United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2015 No. 124

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, August 4, 2015, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Lord God omnipotent, Your power and love sustain us. Rule the wills of our lawmakers by Your might as You use them to do Your work on Earth. Lord, give our Senators faith to look beyond today's challenges and trials, finding in You the source of their optimism and confidence. May their confidence in the unfolding of Your loving providence lighten every task, providing them with reasons to rejoice. Give them the gift of perseverance, enabling them to refuse to become weary in doing Your will. When they fall, help them always to rise again.

Lord, thank You for providing us with faith to look beyond today's vicissitudes, always knowing that nothing can separate us from Your love.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, President Obama will deliver another blow to the economy and to the middle class. He will unveil regressive regulations that are set to harm struggling workers and families. They are projected to cost literally billions. They threaten to ship good middle-class jobs overseas and will likely make it harder to maintain reliable sources of energy to meet demand. They will also likely result in higher energy bills for those who can least afford them, potentially raising electricity rates by double digits for people I represent.

All of this, and for what? Not only will these massive regulations fail to meaningfully affect the global climate, but they could actually end up harming the environment by outsourcing the energy production to countries with poorer environmental records like India and China.

They may also be illegal. That is why I wrote the Governors earlier this year, suggesting they take a responsible wait-and-see approach and allow the courts to weigh in before subjecting their citizens to such unnecessary pain.

The Supreme Court's rebuke to the White House in June on another environmental regulation underlines the wisdom of this approach. Even though that mercury regulation was ultimately tossed out, most of its damage had already been done. It reminded Governors that it would be reckless not to take a wait-and-see approach this time.

Now, several Governors have already decided they will not allow the administration to rush them into adopting these regulations, and I expect more to follow. I was recently able to place language in the Senate Interior appropriations bill that would prohibit the administration from arbitrarily imposing its will on States that take this responsible approach.

Senator CAPITO also has a bill that would prohibit the regulations from moving forward until the courts have ruled on their legality. These aren't the only legislative options Congress can consider. We can pursue other avenues like CRA resolutions and further appropriations riders as these regulations are published and as they wind their way through the courts.

Here is the bottom line about today's announcement. If the Obama administration were actually serious about advancing renewable energy, then it would follow the example of what leaders like Senator MURKOWSKI have been achieving in the Energy Committee. She is showing how we can make big strides on energy diversification and that we can do it in a bipartisan way and that we don't have to punish the middle class to do it.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

This White House seems to want good politics, not good policy. Officials in this administration have said they want to make electricity rates skyrocket, and they want to make examples out of people who get in the way. They are tired of having to work with the Congress the people elected. That is why the administration is now trying to impose these deeply regressive regulations—regulations that may be illegal, won't meaningfully impact the global environment, and will likely harm middle and lower class Americans the most—by executive fiat. It represents a triumph of blind ideology over sound policy and honest compassion.

In Kentucky, these regulations would likely mean fewer jobs, shuttered powerplants, and higher electricity costs for families and businesses. I am not going to sit by while the White House takes aim at the lifeblood of our State's economy. I am going to keep doing everything I can to fight them.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the revelations we have seen from Planned Parenthood are deeply disturbing. They raise fundamental questions about what kind of society we want to be, so I want to thank Senators ERNST, PAUL, LANKFORD, and a number of others, for accepting my invitation to lead the effort on the Senate's response.

The legislation they worked to develop is all about restoring America's commitment to care and to compassion. It would fund women's health, not Planned Parenthood, and we will take a vote to advance it tonight. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would protect Federal funding for health services for women. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would ensure funds continue to flow to community health centers and hospitals that provide more comprehensive health services and may have many more facilities nationwide. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would help women receive health services, such as screenings, prenatal and post-natal care, well-child care, diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, immunizations, and other care they need. That is a true commitment to women's health. That is real compassion.

I know Democrats have relied on Planned Parenthood as an ally recently, but they must be moved by the horrifying images we have all seen. They must be shocked by the utter lack of compassion that has been on display. They must care about women's health as much as they care about some scandal-plagued political organization. That is why tonight I am asking them to truly reflect on what is important. I am asking them not to block this funding for women's health just to protect some political group mired in scandal. Women deserve better, and our country deserves better.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, here is an excerpt from an article in the Republican leader's hometown newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal:

> Sara Hall started going to Planned Parenthood when she was in her late teens and needed birth control, and she's gotten care there ever since.
>
> Without them, ''I wouldn't have a doctor to see. I don't know where I would have gone. It would have meant I wouldn't get the care I needed.''

Like Sara, millions of American women depend on Planned Parenthood for much needed health services. Every year, Planned Parenthood helps women, just like Sara, get the important services they need, such as birth control measures, but it is more than just birth control.

Here are a few of the health services Planned Parenthood provides to American women, and they did it, for example, in 2013. Half a million women went to Planned Parenthood for breast cancer screening, 400,000 women received a cervical exam from Planned Parenthood's medical staff, and 4.5 million treatments and tests for sexually transmitted diseases and infections were performed. Yet, here we are once again, faced with another Republican attempt to limit women's access to health care.

A few hours from now, the Senate will vote on a Republican bill to defund Planned Parenthood. Let's understand what that vote means. Defunding Planned Parenthood would limit American women's access to critical health services, such as contraception, breast and cancer screenings, and well-women visits. This legislation is just another Republican attack on the health care of millions of women, like Sara from Kentucky.

Over the past few months, Republicans have worked to trick American women into believing Republicans don't want to limit women's access to contraceptives or other critical health services provided by Planned Parenthood, but votes like the one we are going to take in a couple of hours lay bare the truth. The cold, hard fact is that a vote to defund Planned Parenthood is a vote to limit women's access to cancer screenings, contraceptives, and other important services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Our Nation is already facing a shortage of primary care providers. For many women, Planned Parenthood is their preferred medical provider. One in five American women will go to Planned Parenthood for services at some time during their lives. Defunding Planned Parenthood and reducing the number of providers available for women to receive contraceptives and other critical health services would reduce women's access to good health, and more importantly, their access to care, which is very direct and to the point.

