to obtain Federal education funding in the form of block grants. States would submit a declaration of intent to the Department of Education to consolidate Federal education programs and funding and redirect sources toward State-directed education reform initiatives. What this does is allow State and local leaders to exercise greater control over the use of Federal education funds to address the needs of local students and target scarce resources to areas of highest need.

I ask my Senate colleagues to join me in empowering our schools to serve their students, not DC Democrats, and support this important amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, this amendment is well-intentioned, unnecessary, won't pass, and undermines the bipartisan agreement we reached to try to move in exactly the direction the Senator from Montana suggested. In addition, the House of Representatives rejected it last night.

I recommend instead that my friends who want more local control of the schools vote for our bipartisan agreement, which ends the common core mandate, ends waivers in 42 States, reverses the trend of national school boards, and which, in my opinion, would be the biggest step toward restoring local control to public schools in the last 25 years.

I urge a ''no'' vote on a well-intentioned, unnecessary idea which won't become law and which might help undermine the bipartisan proposal that has a very good chance of becoming law.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in this series be 10 minutes in length.

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 44, nays 54, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Leg.]

YEAS—44

Ayotte	Boozman	Coats
Barrasso	Burr	Cornyn
Blunt	Cassidy	Cotton
Crapo	Inhofe	Rounds
Cruz	Isakson	Sasse
Daines	Johnson	Scott
Enzi	Lankford	Sessions
Ernst	Lee	Shelby
Fischer	McCain	Sullivan
Flake	McConnell	Thune
Gardner	Moran	Tillis
Graham	Paul	Toomey
Grassley	Perdue	Vitter
Heller	Risch	Wicker
Hoeven	Roberts	

NAYS—54

Alexander	Feinstein	Murphy
Baldwin	Franken	Murray
Bennet	Gillibrand	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hatch	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Portman
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Cantwell	Kaine	Sanders
Capito	Kirk	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Leahy	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Cochran	Markey	Tester
Collins	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Corker	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

King	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is rejected.

The Senator from Tennessee.

AMENDMENT NO. 2120

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, if I could have the attention of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the order relating to the Warren amendment be vitiated and the amendment remain pending while Senator MURRAY and I work with Senator WARREN on the language in the bill.

So we won't be voting on the Warren amendment today, but it will remain pending. That leaves votes on two amendments: Senator BROWN's amendment and Senator TOOMEY's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2099

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2099, offered by the Senator from Washington, Mrs. MURRAY, for Mr. BROWN.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I know Senator BROWN is on his way. But I just want to let Senators know that too often our Nation's students show up to school hungry or lacking adequate school supplies. Many of our teachers, as we know, are really struggling to provide students with an education, while they are also dealing with the compounding problems brought on by poverty.

Site resource coordinators, which this amendment addresses, operate through a community school model, are able to bolster the number of resources in schools, and increase the number of services offered to students and their families.

So what this amendment does is that it would further that goal by allowing

title IV funds to be used for site coordinators.

I thank Senator BROWN for offering this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I remind Senators that this and the next vote are 10-minute votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield back the time.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield back the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, all time is yielded back.

The question occurs on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Leg.]

YEAS—98

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

NOT VOTING—2

King	Rubio

The amendment (No. 2099) was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2094, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2094, as modified, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, this amendment is really very simple. It is designed to protect children from sexual predators. We know we have a problem because every year we arrest hundreds of school employees across the country for the sexual abuse of children who are supposed to be in their care.

This measure will help that problem by a very simple requirement that States pass legislation to prohibit knowingly recommending for hire a teacher who has abused children. This is common sense.

I am very grateful to my colleagues for helping us get here, especially Senator MANCHIN. He has been a great partner in this effort for a long time now. I want to thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator MURRAY for their work in helping us find the common ground that could get to a great bipartisan solution for a real problem.

I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I appreciate the hard work Senator TOOMEY has put in. Our staffs have worked together. I wish to thank Chairman ALEXANDER and Ranking Member MURRAY for their hard work on this. This young man from West Virginia, Jeremy Bell, was the victim of a crime that was preventable if we had known. We did not know. This person who basically was a predator was passed down to West Virginia without West Virginia having any knowledge at all. This will prevent this from happening anywhere in the country.

