Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation to test the efficacy of providing Alzheimer's Disease caregiver support services in delaying or reducing the use of institutionalized care for Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer's Disease or a related dementia.

S. 3138

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3138, a bill to prevent Iran from directly or indirectly receiving assistance from the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

S. 3142

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3142, a bill to require reporting on acts of certain foreign countries on Holocaust era assets and related issues.

S. 3146

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3146, a bill to require servicers to provide certain notices relating to foreclosure proceedings, and for other purposes.

S. 3150

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3150, a bill to use certain revenues from the outer Continental Shelf to reduce the Federal budget deficit.

S. 3179

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3179, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve and extend the credit for carbon dioxide sequestration.

S. 3184

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 3184, a bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3194

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3194, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote healthy eating and physical activity among children.

S.J. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 5, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

S.J. RES. 21

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 21, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States.

S.J. RES. 32

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 32, a joint resolution to provide limitations on the transfer of certain United States munitions from the United States to Saudi Arabia.

S.J. RES. 35

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 35, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule of the Department of Labor relating to ''Interpretation of the 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act''.

S.J. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 36, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to parental rights.

S. CON. RES. 41

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 41, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress on the Peshmerga of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

S. CON. RES. 42

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 42, a concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress regarding the safe and expeditious resettlement to Albania of all residents of Camp Liberty.

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 42, supra.

S. CON. RES. 47

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 47, a concurrent resolution expressing support for fostering closer economic and commercial ties between the United States and the United Kingdom following the decision of the people of the United Kingdom to withdraw from the European Union.

S. RES. 349

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 349, a resolution congratulating the Farm Credit System on the celebration of its 100th anniversary.

S. RES. 485

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 485, a resolution to encourage the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to abide by constitutional provisions regarding the holding of presidential elections in 2016, with the aim of ensuring a peaceful and orderly democratic transition of power.

S. RES. 524

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 524, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the conflict in Yemen.

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 526, a resolution calling for all parties to respect the arbitral tribunal ruling with regard to the South China Sea and to express United States policy on freedom of navigation and overflight in the East and South China Seas.

S. RES. 529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 529, a resolution calling upon the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran to release Iranian-Americans Siamak Namazi and his father, Baquer Namazi.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 530, a resolution supporting the termination of the Select Investigative Panel of the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives established pursuant to House Resolution 461, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARDIN:

S. 3210. A bill to identify and combat corruption in countries, to establish a tiered system of countries with respect to levels of corruption by their governments and their efforts to combat such corruption, and to assess United States assistance to designated countries in order to advance anti-corruption efforts in those countries and better serve United States taxpayers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, there is growing recognition in the United States, and around the world, that corruption is a serious threat to international security and stability. We have all seen the headlines—from scandals in Brazil and Malaysia, to the doping by Russian athletes and their subsequent ban from the Summer Olympics, to the Panama Papers. It is becoming clear that where there are high levels of corruption we find fragile states, or states suffering from internal or external conflict—in places such as Afghanistan and Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Somalia, Nigeria, and Sudan.

The problem of corruption, and the dysfunction that follows it, can be difficult to address because it is like a hydra, with many corrupt actors that can include government officials, businessmen, law enforcement, military personnel, and organized criminal groups. Corruption is a system that operates via extensive, entrenched networks in both the public and private sectors.

But we must address it. We can't throw up our hands and accept corruption as the status quo, because the costs of not addressing and rooting it out are too great. Corruption fuels violent extremism, pushing young people toward violence, because they lose faith in the institutions that are supposed to protect and serve them. Corruption feeds the destructive fire of criminal networks and transnational crime. Citizens lose faith in the social compact between governments and the people. Terrorist groups use corruption to recruit followers to their hateful cause. It's a vicious cycle.

The human cost of corruption is substantial. Across the globe, millions of men, women and children are victims of modern day slavery. Corruption enables their trafficking within and among countries. Corruption is a constant companion to modern day slavery and the suffering that it brings. We also have seen this play out in the refugee and migrant crisis, with thousands drowning in the Mediterranean, victims of trafficking networks and corrupt government officials who facilitate this illicit business. Make no mistake, corruption is big business—one news report estimates that traffickers made 5 to 6 billion dollars in 2015 alone in bringing approximately one million refugees and migrants to Europe.

Let's be clear-eyed—any fight against corruption will be long-term and difficult. It's a fight against powerful people, powerful companies, and powerful interests. It is about changing a mindset and a culture as much as it is about establishing and enforcing laws. As my colleagues and constituents know, my attention has long been focused on fighting corruption. I introduced S. 284, the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act, to target human rights abusers and corrupt individuals around the globe who threaten the rule of law and deny fundamental freedoms. But the problem is so big—we simply have to do more.

This is why I am introducing the Combating Global Corruption and Accountability Act. We must meet the scale of the problem of corruption with greater resolve and commitment. To do that, I believe we must focus on four things.

First, we must institutionalize the fight against corruption as a national security priority. In my bill, the State Department will produce an annual report, similar to the Trafficking in Persons Report, which takes a close look at each country's efforts to combat corruption. That model, which has effectively advanced the effort to combat modern day slavery, will similarly embed the issue of corruption in our collective work, so that we hold governments to account. This bill establishes minimum standards for combating corruption—standards that should be part and parcel of every government's commitment to its citizens. These include whether a country has laws that recognize corrupt acts for the crimes they are—violations of the people's trust—along with appropriate penalties for breaking that trust. Whether a country has an independent judiciary for deciding corruption cases, free from influence and abuse. Whether there is support for civil society organizations that are the watchdogs of integrity against would-be thieves of the state. This bill, hopefully, will build anticorruption DNA into the foundations of government action.

Second, in the United States, our whole-of-government effort must be better coordinated. Right now, we work across multiple agencies and in multiple offices to combat corruption. There is much information and many best practices that can be shared—we've got to do better at that and take advantage of those areas where we have been successful. The State Department and the United States Agency for International Development have done great work, but the vast nature of the problem requires that we improve our ability to tackle it. In this bill, agencies and bureaus and our missions overseas will have to prioritize corruption into their strategic planning as an essential part of our foreign policy work—a step that I believe will foster greater cooperation.

Third, we must improve oversight of our own foreign assistance and promote transparency. The U.S. taxpayer has a right to know how our foreign assistance is being spent, and also should feel confident that we are doing the kind of risk assessments, analysis, and oversight that ensure our assistance to other countries is having the effect we want it to have. My bill consolidates information and puts it online, where citizens can see the numbers and the programs. That kind of transparency is in and of itself good, but in my experience it has the effect of making us better at self-policing our work. We can use the data to capture redundancies and analyze trends, which I believe will make our decision-making better. The bill embeds oversight into our foreign assistance programs overseas, maintaining the flexibility we need to meet our goals rapidly while also holding government to account.

In fact, it is a natural complement to the Foreign Assistance Transparency and Accountability Act, a bill Senator RUBIO and I co-sponsored that looks at our foreign aid and ensures that our foreign assistance programs are tracked and evaluated adequately and appropriately.

I am a believer in the power of example. This ''one-two'' punch of the Combating Global Corruption Act and the Foreign Assistance Transparency Act strengthens our foreign assistance policy, demonstrates that we hold ourselves to the highest standards, and shows other countries that we are committed to this fight.

Finally, we have to find ways to resource anti-corruption work. Corruption is big business and big money. We should look for ways to use seized assets and ill-gotten proceeds to build civil society capacity to fight corruption, and make it easier to transfer these assets to the appropriate effort. The Obama administration has built on the efforts of those before it to improve our ability to go after the big players, and there have been some great successes by the Treasury and Justice Departments in winning judgments and recovering assets. So we will look at the resources and the training and the intelligence needs, and we will make sure we have the tools and skills to continue those kinds of successes.

I want to close with a few words about something that is hard to capture in legislation. It is something that I grappled with when drafting this bill. It is something that perhaps, more than anything, will dictate if we win this struggle against corruption. And that is political will.