To put it another way, the demand for care would still exist, but there would be fewer providers to render this care. And for many women, Planned Parenthood may be the only provider where they can seek medical help. Republicans are trying to eliminate their access to health centers.

Last Thursday, I listened to the senior Senator from Texas, where he claimed this bill we are going to vote on soon would actually increase access to care for women. I am surprised this distinguished Member of the Senate, a longtime member of the Texas Supreme Court, would say something like that.

He and other Republicans believe, I guess, that clinics like community health centers will pick up the slack should Planned Parenthood be defunded. That is simply not true. I am a strong supporter of community health centers. It is part of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, because I believe in community health centers. We put billions of dollars in that bill, and during the years it has been in existence, it has done so much to provide help for community health centers, but we still have far, far much to do. There are not enough community health centers, even with what we have done, to increase their ability to meet the current demand. To throw in a few more women who have been knocked out of Planned Parenthood—and ''a few'' is a pejorative term; it would be millions of women—is wrong.

The director of women's health policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation says: ''Across the nation, Community health centers are already at capacity.''

Take a look, for example, at the assistant Republican leader's home State of Texas. A recent report from George Washington University detailed what it would take for other providers to replace Planned Parenthood—exactly what the senior Senator from Texas has suggested.

For example, in Midland County, TX, there would have to be an increase of 537 percent by non-Planned Parenthood clinics, if Planned Parenthood is defunded. Lubbock County would see an increase of 250 percent. Community health centers cannot handle that, nor can they handle that increase in heavily populated Dallas County, where it would be an almost 200-percent increase.

What the Republican legislation does is makes it nearly impossible for women who need medical attention to get the care they need. If women cannot go get health care from Planned Parenthood, where do they go?

Take a look at what happened in the State of Indiana in 2011, when that State's legislature voted to deny State funding for Planned Parenthood health centers. Republicans then argued that

other health care providers would bridge the gap and absorb Planned Parenthood patients. They asserted that other providers would take care of those women just fine.

So what are those other health care providers for women that the Indiana Republicans said could take the place of the State's Planned Parenthood health centers? Prisons—listen to this—prisons, they suggested, juvenile detention centers, and homeless shelters. These are certainly not the kinds of places my Republican colleagues would want to send their daughters, sisters or wives for care.

It is common sense—if you take away Planned Parenthood health centers, women will have no ability to access care, and most will go without the care they need.

The Republican senior Senator from Maine agrees. Here is what she said:

> The problem is, in my state and many others, Planned Parenthood is the primary provider of women's health services in certain parts of my state. So I don't know how you would ensure that all of the patients of Planned Parenthood could be absorbed by alternative care providers.

In Nevada, Planned Parenthood centers there serve about 22,000 patients a year. Where will these patients go if the Republicans' legislation passes? I do not know. They will not get the care they need, that is for sure.

Senate Republicans are not being fair to American women. They are trying to shift the responsibility to someone who does not exist.

It is our responsibility in the Senate to ensure that American women have access to care. It is our obligation to protect our wives, our sisters, our daughters, and our granddaughters from the absurd policies of a Republican Party that has lost its moral compass. Today, Senate Democrats will do just that. This Planned Parenthood bill is not going anywhere in the Senate. Senate Democrats will fight this vigorously and any other attempt from Republicans to deprive American women health care.

Mr. President, I do not see anyone here to speak. I would ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1881, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 169, S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

Every now and then we see something that is so horrific that we must answer it. And by now, we are all familiar with the deeply disturbing videos of Planned Parenthood doctors cavalierly discussing their practice and methods of harvesting baby body parts.

Like so many Nebraskans, I am shocked by the lack of compassion for these women and their unborn babies.

My colleague and friend from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST, has introduced legislation that takes immediate action and cuts off funding for this scandal-plagued organization. I am proud to join her in sponsoring this very important legislation.

This bill has nothing to do with whether one is pro-life or pro-choice. It is not going to settle the issue of abortion, which has divided our country for over 40 years. This bill simply says that taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations mired in scandal and likely illegal activity. This has nothing to do with ideology. It has nothing to do with religious conviction. This is about the responsible and conscientious use of Federal tax dollars.

Elected officials have a responsibility to be wise stewards of public funding. I believe it is irresponsible to continue to support funding for a group that has lost the public's trust and engages in violations of Federal law.

I believe it is important to note that Federal law clearly prohibits abortion providers from the intentional manipulation of the bodies of unborn children for the purposes of obtaining body parts. Section 498A of title 42 of the U.S. Code clearly states:

> In research carried out under subsection (a) of this section, human fetal tissue may be used only if the attending physician with respect to obtaining the tissue from the woman involved makes a statement, made in writing and signed by the physician, declaring that—No alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.

A video released on July 21, 2015, details a Planned Parenthood doctor discussing using a ''less crunchy'' abortion technique to get more whole specimens. Let me repeat the law: A doctor must certify that ''no alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.''

Senators can reach their own conclusions.

I think the truth is pretty self-evident, and I believe the law and these videos speak for themselves.

I wish to address another important point. This legislation is not an attack on women's health. To the contrary, as a mother and a grandmother, I am steadfastly committed to ensuring that all women have access to high-quality medical care. The legislation I intend to support today redirects funds to local health departments, hospitals, and community health centers.

Our focus should be on supporting organizations that prioritize women's health, not organizations hiring pricey PR firms for damage control.

Across the country there are 1,200 Federally qualified health centers and 9,000 clinic sites. These community health centers vastly outnumber the roughly 700 Planned Parenthood facilities nationwide. In Nebraska, we have 6 health centers and 36 clinic sites that have served over 64,000 people. These centers serve all of Nebraska—from the panhandle to our metropolitan areas in Omaha and Lincoln. Fifty-two percent of those patients are uninsured and 30 percent are on Medicaid. Meanwhile, there are only two Planned Parenthood centers in Nebraska.

So it begs the question: Wouldn't patients be better served if that money was redirected to community health centers? I believe the answer is yes. These health centers deliver many—and sometimes more—of the health services provided by Planned Parenthood. In 2012 alone, federally qualified health centers performed 400,000 mammograms and over 2 million cervical cancer screenings.