I urge all of my colleagues to please support this piece of legislation. This amendment is most reasonable. It will protect your children.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I ask for 30 seconds for Senator MURRAY and me to make a brief comment.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from West Virginia for working with Senator MURRAY and me and others to come to a conclusion on this. They feel passionately about it. They have worked hard on it. They deserve credit for that. I am glad to be a cosponsor of it, and I plan to vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I join with the chairman in thanking the Senators from Pennsylvania and West Virginia and for working with our staffs to create this new version. I think this amendment gets at a real problem by ensuring that suspected abusers do not transfer to other States and districts. It is a positive step. I urge its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 228 Leg.]

YEAS—98

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

NOT VOTING—2

King	Rubio

The amendment (No. 2094), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2147

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to amendment No. 2147, offered by the Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, for Mr. PORTMAN.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Virginia be given 1 minute and the Senator from California be given 1 minute to speak prior to the five voice votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Virginia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2096

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 2096.

CTE is a core academic subject. I grew up working in my dad's ironworking and welding shop. I ran a school that taught kids to be carpenters and welders in Honduras many

years ago, and what I learned is that high-quality technical education is an important part of the educational spectrum. We downgraded it for a number of years, but there is a renaissance now.

What my amendment would do is it would go into the current Federal law and specify that career and technical education programs are core curricula. Originally, English, math, and science were. This bill broadens what is a core curriculum to include computer science and foreign languages. This amendment would make plain that high-quality career and technical education is a core academic subject.

I wish to thank Senators AYOTTE, MERKLEY, SCOTT, BALDWIN, and WARNER as cosponsor. I also thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing this bipartisan bill to the floor.

This is commonsense and bipartisan. I hope it will pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

AMENDMENT NO. 2087

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise to speak on amendment No. 2087. It is pretty simple what this amendment would do, and I present it on behalf of Senator PORTMAN and myself. It assures that homeless children have access to HUD housing.

Today, we have 1.3 million children homeless in this country. In my State, we have 310,000. The problem is getting a clear definition of an individual who is homeless. This bill would allow the appropriate authorities in a school to certify that a youngster is homeless, so we don't have a conflict between the HUD certification and the school certification. It is long overdue. I believe it will be helpful. I am very hopeful this amendment will pass with a very big vote.

I thank the Chair, and I thank Senator PORTMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield back our remaining debate time on the final amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All Democratic debate time is yielded back.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I yield back all Republican time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2147

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2147.

The amendment (No. 2147) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2103

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2103.

The amendment (No. 2103) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2096

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2096.

The amendment (No. 2096) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2121

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2121.

The amendment (No. 2121) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2087

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2087.

The amendment (No. 2087) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2079

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2079.

The amendment (No. 2079) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 1735.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1735) entitled ''An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes,'' and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative 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 the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 1735.

Mitch McConnell, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Jeff Flake, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Jeff Sessions, Shelley Moore Capito, Lamar Alexander, Lindsey Graham, Joni Ernst, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Kelly Ayotte, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXVIII, that the time until 1:45 p.m. today be divided between the managers or their designees and that at 1:45 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and that the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 1735; further, if the compound motion is agreed to, Senator REED of Rhode Island or his designee be immediately recognized to offer a motion to instruct the conferees; and that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on that motion, and following the disposition of that motion, the Senate resume consideration of S. 1177.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Louisiana.

SANCTUARY CITIES

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to discuss the very significant issue of sanctuary cities.

Obviously, we have all been startled and saddened by the horrific murder in San Francisco that is a direct result of San Francisco's sanctuary city policy. As a result, I will be filing an amendment today on this bill to address sanctuary city policy.

This is not a new idea for me. It is not a new issue. I have had legislation on this topic since 2009. I have tried to get the attention of the U.S. Senate and the attention of others on this topic numerous times since then. I have only been able to get one vote on an appropriations bill. Unfortunately, my amendment to try to end sanctuary city policy around the country was tabled, with every Democrat, sadly, voting to table the amendment, except my then-Democratic colleague Senator Mary Landrieu.

I hope the very tragic murder of Kathryn Steinle in San Francisco—a wonderful 32-year-old woman—gets all of our attention and causes all of us to focus on this very serious issue. As we all know, her murderer was an illegal alien who was deported five times previously. As we all know, he was an illegal alien who was convicted of felonies seven times previously. As we all know, it is because of San Francisco's sanctuary city law, defying Federal law, that caused local police officials there not to cooperate with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officials to hold this dangerous criminal for further deportation proceedings.

Obviously, there are a lot of things wrong with our immigration system that this case illustrates. The fact that he could come back into the country so many times, having been deported, is a real red flag. But certainly this also underscores the truly dangerous nature of sanctuary cities policy.

Unfortunately, San Francisco is not alone in promoting this ridiculous policy. There are over 200 cities now that