At the end of June, after six long years, the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission issued a final rule to implement Section 1504 of the Dodd-Frank Act, known as the ''Cardin-Lugar provision''. This provision requires that all foreign and domestic companies listed on U.S. stock exchanges and involved in oil, gas, and mineral resource extraction must publish the project-level payments they make to the foreign countries in which they operate. This was a watershed moment in which the United States reclaimed its position as a leader in the effort to increase global accountability and transparency. Six years. That is the length of a term of a U.S. Senator. It is college and a Master's degree. It is the length of the horrific conflict in Syria. Six years for the United States to achieve greater revenue transparency in the extractives sector because we know secrecy breeds corruption and corruption can breed instability and perpetuate poverty in resource-rich countries. It took that long

because some people believed that less transparency is a good thing. Some groups believed that accountability should take a back seat to profitability.

I am under no illusion that this global fight against corruption will be easy. It will make the work of our government agencies more challenging. It will make our diplomacy more challenging. It will require political will. But political will finds its source and its strength in our values. Political will is created when we embrace those values. Political will endures in good governance, accountability, and transparency and those values that are at the core of the compact between the government and the governed.

As this bill moves forward, I urge my colleagues to find the political will to combat global corruption, ensure accountability, and keep our commitment to the best of American values.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 3211. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a national Oncology Medical Home Demonstration Project under the Medicare program for the purpose of changing the Medicare payment for cancer care in order to enhance the quality of care and to improve cost efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 3211

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Cancer Care Payment Reform Act of 2016''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHING AN ONCOLOGY MEDICAL HOME DEMONSTRATION PROJECT UNDER THE MEDICARE PROGRAM TO IMPROVE QUALITY OF CARE AND COST EFFICIENCY.

Title XVIII of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after section 1866E (42 U.S.C. 1395cc–5) the following new section:

''SEC. 1866F. ONCOLOGY MEDICAL HOME DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—Not later than 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish an Oncology Medical Home Demonstration Project (in this section referred to as the 'demonstration project') to make payments in the amounts specified in subsection (f) to each participating oncology practice (as defined in subsection (b)).

''(b) DEFINITION OF PARTICIPATING ONCOLOGY PRACTICE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'participating oncology practice' means an oncology practice that—

''(1) submits to the Secretary an application to participate in the demonstration project in accordance with subsection (c);

''(2) is selected by the Secretary, in accordance with subsection (d), to participate in the demonstration project; and

''(3) is owned by a physician, or is owned by or affiliated with a hospital, that submitted a claim for payment in the prior year for an item or service for which payment may be made under part B.

''(c) APPLICATION TO PARTICIPATE.—An application by an oncology practice to participate in the demonstration project shall include an attestation to the Secretary that the practice—

''(1) furnishes physicians' services for which payment may be made under part B;

''(2) coordinates oncology services furnished to an individual by the practice with services that are related to such oncology services and that are furnished to such individual by practitioners (including oncology nurses) inside or outside the practice in order to ensure that each such individual receives coordinated care;

''(3) meaningfully uses electronic health records;

''(4) will, not later than one year after the date on which the practice commences its participation in the demonstration project, be accredited as an Oncology Medical Home by the Commission on Cancer, the National Committee for Quality Assurance, or such other entity as the Secretary determines appropriate;

''(5) will repay all amounts paid by the Secretary to the practice under subsection (f)(1)(A) in the case that the practice does not, on a date that is not later than 60 days after the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary, submit an application to an entity described in paragraph (4) for accreditation as an Oncology Medical Home in accordance with such paragraph;

''(6) will, for each year in which the demonstration project is conducted, report to the Secretary, in such form and manner as is specified by the Secretary, on—

''(A) the performance of the practice with respect to measures described in subsection (e) as determined by the Secretary, subject to subsection (e)(1)(B); and

''(B) the experience of care of individuals who are furnished oncology services by the practice for which payment may be made under part B, as measured by a patient experience of care survey based on the Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems survey or by such similar survey as the Secretary determines appropriate;

''(7) agrees not to receive the payments described in subclauses (I) and (II) of subsection (f)(1)(B)(iii) in the case that the practice does not report to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (6) with respect to performance of the practice during the 12-month period beginning on the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary;

''(8) will, for each year of the demonstration project, meet the performance standards developed under subsection (e)(4)(B) with respect to each of the measures on which the practice has agreed to report under paragraph (6)(A) and the patient experience of care on which the practice has agreed to report under paragraph (6)(B); and

''(9) has the capacity to utilize shared decision-making tools that facilitate the incorporation of the patient needs, preferences, and circumstances of an individual into the medical plan of the individual and that maintain provider flexibility to tailor care of the individual based on the full range of test and treatment options available to the individual.

''(d) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING PRACTICES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, not later than 15 months after the date of the enactment of this section, select oncology practices that submit an application to the Secretary in accordance with subsection (c) to participate in the demonstration project.

''(2) MAXIMUM NUMBER OF PRACTICES.—In selecting an oncology practice to participate in the demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the participation of such practice in the demonstration project does not, on the date on which the practice commences its participation in the demonstration project—

''(A) increase the total number of practices participating in the demonstration project to a number that is greater than 200 practices (or such number as the Secretary determines appropriate); or

''(B) increase the total number of oncologists who participate in the demonstration project to a number that is greater than 1,500 oncologists (or such number as the Secretary determines appropriate).

''(3) DIVERSITY OF PRACTICES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in selecting oncology practices to participate in the demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, include in such selection—

''(i) small-, medium-, and large-sized practices; and

''(ii) practices located in different geographic areas.

''(B) INCLUSION OF SMALL ONCOLOGY PRACTICES.—In selecting oncology practices to participate in the demonstration project under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that at least 20 percent of the participating practices are small oncology practices (as determined by the Secretary).

''(4) NO PENALTY FOR CERTAIN OPT-OUTS BY PRACTICES.—In the case that the Secretary selects an oncology practice to participate in the demonstration project under this section that has agreed to participate in a model established under section 1115A for oncology services, such practice may not be assessed a penalty for electing not to participate in such model if the practice makes such election—

''(A) prior to the receipt by the practice of any payment for such model that would not otherwise be paid in the absence of such model; and

''(B) in order to participate in the demonstration project under this section.

''(e) MEASURES.—

''(1) DEVELOPMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall use measures described in paragraph (2), and may use measures developed under paragraph (3), to assess the performance of each participating oncology practice, as compared to other participating oncology practices as described in paragraph (4)(A)(i).

''(B) DETERMINATION OF MEASURES REPORTED.—In determining measures to be reported under subsection (c)(6)(A), the Secretary, in consultation with stakeholders, shall ensure that reporting under such subsection is not overly burdensome and that those measures required to be reported are aligned with applicable requirements from other payors.

''(2) MEASURES DESCRIBED.—The measures described in this paragraph, with respect to individuals who are attributed to a participating oncology practice, as determined by the Secretary, are the following:

''(A) PATIENT CARE MEASURES.—

''(i) The percentage of such individuals who receive documented clinical or pathologic staging prior to initiation of a first course of cancer treatment.

''(ii) The percentage of such individuals who undergo advanced imaging and have been diagnosed with stage I or II breast cancer.

''(iii) The percentage of such individuals who undergo advanced imaging and have

been diagnosed with stage I or II prostate cancer.

''(iv) The percentage of such individuals who, prior to receiving cancer treatment, had their performance status assessed by the practice.

''(v) The percentage of such individuals who—

''(I) undergo treatment with a chemotherapy regimen provided by the practice;

''(II) have at least a 20-percent risk of developing febrile neutropenia due to a combination of regimen risk and patient risk factors; and

''(III) have received from the practice either GCSF or white cell growth factor.

''(vi) With respect to such individuals who receive chemotherapy treatment from the practice, the percentage of such individuals so treated who receive a treatment plan prior to the administration of such chemotherapy.