These health centers are better able to respond to the needs of these women because they are closer to the communities they serve. They are indispensable in providing preventive health services and preventive screenings to the uninsured and our medically underserved populations.

In conclusion, I believe elected officials have a basic duty to stop sending tax dollars to an organization mired in scandal and likely illicit activity.

It is time for us to come together and support truly compassionate care for women and their unborn children. It is time to cut funding for Planned Parenthood and to use that money for its original intent, which is providing resources and care for women's health.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an issue that has shaken the moral compass of our society. The phrase ''it's a boy'' is one we often use when celebrating new life. Instead, this was spoken by a Planned Parenthood employee as the body of an unborn baby boy was picked apart and harvested for organs, such as a liver, kidneys, and heart. We have watched

as other Planned Parenthood employees talked about ''less crunchy'' techniques to preserve baby organs for buyers and grumbled about a ''war torn'' unborn baby before being sold for parts.

While it would be easier to ignore these videos, today we are standing up and shining a light on what is really happening. This is human life, and Planned Parenthood—the Nation's single largest provider of abortion services—is harvesting baby body parts. The American people are shocked and horrified by the utter lack of compassion and disregard shown by Planned Parenthood for these women and their babies. This gruesome footage resonates with our collective conscience and goes against the very principles we stand for.

As a mother and grandmother, I believe the gravity of Planned Parenthood's callus and morally reprehensible behavior cannot be ignored. I am committed to defending life because protecting the most vulnerable is an important measure of any society.

I am proud to stand before you today with 45 cosponsors and offer legislation that will defund Planned Parenthood while safeguarding funding for women's health services. This legislation prohibits Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, protects Federal funding for women's health services, such as prenatal and post-partum care, cervical and breast cancer screenings, diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, and guarantees there will be no reduction in overall Federal funding available to support women's health.

This legislation redirects Federal funding taken from Planned Parenthood to other eligible entities that provide health services for women, such as community health centers and hospitals. There would be absolutely no reduction in overall Federal funding available to support women's health. Community health centers provide more comprehensive primary and preventive health care services—except abortion—regardless of a person's ability to pay. Meanwhile, Planned Parenthood facilities do not perform in-house mammograms.

The American taxpayers should not be asked to fund an organization such as Planned Parenthood that has shown a sheer disdain for human dignity and complete disregard for women and their babies. These videos are hard for anyone to defend and pull back the curtain on Planned Parenthood's careless practice of rummaging for unborn baby organs to be harvested and sold at a price.

I leave you with this one question: Who do we want to be as a nation? Before us today is an opportunity to vote for legislation that will protect the most vulnerable and women's health.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, even in the greatest deliberative body in this Nation and likely the world, there are moments of profound sadness and regret, and this moment is one for me. I am deeply dismayed that the Republican leadership is engaging in an effort—an effort doomed to fail in just a couple of hours—to defund probably the most trusted provider of health care for women in the United States of America.

It is misguided because there are so many significant issues that should be front and center for this body: making sure that we invest in our roads and bridges, making sure that we improve our education system, making sure that we keep faith with our veterans. So many of them are going nowhere because of this partisan paralysis and gridlock. Dismayingly to the American people, that has prevented real action. I regret that we are, in effect, distracted from those goals and those missions that the American people expect us to fulfill.

Once again, many of my colleagues across the aisle have aligned themselves with the most extreme of the anti-choice movement to undermine access to critical health care services for women—for millions of women in this country and thousands in Connecticut who depend on Planned Parenthood for basic health care screenings, cancer diagnosis, family planning, and contraception services, which distinguish it as one of the most trusted health care providers in the United States.

It is the Republican leadership—not just a few Senators but the Republican leadership—that has set up this vote to defund Planned Parenthood. So instead of the Senate moving forward to provide additional health care services to women, it has engaged in this onslaught and assault on women's health care, taking a step back with legislation that is really—let me say bluntly—a political charade, a stunt, a bill or legislative measure that will go nowhere and is as much a sham for the supporters as it is for opponents. The fact is Planned Parenthood provides health care services to women across this country. Only 3 percent of its activity relates to abortion. So 97 percent of what it does is to provide screenings, diagnosis, and family planning. If this measure goes through, millions of women will be undiagnosed with cervical and breast cancer, millions of women will be denied access to contraception and family planning, and millions of young women will be denied the kind of education they need to prevent pregnancy.

It is in preventing pregnancy that so often Planned Parenthood is engaged, and to make it safe, legal, and rare. Eliminating $528 million from the largest women's health care provider in the country would create a public health crisis. Pure and simple, a public health crisis would be the inevitable consequence of this measure to defund Planned Parenthood. Of the 2.7 million women Planned Parenthood serves every year, 78 percent are low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood for breast cancer screening, testing for sexually transmitted infections, hepatitis B vaccines, family planning counseling, education on how to recognize and leave abusive relationships, domestic violence, referrals to other medical specialists, and many other essential services that would be unaffordable and inaccessible without Planned Parenthood.

Over half of Planned Parenthood's clinics serve women in medically underserved areas or in health provider shortage areas. So 13 of Connecticut's 17 women's health centers serve women in rural or medically underserved parts of my State. Defunding Planned Parenthood would mean 64,000 of my constituents could lose access to quality health services.

Because there is no network of health care providers with the capacity to serve this population if Planned Parenthood is denied funding, millions of women—particularly Medicaid recipients—would lose access to quality health services, and the result would be a public health crisis. That is the stark reality of these numbers and statistics. Dry and abstract as they are, they stand for real-life consequences—real women whose lives will be inevitably transformed for the worse if this measure were to pass.

Beyond the din of this place that so often consumes us—the confusion and the noise—there are real people whose lives will be affected by these kinds of measures and whose lives are affected even by the effort to defund Planned Parenthood because of the uncertainty and doubt that it creates.

These real people are women such as Elizabeth A., who said:

> When I didn't have health insurance 3 years ago, I went to Planned Parenthood where I had access to safe, affordable, reproductive health care. I still go there for my health needs! I was able to get STD testing and birth control when I couldn't afford it anywhere else.

Rachel S. of Naugatuck, CT:

> Birth control helped my husband and me put off having a family until we were financially ready to care for a child. The effects of pregnancy, both physically and financially, mean that free or low-cost birth control is an important factor in a successful future for both the woman and her family.

And Nicole B. of West Haven, CT:

> I come to Planned Parenthood because it is a safe place to get birth control and exams. Everyone is helpful and non-judgmental. The city needs a place like this and many women benefit from Planned Parenthood services.

These stories are from real people whose lives we in the Senate are supposed to care about. I care about them

because I know so many women whose lives have been affected by Planned Parenthood. I know so many of the staff and dedicated professionals who work at Planned Parenthood clinics.

One spoke to me on Saturday afternoon—one of the low points last week during the controversy that has enveloped Planned Parenthood—about how she was inspired and revived by simply passing by a room where one of the counselors was talking to a group of young people, both men and women, about the education that was important to them as far as preventing unwanted pregnancy and how seeing Planned Parenthood at work in that setting—the real work of providing health care and education—inspired her to keep going despite those difficulties.

The fact is that over and over my constituents, the people of Connecticut, have told me they choose Planned Parenthood because of the professionalism, dedication, and nonjudgmental approach to their patients. Many view Planned Parenthood as a safe space to come when they need advice, when they need medical examinations.

If Republicans succeed in defunding it, women will be without their most trusted health care provider. So many of them are relying on it because it is trustworthy, professional, and dedicated to them—first and foremost to them.

Today I stand with Planned Parenthood and the thousands and thousands of women in Connecticut and around the country who benefited from their services. I will vehemently oppose these efforts to allow a secretive and dishonest group to discredit and to dismay so many. They have manipulated the facts, put employees and volunteers in danger, and have eliminated the organization's ability to provide essential services. But the important point is that we resist this effort today to defund an organization that has provided so many services to so many people in need and has enabled this Nation to avert a public health crisis that will ensue if we follow this misguided effort, and that we follow our better instincts and make sure that we keep the faith with women who need health care in this Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. COATS. Madam President, William Wilberforce is a man whom I have, over the years, looked to as a role model and an example of what public service should be and what public servants should be.

Wilberforce served as a Member of the British Parliament from 1784 to 1812. After an early career marked by what he described as doing nothing of purpose, Wilberforce then went through a transformational period of self-reflection. He emerged with a deepened faith, greater moral courage, and an unshakeable passion for ending the slave trade. He said:

> So enormous, so dreadful, so irremediable did the [slave] trade's wickedness appear that my own mind was completely made up for abolition. Let the consequences be what they would: I from this time determined that I would never rest until I had effected its abolition.

It took Wilberforce 20 years of blood, sweat, tears, and even death threats, but he succeeded in pushing the House of Commons and the House of Lords to put abolition into law when the Slave Trade Act of 1807 passed.

I believe today, just 2 hours from now, we will have a William Wilberforce moment facing the Senate. Through a series of video releases over the past few weeks, the American people have learned about the shocking and barbaric practices Planned Parenthood uses to terminate innocent human lives. In several different videos, senior Planned Parenthood officials openly and candidly discussed the organ harvesting of fetuses.

In one video, the senior director of medical research for Planned Parenthood explained the process by which aborted body parts are harvested. I am not going to describe that process on the floor. I talked about it last week. But for those who have seen the video and those who have read about the practices, it is abhorrent to hear the cold, calculating consideration of how best to disassemble, to tear apart, to rip apart a growing life so that they could harvest certain body parts and then sell them for research. And they were negotiating prices.

It was like describing to somebody how they could go to Home Depot and pick things off the shelf: Let's see what this costs; no, maybe we can get a better price for this. But in this case we are talking about living human tissue being taken, harvested, and sold from aborted babies.

So let's consider for a second what is the bottom line. The bottom line is we are talking about an organization that is embracing the dismembering of human life with taxpayer support. Millions of Americans who have seen these videos are outraged by the cavalier attitude that Planned Parenthood has about human life. Americans from all walks of life, Americans of different faiths and, maybe, even of different political parties abhor this.

Then we learned that our tax dollars, our hard-earned tax dollars, are sent to an organization that practices these methods. Surely, we can come to a conclusion that this is something that violates the faith and beliefs of many millions Americans and is subsidized by the Federal taxpayer?

Now, over the past few days, we have heard many who say they object to what Planned Parenthood is doing here. But, you know, we can't afford to stop funding many of the very important women's health services that Planned Parenthood provides. And this is an important consideration because I am sure every Senator here believes in ensuring that all women, regardless of their status and regardless of their financial situation, deserve to have access to vital services that health care providers provide.

The bill before us that we will be voting on today, offered by the Presiding Officer, Senator ERNST of Iowa, addresses these concerns. Her legislation would transfer money provided to Planned Parenthood to a whole range of women's health care providers. I have the bill here in front of me. It is very simple, a very basic bill.

I want to read from this bill:

> State and county health departments, community health centers, hospitals, physicians offices, and other entities currently provide, and will continue to provide, health services to women. Such health services include relevant diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postpartum care, immunization, family planning services including contraception, sexually transmitted disease testing, cervical and breast cancer screenings, and referrals.

The bill goes on to say that such entities provide services to all persons, regardless of their ability to pay and provide services in medically underserved areas and to medically underserved populations.

So what is being offered here and what we will be voting on this evening doesn't take anything away from women's ability—regardless of their financial situation or where they live—to have the services that are needed and need to ensure their health and the future health of their children.

In the United States there are five times as many community health centers as there are Planned Parenthood operations. In my own State, we have 108 community health centers in urban and rural areas all throughout the State of Indiana—5 times the amount of Planned Parenthood facilities. So the issue of denying women needed health care simply is not the case under this legislation.

The barbaric practice of conducting abortions in a way that promotes harvesting fetal organs or profiting from such practice has no place in a modern society. Planned Parenthood's practices, I would suggest, should not receive a dime of taxpayer money. The question is, Do we want taxpayer dollars to continue to support an organization that treats human body parts like a product on the shelves of a store?