''(vii) With respect to chemotherapy treatments administered to such individuals by the practice, the percentage of such treatments that adhere to guidelines published by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network or such other entity as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(viii) With respect to antiemetic drugs dispensed by the practice to individuals as part of moderately or highly emetogenic chemotherapy regimens for such individuals, the extent to which such drugs are administered in accordance with evidence-based guidelines or pathways that are compliant with guidelines published by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network or such other entity as the Secretary determines appropriate.

''(B) RESOURCE UTILIZATION MEASURES.—

''(i) With respect to emergency room visits in a year by such individuals who are receiving active chemotherapy treatment administered by the practice as of the date of such visits, the percentage of such visits that are associated with qualified cancer diagnoses of the individuals.

''(ii) With respect to hospital admissions in a year by such individuals who are receiving active chemotherapy treatment administered by the practice as of the date of such visits, the percentage of such admissions that are associated with qualified cancer diagnoses of the individuals.

''(C) SURVIVORSHIP MEASURES.—

''(i) Survival rates for such individuals who have been diagnosed with stage I through IV breast cancer.

''(ii) Survival rates for such individuals who have been diagnosed with stage I through IV colorectal cancer.

''(iii) Survival rates for such individuals who have been diagnosed with stage I through IV lung cancer.

''(iv) With respect to such individuals who receive chemotherapy treatment from the practice, the percentage of such individuals so treated who receive a survivorship plan not later than 45 days after the completion of the administration of such chemotherapy.

''(v) With respect to such individuals who receive chemotherapy treatment from the practice, the percentage of such individuals who receive psychological screening.

''(D) END-OF-LIFE CARE MEASURES.—

''(i) The number of times that such an individual receives chemotherapy treatment from the practice within an amount of time specified by the Secretary, in consultation with stakeholders, prior to the death of the individual.

''(ii) With respect to such individuals who have a stage IV disease and have received treatment for such disease from the practice, the percentage of such individuals so treated who have had a documented end-of-life care conversation with a physician in the practice or another health care provider who is a member of the cancer care team of the practice.

''(iii) With respect to such an individual who is referred to hospice care by a physician in the practice or a health care provider who is a member of the cancer care team of the practice, regardless of the setting in which such care is furnished, the average number of days that the individual receives hospice care prior to the death of the individual.

''(iv) With respect to such individuals who die while receiving care from the practice, the percentage of such deceased individuals whose death occurred in an acute care setting.

''(3) MODIFICATION OR ADDITION OF MEASURES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may, in consultation with appropriate stakeholders in a manner determined by the Secretary, modify, replace, remove, or add to the measures described in paragraph (2).

''(B) APPROPRIATE STAKEHOLDERS DESCRIBED.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term 'appropriate stakeholders' includes oncology societies, oncologists who furnish oncology services to one or more individuals for which payment may be made under part B, allied health professionals, health insurance issuers that have implemented alternative payment models for oncologists, patients and organizations that represent patients, and biopharmaceutical and other medical technology manufacturers.

''(4) ASSESSMENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, for each year in which the demonstration project is conducted, assess—

''(i) the performance of each participating oncology practice for such year with respect to the measures on which the practice has agreed to report to the Secretary under subsection (c)(6)(A), as compared to the performance of other participating oncology practices with respect to such measures; and

''(ii) the extent to which each participating oncology practice has, during such year, used breakthrough or other best-in-class therapies.

''(B) PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders described in paragraph (3)(B) in a manner determined by the Secretary, develop performance standards with respect to—

''(i) each of the measures described in paragraph (2), including those measures as modified or added under paragraph (3); and

''(ii) the patient experience of care on which participating oncology practices agree to report to the Secretary under subsection (c)(6)(B).

''(f) PAYMENTS FOR PARTICIPATING ONCOLOGY PRACTICES AND ONCOLOGISTS.—

''(1) CARE COORDINATION MANAGEMENT FEE DURING FIRST TWO YEARS OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, in addition to any other payments made by the Secretary under this title to a participating oncology practice, pay a care coordination management fee to each such practice at each of the times specified in subparagraph (B).

''(B) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The care coordination management fee described in subparagraph (A) shall be paid to a participating oncology practice at the end of each of the following periods:

''(i) The period that ends 6 months after the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) The period that ends 12 months after the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary.

''(iii) Subject to subsection (c)(7)—

''(I) the period that ends 18 months after the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary; and

''(II) the period that ends 24 months after the date on which the practice's agreement period for the demonstration project begins, as determined by the Secretary.

''(C) AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with oncologists who furnish oncology services for which payment may be made under part B in a manner determined by the Secretary, determine the amount of the care coordination management fee described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) PERFORMANCE INCENTIVE PAYMENTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (E), the Secretary shall, in addition to any other payments made by the Secretary under this title to a participating oncology practice, pay a performance incentive payment to each such practice for each year of the demonstration project described in subparagraph (B).

''(B) TIMING OF PAYMENTS.—The performance incentive payment described in subparagraph (A) shall be paid to a participating oncology practice as soon as practicable following the end of the third, fourth, and fifth years of the demonstration project.

''(C) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS.—Performance incentive payments made to participating oncology practices under subparagraph (A) for each of the years of the demonstration project described in subparagraph (B) shall be paid from the aggregate pool available for making payments for each such year determined under subparagraph (D), as available for each such year.

''(D) AGGREGATE POOL AVAILABLE FOR MAKING PAYMENTS.—With respect to each of the years of the demonstration project described in described in subparagraph (B), the aggregate pool available for making performance incentive payments for each such year shall be determined by—

''(i) estimating the amount by which the aggregate expenditures that would have been expended for the year under parts A and B for items and services furnished to individuals attributed to participating oncology practices if the demonstration project had not been implemented exceeds such aggregate expenditures for such individuals for such year of the demonstration project;

''(ii) calculating the amount that is half of the amount estimated under clause (i); and

''(iii) subtracting from the amount calculated under clause (ii) the total amount of payments made under paragraph (1) that have not, in a prior application of this clause, previously been so subtracted from a calculation made under clause (ii).

''(E) AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL PRACTICES THAT MEET PERFORMANCE STANDARDS AND ACHIEVE SAVINGS.—

''(i) PAYMENTS ONLY TO PRACTICES THAT MEET PERFORMANCE STANDARDS.—The Secretary may not make performance incentive payments to a participating oncology practice under subparagraph (A) with respect to a year of the demonstration project described in subparagraph (B) unless the practice meets or exceeds the performance standards developed under subsection (e)(4)(B) for the year with respect to—

''(I) the measures on which the practice has agreed to report to the Secretary under subsection (c)(6)(A); and

''(II) the patient experience of care on which the practice has agreed to report to the Secretary under subsection (c)(6)(B).

''(ii) CONSIDERATION OF PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT.—The Secretary shall, in consultation with the appropriate stakeholders described in subsection (e)(3)(B) in a manner determined by the Secretary, determine the amount of a performance incentive payment to a participating oncology practice under subparagraph (A) for a year of the demonstration project described in subparagraph (B). In making a determination under the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall take into account the performance assessment of the practice under subsection (e)(4)(A) with respect to the year and the aggregate pool available for making payments for such year determined under subparagraph (D), as available for such year.

''(3) ISSUANCE OF GUIDANCE.—Not later than the date that is 12 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall issue guidance detailing the methodology that the Secretary will use to implement subparagraphs (D) and (E) of paragraph (2).

''(g) SECRETARY REPORTS TO PARTICIPATING ONCOLOGY PRACTICES.—The Secretary shall inform each participating oncology practice, on a periodic (such as quarterly) basis, of—

''(1) the performance of the practice with respect to the measures on which the practice has agreed to report to the Secretary under subsection (c)(6)(A); and

''(2) the estimated amount by which the expenditures that would have been expended under parts A and B for items and services furnished to individuals attributed to the practice if the demonstration project had not been implemented exceeds the actual expenditures for such individuals.

''(h) APPLICATIONS FROM ENTITIES TO PROVIDE ACCREDITATIONS.—Not later than the date that is 18 months after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish a process for the acceptance and consideration of applications from entities for purposes of determining which entities may provide accreditation to practices under subsection (c)(4) in addition to the entities described in such subsection.