Today the Senate will decide if we fight for what we believe is morally right or whether we stand by and allow the trivialization of life to continue.

I am here to urge my colleagues to vote yes on this vitally important piece of legislation that we will be taking up in less than 2 hours.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to speak in opposition to S. 1881, the bill that will be coming before us this afternoon, and I have several quick points that I think need to be made.

The first is that this bill has nothing to do with abortion. Ninety-seven percent of the activities of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and its associated facilities have nothing to do with abortion. They have to do with women's health, they have to do with cancer screening, and they have to do with contraception and early detection. The 3 percent that do involve abortion have no involvement whatsoever with Federal funds. This is not a case where Federal funds are going to support abortion or any of the related activities.

The net effect of this bill is simply to deny basic health care, including contraception, to millions of women, particularly low-income women. And the irony is that it will undoubtedly increase abortions in this country.

I have never understood why people who are opposed to abortion also seem to be opposed to the provision of family planning and contraceptive information which can prevent unwanted pregnancies and, indeed, prevent abortions. The Guttmacher Institute, a respected, nonpartisan institution, estimates that without family planning information supplied by organizations such as Planned Parenthood, abortions would increase in this country by 345,000 a year. That is not a result anybody wants. It is certainly not one I want. That would mean an increase in abortions—345,000 a year.

I understand the bill does make funds generally available to a whole host of different organizations, some of which may or may not provide the kinds of family planning services that have been provided for over 70 years by Planned Parenthood. It is a narrower network. It eliminates clinics that have been available to women and doctors who have been available to women for many years.

Ironically, amidst all the discussion about the Affordable Care Act, a criticism which was ''Maybe you can't keep your own doctor,'' this is a bill designed to keep you away from your doctor, the doctor you have been seeing and have confidence in at a clinic run by Planned Parenthood.

The issue, which my colleague from Indiana noted, is not about abortion. It is not about Planned Parenthood. It is not about contraception. It is about fetal tissue and the uses of fetal tissue and how fetal tissue should be controlled and whether it should be allowed to be used for medical research. But that is a debate we should have on that issue. There is no reason we should be defunding Planned Parenthood because of a debate we may or may not want to have in the future about the use of fetal tissue. We are denying medical services to women—particularly low-income women—because of an issue that has nothing to do with the 97 percent of services this organization provides. To me, this bill is like attacking Brazil after Pearl Harbor—it is a vigorous response, but it is the wrong target.

If the concern is Planned Parenthood or any other organization having access to fetal tissue and then using that tissue in medical research—by the way, designed to save lives and ameliorate the effects of diseases such as Parkinson's or Alzheimer's—then let's focus on that. Let's talk about whether it should be legal, how it should be controlled, what the limitations should be. But we should not eliminate an organization which for many years—almost 100 years—has been providing health care for women, particularly low-income women, basic female health care such as cancer screenings and contraception and family planning.

This is a straightforward attack on women's health, in my view, particularly the health of low-income women.

''No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition.'' That radical statement wasn't made by me. It wasn't made by Jimmy Carter. It wasn't made by John F. Kennedy. It was made by that known radical Richard M. Nixon in 1970. So access to family planning information goes back almost 50 years. If people in this body don't think that is appropriate, then let's debate that, but let's not use this collateral issue of fetal tissue, which we can debate, to defund an organization that serves the needs of many women in my State and in States across the country, particularly low-income women. Two-thirds of Planned Parenthood's patients are low-income women. They serve the needs of those women in a responsible, legal, and thoughtful way.

This is targeting an organization for the wrong reason. If we want to discuss fetal tissue and how to deal with it and what the pros and cons are, then let's do so, but I don't believe it is appropriate to do it in the context of legislation that will basically crush an organization that has been enormously helpful in maintaining women's health throughout this country and will not, in fact, end whatever concerns people have about the use of fetal tissue.

Again, Madam President, this bill has nothing to do with abortion. It has everything to do with women's health. I hope my colleagues will move on, debate the real issues, and oppose this ill-founded and I believe unsupported piece of legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1917 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am informed that it is in order for me to file the substitute amendment that I just described, and I send that to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this weekend I watched the Planned Parenthood videos that are in the news, including one in which the organization's leadership says very clearly that the statements made by some of their staff are totally unacceptable. I believe that is important for everyone to hear.

With that said, here is the great danger with the legislation before the Senate today: This bill paints a big red target on some of the most basic, essential health care services for women in America: birth control, gone; pregnancy tests, gone; prenatal services, gone; HIV tests, gone; breast cancer screenings, gone; cervical cancer screenings, gone; ovarian cancer screenings, gone; vaccinations that prevent cancers, gone; treatment for urinary tract infections, gone; testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, gone; basic physical exams, gone; treatment for digestive or breathing problems, gone; treatment for chronic conditions, gone; pediatric care, gone; adoption referrals, gone; nutrition programs, gone; referrals to hospitals and specialists, gone.

When you wipe out Planned Parenthood's funding, you dramatically and painfully reduce women's access to services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortion—nothing to do with abortion. This bill will take away the guarantee that Medicaid patients have their free choice of doctors in the program. The people who this bill will hurt the most are poor women who have nowhere else to turn.

I urge my colleagues today to drop this misguided campaign. Instead of restricting women's access to health care services—such as the ones I have just outlined—let's work on a bipartisan basis to improve access to health care services for women in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer knows, we will have a very important vote about an hour and a half from now on a bill that would eliminate taxpayer funding for abortions, consistent with four decades of U.S. law. Contrary to the comments made by our friend from Oregon who just spoke, rather than withhold those funds, it would take that same amount of money and redirect it for women's health services and actually give them better access to health services at the same time. In other words, this legislation will fund women's health care but not abortions on the taxpayers' dime.

I particularly want to thank Senator ERNST, Senator LANKFORD, Senator FISCHER, and Senator PAUL for their leadership on this important issue. This is the beginning of the fight to regain America's conscience and the fight to restore the law that has been on the books for 40 years when it comes to taxpayer funding of abortions.

We all understand that the Supreme Court in Roe v. Wade has held that abortion is a right. But we also know that there is a rare area where there is a consensus between pro-choice and pro-life people, such as myself, and that is that we draw the line—and have since 1976—when it comes to taxpayer funding of abortions. Of course, what brought us to this point most immediately was that our collective conscience was shocked by videos depicting Planned Parenthood executives discussing the harvesting and sale of the organs of unborn babies—an abhorrent, disgusting practice that we cannot ignore. Perhaps the only thing more shocking than the actual dismembering of unborn children for sale is the cavalier attitudes by the Planned Parenthood staff who seem to have sacrificed their humanity and show so little regard for the sanctity of human life.

What was shown in these videos is an outrage, and it demands our action. Many of our colleagues from across the aisle have cited their own disapproval of what has been presented in these videos. They will be given an opportunity at 5:30 when we vote on the motion to proceed to get on this bill to demonstrate that their actions actually match their words.

According to one report, the junior Senator from Indiana said he found the comments by Planned Parenthood personnel in the video disgraceful. Similarly, the junior Senator from Virginia said that he found the videos ''extremely troubling.'' When asked about the videos last week, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton also called them ''disturbing.'' And they are.

Like our recent successful bipartisan efforts to fight the scourge of human trafficking, we have a rare opportunity to make a difference and address the moral imperative to defend those who cannot defend themselves.

It is important—because I have already heard some of our colleagues misrepresent what is in the bill—to remind everybody what this bill actually does. First and foremost, it eliminates Federal funding for one of the country's largest abortion providers—Planned Parenthood. In fiscal year 2014, Planned Parenthood performed 327,653 abortions. At the same time, Planned Parenthood received $528 million from Federal taxpayers.

Planned Parenthood reported revenue in fiscal 2014 of $1.1 billion. In other words, almost half of its income came from tax dollars from the Federal Government at the same time they performed 327,653 abortions.

You will hear some of our friends who are defending Planned Parenthood say: Oh, well, this is different because the money is kept separate. But we know that money that comes from the Federal Government can keep the lights on and keep the doors open so the abortions can continue to be performed. It is simply a fiction to claim that Federal tax dollars are not supporting conduct proscribed by the Hyde amendment for the last 40 years.

We don't stop there, though, when it comes to this legislation. As I mentioned at the outset, we would actually redirect the money to ensure that taxpayer dollars that once went to Planned Parenthood now go to provide for women's health, such as in thousands of community health centers across the country.

I am a big fan of community health centers because they really represent one-stop shopping when it comes to primary health care needs. The ironic thing is we can actually provide better access and more access for women by transferring the money from Planned Parenthood to community health centers and other nonabortion providers. For example, in my State, we have as many as eight times more community health centers as there are Planned Parenthood providers. We can provide women with eight times more opportunity to see that their health care needs are taken care of and at the same time respect the law that prohibits taxpayer dollars to be used for abortions and to support abortions.

In fact, according to data from 2013—the most recently available nationwide—every State in the country has more community health centers than Planned Parenthood clinics.

Since I didn't want to mention all 50 of them here—that would be a little overwhelming and be hard to read at the same time—I just picked out two States, along with the nationwide statistic—13 community health centers to every 1 Planned Parenthood provider that would still be able to provide primary health care services to women under this legislation. But if we look at Indiana, for example, we would have four times more providers under this legislation. In the State of Virginia, we would have 20 times more providers by simply defunding Planned Parenthood, the abortion provider, and using tax dollars and transferring that money to community health centers. We can actually provide greater access for women's health care.

Let's be clear, because I suspect, as I have already heard when I came to the floor, that there will be a lot of misrepresentation about what is in the bill. We need to be clear. This legislation defends women's health and ensures women access across the country to essential health services.

As I said a few moments ago, in many respects the debate that we are having was already decided in 1976, the year of the Hyde amendment, named after Henry Hyde, which, as my colleagues all know, prevents taxpayer dollars from funding abortions, except in rare circumstances. We talked about that a lot during the course of the anti-human trafficking bill. But this has been the law of the land for 40 years.

I strongly encourage all of our colleagues to vote to get on this bill. An organization that so callously reduces our most vulnerable to spare parts for sale has no business receiving any money from the Federal taxpayers. If people want to raise money from other private sources to support this effort, then let them do that. But tax dollars are not available and should not be available to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion practice—again, the largest single abortion provider in America.

While many of our colleagues on the other side have agreed that the vile practices that we witnessed in these videos are disturbing, still some have tried to put off having this discussion at all. I think what would be the biggest failure on our part—no matter what the outcome of our vote on the underlying legislation—would be to fail to have this discussion and this debate for the American people to hear so we can get their input. The real travesty would be if we shut off debate because 60 Senators didn't see fit to vote to get on the bill. That vote will be in roughly 1 hour and 15 minutes.

There are others who say we simply have more important things to do. I disagree. For example, the senior Senator from New York said consideration of this bill was ''wasting valuable time'' and that we should instead ''[start] urgent budget negotiations.''

Really? Really? I hardly know what to say. To those who share my disgust for the conduct depicted in these videos and who agree they are disgraceful, disturbing, and extremely troubling, how can you now turn around and refuse to vote with us to get on this legislation so we can have that discussion, so we can have that debate, and so we can vote our conscience? If your conscience is shocked by the footage in these videos, I really can't see how anybody could possibly vote no on this legislation at 5:30 when we vote to get on the bill.

Somehow, we as a nation have been lulled into a sense of complacency and have become somehow so desensitized to these barbaric practices depicted in these videos that they no longer stimulate us to act. But today we have a

chance on behalf of the American people, the people we collectively represent, to act and to act in a way that protects the most vulnerable.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, thanks to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Senate is unfortunately taking a vote on whether critical health care services should be taken away from millions of women across the country. We will be voting on whether a young woman should be able to go to a provider she trusts to get birth control, whether cancer screenings should be more or less available to women across the country, and whether the U.S. Senate is going to turn back the clock on women's health.