''(i) REVISIONS TO DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—The Secretary may make appropriate revisions to the demonstration project under this section in order for participating oncology practices under such demonstration project to meet the definition of an eligible alternative payment entity for purposes of section 1833(z).

''(j) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may waive such provisions of this title and title XI as the Secretary determines necessary in order to implement the demonstration project under this section.

''(k) ADMINISTRATION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to this section.''.

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

S. 3213. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for transparency of payments made from the Judgment Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to draw attention to important legislation that would ensure American taxpayers know how their hard-earned dollars are being spent. This morning, I was pleased to join Senator LANKFORD to introduce a bill that expands on similar legislation that I introduced with Senator GARDNER last year, known as the Judgment Fund Transparency Act. The Judgment Fund is administrated by the Treasury Department and is used to pay certain court judgments and settlements against the Federal Government. It is essentially an unlimited amount of money made available to the Federal Government to cover its own liability.

The fund is not subject to the annual appropriations process. And even more remarkable, the Treasury Department has no reporting requirements. Because of this, the Judgment Fund payments are made with very little oversight or scrutiny. Because the Treasury Department has no binding reporting requirements, few public details exist about where the funds are going and why. This is no small matter, as the Judgment Fund disburses billions of dollars in payments every year. For example, between 2013 and 2015, the Federal Government paid more than $10 billion in Judgment Fund awards with scant transparency or oversight. Hard-working taxpayers and Members of Congress have every right to see exactly how tax dollars are being spent out of this Judgment Fund.

I was proud to see my original version of the bill pass the Senate as part of the Energy Policy Modernization Act in April. Still, recent developments show more oversight is needed, and that is why I have joined with Senator LANKFORD to update and expand the Judgment Fund Transparency Act. This update is the result of payments made through the Judgment Fund to Iran earlier this year.

In January, the Obama administration transferred $1.7 billion to Iran's Central Bank. It was paid in connection with the settlement of a claim relating to arms sales to the Shah. Last month, new reports indicated that the U.S. payment was transferred to Iran's defense budget. In defending the payment, White House spokesman Josh Ernst argued that it was ''Exhibit A in the administration pursuing tough, principled diplomacy in a way that actually ends up making the American people safer and advancing their interests.''

I disagree. A $1.7 billion payment that goes to Iran's military does not make our country safer. Iran was designated a state sponsor of terror in 1984. Its military has long provided weapons, training, and funding to groups such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and other proxies throughout the Middle East and beyond.

Last month, the State Department released its latest country reports on terrorism. It states: ''In 2015, Iran's state sponsorship of terrorism worldwide remained undiminished.'' In fact, the State Department report noted that in some areas, such as Iraq, its support to terrorist groups has actually increased. I am haunted by the fear that some of these very terrorists, groups that may have taken American lives, may have received money from the U.S. Treasury.

The bill that I am introducing with Senator LANKFORD today takes action. It would prohibit the Judgment Fund from being used for this purpose while maintaining key provisions from the original bill requiring openness and transparency.

If the administration wants to deliver another payment to a regime that is going to sponsor terror, it should make its case to Congress and to the American people. More transparency leads to greater accountability. Sunlight is the best disinfectant. Through this bill, we can track taxpayer-funded payments to foreign nations and prevent harmful transactions from happening in the future.

I thank Senator LANKFORD for his diligent work on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to stand behind hard-working American taxpayers and support this legislation.

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

S. 3214. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to allow all eligible voters to vote by mail in Federal elections, to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for automatic voter registration; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. WYDEN: Mr. President, today I am introducing the Vote by Mail Act of 2016 to ensure that all registered voters have the opportunity to fully participate in our democracy.

Fifty-one years ago, President Johnson urged Congress to pass the Voting Rights Act. In the face of implacable opposition from southern states, Johnson clearly laid out the stakes: ''Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty we have to ensure that right.''

Sadly, half a century after that law began to remove the most egregious obstacles to voting, Americans are facing new barriers to exercising their fundamental right to vote. Across the country, there are stories of long lines, inexplicable purges of voter rolls and new requirements that make it harder for citizens to vote. There is no excuse for accepting this state of affairs.

There is no excuse for citizens in Arizona to wait 5 hours to cast their ballot. There is no excuse for citizens in Rhode Island to find two out of every three polling places have closed. There is no excuse whatsoever for poor communities and minority communities across this country to see their polling places shuttered.

Seniors and disabled Americans should not have to wait in long lines or struggle to reach polling places. Working parents shouldn't have to choose between going to work or going to vote. Voting should not be a test of endurance. It should not be a Kafkaesque experience in defeating bureaucracy.

Increasingly, too many voters show up to the polls on election day, only to find out their name is inexplicably missing from the voter rolls, or their

ID doesn't meet some new, more restrictive requirements. There is no excuse for our government to turn away citizens, to say their voice does not count, because of a clerical error or an unjust technicality.

These grossly unfair obstacles have sprouted like weeds across our Nation ever since the Supreme Court overturned large portions of the Voting Rights Act in 2013. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, just this year, 17 States have passed new laws or rules to make it harder for their citizens to vote.

Thankfully there is a solution. My home State of Oregon has led the Nation in making voting more accessible. In Oregon, every voter receives a ballot 2 or 3 weeks before an election date. With the arrival of that ballot, complete with candidate information and issue pamphlets, every Oregonian has ample time to research candidates and issues, think about them, discuss them with friends and family, and then vote. All in their own time. Rather than waiting in long lines, Oregonians can mail their ballot back, or drop it off at ballot collection sites, many of which are open 24–7. No one has to take time off work just to exercise his or her constitutional rights to vote.

Vote-by-mail won't stop every state legislature from devising new ways to suppress voter turnout. But one thing it will do is it will give voters more time to fight back. When Americans have two or three weeks to vote, they'll have more time to challenge registration problems. There's more time for citizens to defend their rights.

Oregon has been voting by mail locally since 1981. When I was first elected to the U.S. Senate in 1996 it was the first time vote-by-mail was used for a federal race. In 2000 Oregon went to an entirely vote-by-mail system including for President of the United States. Since then we have consistently had voter turnout rates that are among the highest in the country. Oregon voting rates are especially high among young voters and in midterm elections. As an added benefit, studies have shown it saved taxpayers money to boot.

Oregon is also leading the charge in another important aspect of our voting system—voter registration. Our representative democracy requires active participation from all our citizens—regardless of one's economic resources or state of residence. This is particularly the case when it comes to ensuring that the voter registration prqciess is widely accessible and easy to navigate. In order to vote, eligible citizens must first register—a step in the political process that has historically been difficult to navigate and subject to onerous burdens designed to exclude citizens of color and lower-income citizens from easily casting a ballot.

Oregon is the first state in the nation to launch an automatic voter registration system, which automatically registers eligible citizens who visit the Department of Motor Vehicles, unless they ''opt out.'' This year alone, Oregon has successfully registered over 200,000 new voters. Our governor, Kate Brown, deserves enormous credit for shepherding this reform into law.

So my proposition is the rest of our country should follow Oregon's lead by offering all voters a chance to vote by mail, and automatically registering eligible voters. To me, this is a no-brainer.

Today I introduced new legislation for national vote-by-mail, which builds on Oregon's system and bills I introduced in 2007 and 2010. My plan is simple: Every voter in a Federal election will receive a ballot in the mail. The Federal Government, through the Postal Service, will assist states with the costs of mailing ballots to registered voters. States can keep their current polling practices if they wish, but those states that choose a full vote-by-mail system will see their election costs significantly drop. Additionally, this bill will shift the burden of registration from the individual to the government. It calls on state governments to collaborate with State motor vehicle agencies to maintain updated voter registration rolls for all citizens who apply for a driver's license and who do not ask to remain unregistered. This practice will serve to both increase the accuracy of our voter rolls and reduce the burden on individual voters by requiring state governments to ensure that eligible citizens are registered.