To me—and to many Democrats and even some Republicans who want to help women get the care they need—it is deeply disappointing that we are even having this debate because extreme Republicans have attacked Planned Parenthood and women's health so many times before—on the budget, the highway bill, the Affordable Care Act, and even on the legislation I introduced last week to help wounded veterans start families. That is right. Some of my Republican colleagues were more interested in scoring political points with their extreme base by picking fights over women's health than they were in helping our wounded veterans.

Unfortunately, it is clear they will jump at any opportunity to put politics before women's health. The bill we are talking about this evening that would defund Planned Parenthood is just more of the same.

My Republican colleagues who support this bill claim it would simply redirect funding for Planned Parenthood to other providers. Let's keep in mind that 2.7 million people visited Planned Parenthood for their health care last year, and 1 out of every 5 women in the United States will visit a Planned Parenthood center at some point in her life. So Planned Parenthood is a critical source of health care in communities across this country, and claiming that other providers can simply absorb those patients is like saying you can pour a bucket of water into a cup. It will not work. Instead, what this bill would actually do is take access to birth control, cancer screenings, STD tests, and other important preventive care away from women. It would leave families and communities without trusted, quality health care providers they rely on, and it would mean that in the United States of America in the 21st century the tea party gets to tell women what doctors they can or cannot go to.

I am not going to let that happen, and I know many of my colleagues here today agree. So this legislation is going nowhere, and, just as we have every other time they have tried these partisan tactics, we are sending a very clear message to those who choose political pandering over women's health.

Political attacks and threats to shut down the government are not going to get in the way of women's access to the care they need—not on our watch. Why? Because we know millions of women and their families are counting on us, and we are going to keep standing up for them.

I will close today by sharing the story of a woman from my home State of Washington. Shannon is from Tumwater, WA. When she was a teenager, she experienced ''unbearable pain'' and went to see a doctor to find out whether she had endometriosis. That is a serious disease that can keep women from having children if it goes untreated. Her doctor told her she was far too young to have endometriosis and sent her home. A few years later when she turned 18, Shannon tried again, and this time she went to a Planned Parenthood center. There, her provider confirmed that she did indeed have endometriosis. Her lesions were removed, and Shannon got the medication to manage her condition, thanks to Planned Parenthood. She no longer has to live with chronic pain, and now she is the proud mother of a little girl.

Shannon said, ''My daughter is truly a gift, and I really have Planned Parenthood to thank for her.''

So today, as many Members on the other side of the aisle vote to take health care away from women and their families, as they try as hard as they can to appeal to the extreme fringe of their party no matter the cost, I hope they think of women like Shannon whose lives are happier and healthier because of the services Planned Parenthood provides to so many communities in our country. That is whom I will be thinking about. I am very proud to vote no tonight and will continue to keep fighting for women, their health care, and their rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor to ask my Republican colleagues a question: Do you have any idea what year it is? Did you fall down and hit your head and think you woke up in the 1950s or the 1890s? Should we call for a doctor? Because I simply cannot believe that in the year 2015, the U.S. Senate would be spending its time trying to defund women's health care centers.

On second thought, maybe I shouldn't be that surprised. The Republicans have had a plan for years to strip away women's rights to make choices about their own bodies. Just look at the recent facts. In 2013, Republicans threatened to shut down the government unless they could change the law to let employers deny women access to birth control. In March of this year, Republicans held up a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill to stop human trafficking. Why? Because they demanded new anti-abortion restrictions to cover private funding meant to help the victims of human trafficking. In June, House Republicans passed a budget eliminating funding for the Title X Family Planning Program, the only Federal grant program that provides birth control, HIV tests, STD screening, and other preventive services for poor and uninsured people.

Over the past few years, Republicans have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act more than 50 times, including the portions that require insurers to cover contraception. Let's be clear. It is not just Congress. Over the past 5 years Republican State legislators have passed nearly 300 new restrictions on abortion access. This year alone Republican State legislators have passed more than 50 new restrictions on women's access to legal health care.

Let's be really clear about something. The Republican scheme to defund Planned Parenthood is not some sort of surprised response to a highly edited video. Nope. The Republican vote to defund Planned Parenthood is just one more piece of a deliberate, methodical, orchestrated, rightwing attack on women's rights, and I am sick and tired of it. Women everywhere are sick and tired of it. The American people are sick and tired of it.

Scheduling this vote during the week of a big FOX News Presidential primary debate, days before candidates take trips to Iowa or New Hampshire, isn't just some clever gimmick. This is an all-out effort to build support to take away a woman's right to control her own body and access to medical care she may need.

This affects all of us, whatever your age, wherever you live. I guarantee that you know someone who has used Planned Parenthood health care centers. No one may mention it at Thanksgiving dinner or post it on Facebook for the whole world to know, but just look at the facts. One in five women in America is a Planned Parenthood patient at least once in her life. Every single year nearly 2.7 million women and men show up for help at Planned Parenthood.

Why do so many people use Planned Parenthood? Because they are nonprofit and they are open. More than half of Planned Parenthood centers are located in areas without ready access to health care. Women who can't get appointments anywhere else go to Planned Parenthood for pap tests and cancer screenings. Couples go to Planned Parenthood for STD treatments or pregnancy tests. Young people go to Planned Parenthood for birth control. And, yes, 3 percent of patients visit Planned Parenthood for a safe and

legal abortion with a doctor who will show compassion and care for a woman who is making one of the most difficult decisions of her entire life.

To be clear, even though the abortions performed at Planned Parenthood are safe and legal, the Federal Government is not paying for any of them—not one dime. For almost 40 years the Federal Government has prohibited Federal funding for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest or life endangerment.

Most of the money Planned Parenthood receives from the government comes in the form of Medicaid payments for medical care provided to low-income patients, the same payments any other doctor or clinic receives for providing cancer screenings or other medical exams. The rest of Planned Parenthood's Federal funding comes from title X that provides birth control to low-income and uninsured people, the same program the House Republicans voted to cut in June.