My hope is this can ignite a new campaign to make it easier, not harder for Americans to vote. Because vote-by-mail and automatic registration are just the first steps in fighting back against those who would disenfranchise their fellow citizens to gain a political edge.

I know many of my colleagues and many voters are cynical about the chances of passing real reforms in this partisan day and age. My view is voting rights are simply too important to abandon the field to special interests who would manipulate our government. So once again I urge my colleagues and urge voters to call for real reform to our voting system and ensure that every citizen who wants to vote has that opportunity.

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

S. 3226. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a registry of certain veterans who participated in a radiation cleanup mission in the Enewetak Atoll in the Marshall Islands during the period beginning on January 1, 1977, and ending on December 31, 1980, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Enewetak Atoll Cleanup Veterans Registry and Study Act of 2016. I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Maine, Senator KING, in this initiative. Our bill would address an issue important to veterans, including many in Maine, who participated in the Enewetak Atoll radiation cleanup missions from 1977 to 1980. These veterans may now be suffering from adverse health conditions due to exposure to radiation during these missions.

At the end of World War II, Enewetak Atoll came under the control of the United States, which used it to test nuclear bombs. From 1948 to 1958, Enewetak Atoll was the site of 43 U.S. nuclear tests. The combined federal effort to clean up the resulting radioactive waste cost about $100 million over three years and required an on-atoll task force numbering almost 1,000 people.

The veterans who served on the cleanup task force did not ask to be sent to Enewetak Atoll. Like good servicemembers, they received their orders and went to work serving the U.S. government by cleaning up radioactive waste over a 3-year period. I have heard from several Enewetak Atoll veterans who have now developed cancers, and they have expressed their concerns that these cancers may be rooted in their service cleaning up nuclear material.

To address this troubling issue, our bill would help identify and bring together the shared experiences of those who served as a part of the Enewetak Atoll cleanup. It would require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, VA, to establish a registry of U.S. veterans who participated in the cleanup missions of the Enewetak Atoll and who have subsequently experienced health issues. It would also direct the VA to commission an independent study investigating any possible linkage between radiation exposure during the cleanup missions and subsequent health problems among the servicemembers who served or trained there.

Protecting the health of those who have served our nation is a solemn responsibility. This legislation keeps faith with our veterans by demonstrating that our government takes the allegations of service-connected exposure to radiation seriously. We must fulfill our obligations and affirm a larger commitment made long ago to take care of those who have so proudly served our Nation—the patriots who have worn our Nation's uniform.

I ask my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to voice my support for the Enewetak Atoll Cleanup Veterans Registry and Study Act of 2016. I am joined by my esteemed colleague from Maine, SUSAN COLLINS, in introducing this initiative, which will help to combat a very important issue facing the servicemen and women stationed at the Enewetak Atoll between 1977 and 1980. These veterans assisted in a radiation cleanup mission that may have exposed them to harmful nuclear waste, and may be causing them health problems to this day.

Between 1948 and 1958, the United States used the Enewetak Atoll for nuclear bomb testing. In 1977, after a

total of 43 nuclear tests, the United States engaged in a 3-year cleanup mission, costing $100 million and requiring a task force of nearly 1,000 servicemembers. However, despite the clearly dangerous nature of handling radioactive material, there is no registry or health study for those who served at Enewetak during that time.

This bill would require the Secretary of the VA to establish a registry of veterans who served as part of the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll, and have subsequently experienced health issues that may have resulted from exposure to radiation. In addition, the bill would direct the VA to commission an independent study investigating any linkages between those who were exposed to the radiation and subsequent health problems. It would allow for the gathering of targeted data for a better assessment of exposure, and would help determine whether these veterans should be granted the presumption of service-connection disabilities.

Throughout our Nation's history, our veterans have put themselves in harm's way to ensure our freedom time and time again. Their unwavering patriotism and courage demonstrate the fortitude of American character and our Nation's commitment to democracy worldwide. In response, we must do everything we can to follow through on our responsibility to provide for our veterans, and the brave men and women who served at Enewetak Atoll are no exception to this solemn duty. This bill demonstrates our commitment to honoring and respecting our Nation's heroes, past and present, and I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MCCAIN):

S. 3234. A bill to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, the Indian Trader Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 3234, the Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act of 2016.

For years, Indian communities have experienced serious socio-economic challenges. Unacceptably high rates of unemployment, remote locations, and a lack of infrastructure are just a few of the problems affecting either the quality of life for Indian people or the ability to build strong sustainable economies.

The Federal programs available to facilitate or create economic opportunities are not structured to effectively target these communities. The Federal bureaucracy underlying various programs also inhibits economic growth as well.

The Committee on Indian Affairs, which I chair, has conducted several hearings, listening sessions, and a roundtable on economic development. The primary concerns from Indian tribes, business owners, and tribal organizations have largely focused on access to capital. The Federal mechanisms for increasing available capital that have been used by Indian tribes or businesses to some degree include loan guarantees, tax credits, tax-exempt bond financing, community development financial institutions, CDFIs, and procurement programs.

This bill is intended to address several of these mechanisms by amending four key Federal laws affecting Indian communities: Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000; Native American Programs Act; Indian Trader Act; and the Buy Indian Act.

By amending these laws, the bill would benefit Indian communities by increasing access to capital for Indian tribes and businesses, increasing opportunities for Indian business promotion, and creating mechanisms and tools to attract business to Indian communities.

This bill will amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 in four ways. First, it would require interagency coordination between the Secretaries of Commerce, Interior, and Treasury to develop initiatives encouraging investment in Indian communities. It would elevate the Director for the Indian programs in the Department of Commerce. The bill would make permanent the waiver of the requirement for Native CDFIs to provide a matching cost share for assistance received by the Treasury CDFI. In addition, the bill would establish the Indian Economic Development Fund to support the Bureau of Indian Affairs Indian loan guarantee and CDFI bond guarantee program for Indian communities.

The bill would also amend the Native American Programs Act to reauthorize the economic development programs For economic development programs governed by this act, the bill would prioritize applications and technical assistance for building tribal court systems and code development for economic development, supporting CDFIs, and developing master plans for community and economic development.

This legislation would also amend the Indian Trader Act. The bill maintains current law and actions taken thereunder, but simply adds authority for the Secretary of the Interior to waive the licensing requirement for traders under this statute where an Indian tribe has a tribal law governing trade or commerce in its Indian lands.

The bill would amend the Buy Indian Act to facilitate the use of and more accountability for the Buy Indian Act in procurement decisions by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service.

Through this bill, more jobs at the local level would be created and small businesses are assisted. Indian tribes could engage in more cohesive community development and infrastructure building. In addition, Federal bureaucracy is diminished, thereby reducing the costs of economic development.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this important and beneficial piece of legislation for Indian communities.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 3241. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to reaffirm the United States' historic commitment to protecting refugees who are fleeing persecution or torture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Refugee Protection Act, along with Senators Franken, Durbig and Hirono. The world is confronting the worst refugee crisis since World War II. There are more than 65 million people who have been forcibly displaced around the globe. In the face of such staggering human suffering, we must not lower our torch—we must raise it higher. The Refugee Protection Act of 2016 takes important steps to bolster and update our laws to address the urgency of today's crisis. Now, more than ever, we must reaffirm our role as a humanitarian leader and renew our commitment to those fleeing persecution across the world.

The ongoing conflict in Syria makes clear the enormity of the humanitarian crisis we face. The terror inflicted by Bashar Al-Assad's regime and ISIS, which now subjects vast swaths of the region to its barbaric rule, has forced more than half of Syria's 23 million people from their homes and claimed the lives of hundreds of thousands of civilians Currently, there are more than 4.8 million registered Syrian refugees, the overwhelming majority of whom are women and children.

The United States must assert its leadership in efforts to resettle the innocent victims of this catastrophe. That is precisely the call so many of us respondedjiipj:st a year ago when the world came together stunned and heartbroken over the image of a 3-year-old Syrian child's lifeless body washed up on a Turkish beach. His tragic death touched our hearts and focused our attention on the desperate plight of this population. We must not forget him or the plight of the thousands of other children who are attempting the same terrifying journey to safety.

We also cannot ignore the humanitarian crisis that is closer to home. Ruthless armed gangs in El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala continue to brutalize women and children with impunity. El Salvador and Guatemala have the highest child murder rates in the world—higher even than in the war zones of Iraq and Afghanistan. These three Central American countries also account for some of the highest rates of female homicide worldwide. The violence and impunity in the Northern

Triangle has forced thousands of mothers and children to flee and seek refuge wherever they can find it. The administration's Central American Refugees Minor, CAM program and its expansion of the Refugee Admissions Program in Central America are an acknowledgment of the unique protection needs resulting from this crisis.

In response to these challenges, and so many others around the world, we must adapt our laws to make good on our commitment as a nation of refuge and freedom. It is our moral obligation but it is also in our national interest.

Our refugee program sends a powerful message to the rest of the world: America is not your enemy. We stand against persecution and terrorism in all its forms. A strong refugee program undermines the hateful propaganda of ISIS that there is a war between Islam and the West, that Muslims are not welcome here, and that the ISIS caliphate is their true home. By offering refuge to the world's most vulnerable people, regardless of their religion or nationality, our refugee program lays bare those lies.

The landmark Refugee Act of 1980 affirmed the commitments we made in ratifying the 1951 Refugee Convention. The Refugee Protection Act of 2016 that Jam introducing today would reaffirm the spirit of those commitments and ensure that our law is up to meeting the humanitarian crisis of our time.

First, our bill would repeal harsh and unnecessary hurdles that exist in current law. It would eliminate the requirement that asylees file for asylum within one year of arrival. This is an arbitrary deadline that has prevented many deserving people from pursuing legitimate protection claims. It is particularly harmful to those individuals who may be slow to come forward and recount their trauma, such as victims of rape or torture. The bill also includes important safeguards to ensure that victims of gender-based persecution and LGBT asylum-seekers receive the protection they deserve.

Second, our bill provides critical protections for children and families. It would enable vulnerable minors seeking asylum to have their cases adjudicated by an asylum officer in a nonadversarial setting. Importantly, our bill would require the Attorney General to appoint counsel for children and other vulnerable individuals, allowing those who cannot advocate for themselves to receive a fair day in court. It is unconscionable that young children are being brought before U.S. Immigration judges without a lawyer to represent them. And, it would provide that all children in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security must be adequately screened for protection needs.

Our legislation also includes important protections for refugee families. It would allow certain children and family members of refugees to be considered derivative applicants for refugee status if they have undergone the requisite security checks. Refugees escaping persecution should not have to choose between finding refuge and keeping their families together.

Third, our bill promotes a more efficient asylum and refugee process. It would require timely notice of immigration charges and provide for updated conditions of detention, preventing individuals from languishing in detention at taxpayer expense and encouraging efficient case adjudication in our immigration courts. It includes measures to provide particularly vulnerable individuals with a full and fair opportunity to seek protection in the United States. The bill would also establish a secure ''alternatives to detention'' program to ensure the appearance of individuals in removal proceedings.

Finally, our bill would facilitate the integration of refugees into our communities, which is a longstanding tradition in this country. It ensures that the Reception and Placement grants, which help refugees become self-sufficient, are adjusted on an annual basis for inflation and cost of living. It would also provide that resettled refugees who work for our government overseas do not face unnecessary hurdles in their adjustment to lawful permanent residence. Our bill also authorizes a study of our refugee resettlement program and improves the collection of data to ensure that our resettlement system uses resources efficiently.

I am proud of the role Vermont has played in welcoming refugees. Since 1989, our State has welcomed nearly 8,000 refugees from more than a dozen war-torn countries. RecerThy, Mayor Christopher Louras and members of the Rutland community announced plans to resettle 100 Syrian refugees. I applaud their decision, which should serve as an example to other communities in Vermont and across the country. I am confident that Vermont will do its part to provide a welcoming home for these families.

I am hopeful that if we pause and remember the role refugees and asylum-seekers have played for generations in making our communities strong and vibrant, we will be able to move past the hateful, ugly rhetoric of this campaign season. Our moral obligation to innocent victims of persecution demands it, and our national interest requires it. I urge all Senators to support the Refugee Protection Act of 2016.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3252. A bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my friend JOHN LEWIS often says that ''the right to vote is the most powerful nonviolent tool we have in a democracy.'' I could not agree more with him. We are a better and more representative Nation when more Americans participate in our democracy, and we can help foster greater participation by modernizing the way we register our voters.

That is why today, I am introducing the Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2016, a bill to require states to automatically register citizens who are eligible to vote by working with State and Federal agencies. Individuals have the option of declining automatic registration, but this bill would provide for a registration process that is more efficient and accurate. Importantly, the information used by the agencies to automatically register individuals will remain private and secure, and can only be used for voter registration, election administration, or prosecution of election crimes.

The bill also takes steps to streamline the voter registration process, by providing for online registration and greater portability of registration when an individual moves to a different location in the same state. Under this bill, no individual can be unfairly penalized for inadvertent registration, and punishment is preserved only in cases of intentional registration fraud or illegal voting. These are all common sense measures that would make it easier for Americans to maintain accurate voter registration information, and they further help to ensure that our voter rolls are current and up-to-date.

My efforts in trying to extend automatic registration to every State is consistent with efforts in Vermont, which became just the fourth State to pass an automatic voter registration bill this past April. The State of Vermont and its superb Secretary of State—Jim Condos—have been leaders in improving access to the ballot box. I cannot offer enough praise for what they have done.

State election officials have estimated that Vermont could add 30,000 to 50,000 voters to the State's rolls when its new automatic voter registration law takes effect after the 2016 election. Now imagine if we can provide similar improvements to the registration rolls for every State in this great Nation. Our union can only become stronger and more representative with the participation of a broader electorate. According to a report from the Brennan Center released in September 2015, a comprehensive automatic voter registration plan could potentially add up to 50 million eligible voters to the rolls. Moreover, not only would it save money and increase accuracy, but it would also reduce the potential for fraud and protect the integrity of our elections.

There is no reason why every eligible citizen cannot have the option of automatic registration when they visit the DMV, sign up for healthcare, or sign up for classes in college. These are just some of the agencies or institutions that would work with the States to provide for automatic voter registration. We live in a modern world, and we

should strive to have a registration system that reflects that.

I would like to thank the Brennan Center for Justice for working so closely with me and my staff on this bill. I would also like to thank Senators KLOBUCHAR and DURBIN for joining me in introducing this bill. A House companion bill is being introduced by Congressman BRADY of Pennsylvania, the Ranking Member on the House Committee on House Administration. I am proud to join all of these individuals in fighting to increase access to the ballot box for all Americans.

The Automatic Voter Registration Act of 2016 is common sense legislation that all members of Congress should be able to support. However, this bill is part of a larger set of voting reforms that we must take on without further delay. We cannot talk about voting without mentioning the fact that this will be the first presidential election where the American people will be without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act since its original passage. It has now been more than three years since the Supreme Court's devastating decision in Shelby County v. Holder.

In that case, five justices severely weakened the Federal government's ability to prevent racial discriminatory voting changes from taking effect before those changes occur. The ruling's impact on voters across the country has been even worse than imagined. Before the ink dried on the Court's opinion, elected officials in several states rushed to exploit the decision by enacting voting laws that disproportionately prevent or discourage minorities from voting. According to the Brennan Center for Justice, at least 17 states have passed new voter restriction laws for the 2016 election. Millions of voters risk being disenfranchised for this election, and yet, this Republican majority—in both the House and the Senate—refuses to even hold a hearing on the issue.

The fundamental right to vote is too important for partisan politics. We must restore the full protections of the Voting Rights Act to ensure that no American's right to vote is infringed, and we must implement an automatic voter registration system to ensure that every American who wishes to vote is able to do so. This is an issue that cannot wait. It is long past time for Congress to respond with action.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 3263. A bill to promote innovation and realize the efficiency gains and economic benefits of on-demand computing by accelerating the acquisition and deployment of innovative technology and computing resources throughout the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, data has become a form of currency. Today, businesses and government are processing and storing more information than ever. This creates access, organization, and security problems for government agencies using outdated, legacy IT systems.

I worked in the technology sector for over a decade. We were doing cloud computing before the cloud even had a name. So I know first-hand the advantages cloud computing offers from a cost-saving, organization, and security perspective.

The private sector is transitioning to cloud computing systems at a rapid pace, but the government continues to lag behind. There are unnecessary impediments related to planning, funding, and procurement that inhibit Federal agencies from migrating to cloud computing services.

That is why I am proud to join my colleagues Senator MORAN, Senator UDALL, and Senator WARNER in introducing the Cloud IT Act. This bill will accelerate deployment of cloud computing services in the Federal government by removing impediments to investment. It will streamline the procurement process for IT tools and encourage the government to work more closely with the cloud computing industry.

Migrating Federal government systems to cloud computing services will reduce redundancies and save time and taxpayer dollars. I ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this much needed legislation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3269. A bill to require the Attorney General to make a determination as to whether cannabidiol should be a controlled substance and listed in a schedule under the Controlled Substances Act and to expand research on the potential medical benefits of cannabidiol and other marijuana components; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act of 2016, with my Judiciary Committee colleagues, Senators GRASSLEY, LEAHY, and TILLIS.

This narrowly focused legislation responsibly cuts the red tape that hinders marijuana research, paving the way for important studies to determine if cannabidiol, a non-psychoactive component of marijuana often referred to as CBD, can be a safe and effective medication for serious illnesses, such as intractable epilepsy.

It does this while maintaining safeguards to protect against illegal diversion.

First, the bill directs the Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services to complete a scientific and medical evaluation of CBD within one year.

Based on this evaluation, the legislation directs the Department of Justice to make a scheduling recommendation for CBD that is independent of marijuana. This has never been done before.

Second, without sacrificing appropriate oversight, it streamlines the regulatory process for marijuana research.

In particular, it improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols.

It also expedites the Drug Enforcement Administration registration process for researching CBD and marijuana.

Third, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD, while simultaneously reducing the stigma associated with conducting research on a Schedule I drug.

It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, and pharmaceutical companies to use a Schedule II Drug Enforcement Administration registration to conduct authorized medical research on CBD.

Given that the security requirements for conducting research on Schedule I and II drugs are nearly identical, this change would not jeopardize important safeguards against illegal diversion.

Fourth, the bill allows medical schools, research institutions, and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for authorized medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines.

Finally, the bill allows parents who have children with intractable epilepsy, as well as adults with intractable epilepsy, to possess and transport cannabidiol or other non-psychoactive components of marijuana used to treat this disease while research is ongoing.

To do so, parents and adults must be able to provide documentation that they or their child have been treated by a board-certified neurologist for at least 6 months, and have certifications from their neurologist that other treatment options have been exhausted, and that the potential benefits outweigh the harms of using these non-psychoactive components of marijuana.

The Cannabidiol Research Expansion Act will responsibly reduce barriers and spur additional research to ensure that CBD and other marijuana-derived medications are based on the most up to date scientific evidence.

I believe this bill is critical to help families across the country as they seek safe, effective medicines for serious illnesses, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important legislation.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3270. A bill to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have fought for years to protect our

Nation's seniors from abuse and exploitation—initially, as former Chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, former Chairman of Senate Finance Committee, and more recently, as Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Two weeks ago, I chaired a Judiciary Committee hearing on Protecting Older Americans from Financial Exploitation. At the hearing, we heard about numerous scams in which seniors were targeted time after time, resulting in their being defrauded, often with devastating consequences. We also heard that many older Americans don't report instances of elder abuse or exploitation due to embarrassment, a refusal to acknowledge that they were victimized, or reliance on the perpetrator as their caretaker.

Sadly, these accounts of elder abuse are nothing new. What has changed is that the scams targeting seniors are becoming increasingly sophisticated. That is one of the reasons why elder financial exploitation has been dubbed ''the crime of the 21st century.''

I have made it a top priority to get the federal government to step up its efforts to fight the abuse, neglect, and financial exploitation of our Nation's seniors.

To this end, I recently called on the Justice Department to outline its efforts to prevent and respond to instances of elder abuse. First, I sent a letter to the Department to find out what it's doing to protect seniors from a new and particularly troubling form of exploitation: the photographing and online publication of nursing home residents in embarrassing and compromising situations.

I also sent a letter to inquire about the Department's efforts to fight imposter scams, in which fraudsters pose as employees of the IRS or another government agency, in order to deprive ordinary Americans of millions of dollars of their hard earned money.

Most recently, I asked about the data the Department is collecting on financial exploitation, as well as how this data is being used to support Federal efforts to protect America's seniors.

In its response to my inquiries, the Justice Department effectively admitted that it falls short in several respects. The Department said that it ''does not collect data on the prevalence of elder financial exploitation nationwide.'' Further, the Department said that it can't provide statistical information on the number of cases it has prosecuted for elder financial exploitation.

What all this means is that we are not getting the full picture of elder financial exploitation.

We do know that some older Americans' trusting and polite nature, combined with their hard-earned retirement savings, make them particularly attractive targets for fraudsters. We also know that the abuse and exploitation of older Americans is on the rise and it can take many forms.

Financial exploitation is the most widespread form of elder abuse, costing America's seniors between an estimated $2.9 billion and $36 billion annually. But, sadly, its costs aren't limited to the negative effect on seniors' bank accounts. Victims suffer all sorts of negative effects, including diminished health, loss of independence, and psychological distress.

It is estimated that up to 37 percent of seniors in the United States are affected by some form of financial exploitation in any 5-year period.

In my home State of Iowa, so-called grandparent scams are on the rise. In these scams, fraudsters present themselves to an older American as a grandchild in distress, hoping to convince the grandparent to send cash or give out a credit card number.

Con artists are also using sweepstakes scams to steal money from seniors. A senior is called and told they have won a prize or sum of money. But before they can claim the supposed prize, the victim is required to pay taxes or processing fees. Once the money is paid to cover the taxes and fees, however, no prize ever materializes.

Other instances of elder financial exploitation are more personal in nature and have especially devastating effects. Some victims are pressured into signing over a deed, modifying a will, or giving a power of attorney. Americans have lost their farms, homes, and life savings to this form of fraud.

In short, elder abuse and exploitation is a serious problem, and it demands a strong response. It requires all of us to work together in a collaborative way.

So, today I am proud to introduce the Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act. I thank my colleagues—Senators BLUMENTHAL, CORNYN, KLOBUCHAR, RUBIO, and BENNET for collaborating with me on this comprehensive bill's development and joining as original cosponsors. It takes a multipronged, bipartisan approach to combating the abuse and financial exploitation of our nation's senior citizens.

We've heard a need for specialized prosecutors and more focused efforts to combat abuse and exploitation. That is why the bill directs the Attorney General to designate at least one federal prosecutor in each U.S. Attorney's Office to serve as an Elder Justice Coordinator for that district.

To ensure that elder abuse is a priority for the Federal Trade Commission and the Justice Department, the bill also calls for each agency to have an Elder Justice Coordinator.

We also need to send a strong message that efforts to target our Nation's seniors won't be tolerated. That is why the bill enhances elder victims' access to restitution and increases penalties for criminals who use telemarketing or email in their schemes to defraud seniors.

The bill also requires that the Justice Department partner with the Department of Health and Human Services to provide training and technical assistance to State and local governments on the investigation, prevention, prosecution, and mitigation of elder abuse and neglect.

Finally we have heard about the need for more data on financial exploitation and the government's response. Gathering accurate information about elder abuse is not only crucial to understanding the scope of the problem, but it is also essential in determining where resources should be allocated. So, the bill helps to accomplish that. It requires that data be collected from federal prosecutors and law enforcement in cases where an older American was the target of abuse or exploitation.

These and other reforms included in the bill are the product of bipartisan discussion, as well as insight from key stakeholders and those who've been battling on the front lines.

This 21st century crime requires a 21st century response. The Elder Abuse Prevention and Prosecution Act takes a strong step toward protecting our Nation's seniors, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. LEE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 3276. A bill to make habitual drunk drivers inadmissible and removable and to require the detention of any alien who is unlawfully present in the United States and has been charged with driving under the influence or driving while intoxicated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Obama administration is putting Americans into harm's way by releasing drunk drivers who are in the country illegally back onto our streets. This is unbelievable when you consider that every two minutes, a person is injured by a drunk driver, and every day in America, 27 people die as a result of a drunk driving crash. These numbers translate into real people.

I would like to talk about my constituent, Sarah Root, who was killed by a drunk driver the day she graduated from college. On January 31, 2016, Eswin Mejia, a Honduran national in the United States illegally, was drag racing in Omaha, NE, with a blood alcohol level more than three times the legal limit. He struck 21–year-old Sarah Root's vehicle from behind and she was killed. Mejia was charged with felony motor vehicle homicide. Although state authorities reportedly contacted ICE several times and requested the agency take custody of him prior to his release from state custody, ICE refused. He was released on bond and is now a fugitive from justice.

In Kentucky, Chelsea Hogue and Meghan Lake were seriously injured by a drunk driver in the country illegally who had been previously deported five times in one week. On February 7, 2016,

Jose Munoz Aguilar was arrested for drunk driving and colliding with a car occupied by the two young women, causing injuries to both women and putting one in a coma. Although Jose Aguilar was transferred to ICE custody, he was promptly released because he didn't meet the Obama administration's enforcement priorities. He remains at large.

In May, three people from a Texas family were killed by a suspected drunk driver who had an outstanding warrant for a previous drunk driving conviction. He had three prior DWI offenses. One of the three family members—18 year old Mauricio Ramirez—was scheduled to graduate from high school just a few short weeks later.

In Houston this May, an illegal immigrant who was driving drunk and evading authorities injured a high school senior and killed a young girl who were on their way home from prom. The driver had been previously deported and attempted to run from the scene.

On February 24, 2016, Esmid Valentine Pedraza was arrested in San Francisco, California, for the murder of Stacey Aguilar. Prior to allegedly committing the murder, Pedraza was reportedly arrested by ICE and placed in removal proceedings in August 2013 after Pedraza's conviction for DUI in Alameda County, California. Although ICE could have continued to detain him, ICE released him back onto the streets after he posted bond.

Mesa, AZ Police Department Sergeant Brandon Mendoza lost his life to an illegal immigrant who was driving the wrong way down a one-way street. The driver was three times over the legal limit and high on meth when he struck Sgt. Mendoza head on. Sgt. Mendoza had just finished his shift of keeping citizens and his community safe.

Police Officer Kevin Will of Houston, TX, was struck and killed by a drunk driver as he investigated a hit-and-run accident. The driver was in the country illegally.

In Phoenix, Police Officer Daryl Raetz was killed by a man who admitted to being drunk and high, and was in the country illegally. Officer Raetz was an Iraq war veteran and had been a police officer for 6 years. He left behind a wife and daughter.

Nobody argues that drunk driving is not a public safety risk, so it is remarkable that the Obama administration's own immigration enforcement priorities fail to take perpetrators off the street. Families coping with the grief of losing a loved one to such a senseless crime must also live with the reality that their government is quick to release offenders back into our communities.

Today, along with several other Senators, I am introducing the Taking Action Against Drunk Drivers Act. Our bill would ensure that federal immigration authorities take custody and hold anyone in the country illegally who has been charged with driving under the influence, DUI, or driving while intoxicated, DWI, taking them off the streets and protecting the public.

Additionally, my bill would make immigrants with three DUI or DWI convictions inadmissible to and removable from the country. Finally, it would make three DUI or DWI convictions an aggravated felony under the Immigration and Nationality Act. This will allow for expedited removal and preclude eligibility for certain benefits and permanently bar legal admission into the country.

We cannot let this current system that promotes the reckless death of innocent Americans continue. I encourage my colleagues to join me in an effort to protect our citizens from these dangerous people.

By Mr. REID (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3281. A bill to extend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

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

S. 3281

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF IRAN SANCTIONS ACT OF 1996.

Section 13(b) of the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (Public Law 104–172; 50 U.S.C. 1701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2016'' and inserting ''December 31, 2026''.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 535—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE TRAFFICKING OF ILLICIT FENTANYL INTO THE UNITED STATES FROM MEXICO AND CHINA

Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 535

Whereas the United States continues to experience a prescription opioid and heroin use epidemic that claimed almost 30,000 lives in 2014;

Whereas fentanyl is a synthetic opioid and the euphoric effects of fentanyl are sometimes indistinguishable from the euphoric effects of heroin or morphine;

Whereas the effect of fentanyl can be approximately 50 times stronger than heroin and 100 times stronger than morphine;

Whereas although pharmaceutical fentanyl can be diverted for misuse, most fentanyl deaths are believed to be linked to illicitly manufactured fentanyl and illicit versions of chemically similar compounds known as fentanyl analogs (collectively referred to in this preamble as ''illicit fentanyl'');

Whereas illicit fentanyl is potentially lethal even if only a very small quantity of illicit fentanyl is ingested or inhaled;

Whereas across the United States, illicit fentanyl use and related deaths are rising at alarming rates;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is cheaper to manufacture than heroin and the sale of illicit fentanyl is highly profitable for drug dealers;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is sold for its heroin-like effects and illicit fentanyl is often mixed with heroin, cocaine, or methamphetamine as a combination product, with or without the knowledge of the user;

Whereas illicit fentanyl is often produced to physically resemble other opioid pain medicines, such as oxycodone, which sell for high amounts on the street;

Whereas drug users often overdose on illicit fentanyl because users are unaware that they are ingesting illicit fentanyl and do not anticipate the toxicity and potential lethality of illicit fentanyl;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, between 2013 and 2014, the death rate from the use of synthetic opioids, including illicit fentanyl and synthetic opioid pain relievers other than methadone, increased 80 percent, and those deaths are largely attributable to fentanyl rather than other prescription synthetics;

Whereas, in 2015, the Drug Enforcement Administration (referred to in this preamble as the ''DEA'') issued a National Drug Threat Assessment Summary, which found that Mexican transnational criminal organizations are—

(1) one of the greatest criminal drug threats to the United States; and

(2) poly-drug organizations that use established transportation routes and distribution networks to traffic heroin, methamphetamine, cocaine, and marijuana throughout the United States;

Whereas, in 2016, the DEA issued a National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary, which found that ''starting in late 2013, several states reported spikes in overdose deaths due to fentanyl and its analog acetylfentanyl'';

Whereas the 2016 National Heroin Threat Assessment Summary found that—

(1) Mexican drug traffickers are expanding their operations to gain a larger share of eastern United States heroin markets; and

(2) the availability of heroin is increasing throughout the United States;

Whereas between 2013 and 2014, more than 700 fentanyl-related deaths in the United States were attributable to illicit fentanyl;

Whereas the number of deaths attributable to illicit fentanyl may be significantly underreported because—

(1) coroners and medical examiners do not test, or lack the resources to test, routinely for fentanyl;

(2) crime laboratories lack the resources to test routinely for fentanyl; and

(3) illicit fentanyl deaths may erroneously be attributed to heroin;

Whereas, in March 2015, the DEA issued a nationwide alert on illicit fentanyl as a threat to health and public safety;

Whereas illicit fentanyl has the potential to endanger public health workers, first responders, and law enforcement personnel who may unwittingly come into contact with illicit fentanyl by accidentally inhaling airborne powder;

Whereas the 2015 National Drug Threat Assessment Summary found that—

(1) Mexico is the primary source for illicit fentanyl trafficked into the United States; and