The government doesn't fund abortions, period. A vote today to defund Planned Parenthood is not a vote to defund abortions. It is a vote to defund cancer screenings, birth control, and basic health care for millions of women.

I say to my Republican colleagues: The year is 2015, not 1955 and not 1895. Women have lived through a world where backward-looking ideologues tried to interfere with the basic health decisions made by a woman and her doctor, and we are not going back—not now, not ever.

The Republican plan to defund Planned Parenthood is a Republican plan to defund women's health care. For my daughter, for my granddaughters, for people all across Massachusetts, and all across this country, I stand with Planned Parenthood, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, Congress provides billions of dollars in taxpayer money for many different programs in various areas, including women's health. Sometimes, however, we have to draw the line, rearrange our priorities, and put some things off-limits. This is one of those times. The taxpayers should not be funding an organization engaged not only in the abortion business but, as we now know, in the baby body parts business.

In the last fiscal year, Planned Parenthood received more than one-half billion dollars of taxpayer money in the form of government grants, contracts, and Medicaid reimbursements. That is nearly $1.5 million per day, every day, and more than 40 percent of Planned Parenthood's revenue. The group's annual reports reveal what it does. In the last 3 years, it performed nearly 1 million abortions. In fact, this taxpayer-supported organization is the nation's largest abortion provider.

Some of Planned Parenthood's propaganda suggests the group focuses more on promoting pregnancies than ending them. But the numbers reveal the truth. Abortion accounts for 94 percent of Planned Parenthood's pregnancy services. The number of Planned Parenthood abortions dwarfs its recipients of prenatal care by more than 15 to 1. Planned Parenthood performs 174 abortions for every 1 adoption referral. In fact, Planned Parenthood's abortion business is growing while its adoption referrals and prenatal care services are shrinking.

We are also told that Planned Parenthood provides other women's health services. Those same annual reports, however, show that cancer prevention services are down 17 percent over the year before. Planned Parenthood does not provide what the American Cancer Society calls a ''very effective and valuable tool'' for breast cancer screening: mammograms. That procedure requires an FDA certification and no Planned Parenthood clinic in America has such a certification.

It is no wonder that Planned Parenthood has fought anything that could conceivably reduce the number of abortions. That is the business they are in. They oppose measures to inform women about abortion dangers or alternatives, they oppose any kind of involvement by parents when children seek an abortion. They even oppose restricting the horrible practice of partial-birth abortion.

We have learned recently what such a commitment to abortion produces.

Not one, not two, not three, but four videos released so far show Planned Parenthood's own leaders discussing the harvesting and selling of baby parts as casually as a mechanic sells car parts. They discuss how Planned Parenthood abortionists arrange their procedures and techniques to obtain the intact baby body parts that they need. These videos are revolting. They reveal an attitude toward human life that I thought we left behind long ago, when we decided human beings were not commodities to be traded.

Planned Parenthood has responded to these videos with propaganda and distraction. After the first video was released, for example, they said that it had been heavily edited, and their comments were taken out of context. That is often the first response by someone exposed by their own words. I urge my colleagues and fellow citizens not to be distracted. The Center for Medical Progress, which released the video, has made the full video and complete transcript available.

Planned Parenthood also claims that it receives cost reimbursement for the ''services'' it provides. I remind my colleagues of two things. First, even if that were true, these are costs associated with the harvesting of baby body parts. We must never forget what is at the heart of this whole thing—the harvesting and selling of pre-born body parts. Second, Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services says in one of the videos that if they can ''do better than break even,'' they are ''happy to do it.'' It appears that Planned Parenthood's only guideline is that ''this is not something that you should be making an exorbitant amount of money on.''

In the fourth video, a Planned Parenthood medical director talks about how ''a little bit of training'' will make sure that fetal organs can be removed intact. She says that charging a fee for each body part ''works a little better, just because we can see how much we can get out of it.'' And to top it all off, this medical director talks about how calling this gruesome business ''research'' helps to avoid getting caught.

The truth about Planned Parenthood is finally coming out, and Congress should respond in two ways. First, we should exercise our oversight authority to investigate how Planned Parenthood is using the hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars it annually receives. Federal law, for example, makes it illegal ''for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any fetal tissue for valuable consideration.'' If our investigation turns up any evidence of possible criminal wrongdoing, such evidence should be turned over to the proper authorities.

Second, we should stop giving Planned Parenthood taxpayer money. Even if the investigations show that Planned Parenthood has broken no laws, regulations, or other rules, we should get American taxpayers out of the business of harvesting and selling baby body parts. Senator ERNST's bill would do just that.

The abortion lobby's misdirection, distraction, and spin are already in high gear. Last week here on the Senate floor, one of my Democratic colleagues said that this bill is an ''attack on women's health.'' It is no such thing. Planned Parenthood is not the only provider of prenatal services or cancer screenings. It is, however, the only organization financed by American taxpayers that traffics in baby body parts.

Just as everyone should judge Planned Parenthood's words for themselves, everyone should also read this bill for themselves. It says that while Planned Parenthood will no longer receive taxpayer money, overall funding for women's health will not decrease. This bill supports women's health but defunds Planned Parenthood.

This bill does not prohibit Planned Parenthood from performing abortions, it does not even prohibit Planned Parenthood from continuing its practice of harvesting and selling baby body parts. But if Planned Parenthood wants to be in this gruesome business, it should do so without being subsidized by American taxpayers.

I reiterate that this bill does not reduce services for women's health by a single dime. Healthcare providers all over this country, including community health centers, offer all sorts of services for women. These include the very services that my Democratic colleague mentioned here last week, such

as cancer screenings, vaccinations, breast exams, and HIV testing. Under this bill, Federal funding for such services will not be reduced, but rather redirected to providers who are not involved in the sordid and contemptible baby body parts business.

The recent revelations about Planned Parenthood have pulled back the curtain on something very ugly in our culture. Millions of abortions over multiple decades have devalued human life to the point where—at least to some—preborn babies are little more than commodities, collections of parts that can be harvested and sold. Is that the kind of country we want? No, it is not. We should use this opportunity to examine our values to chart a better course.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we are now 7 months into the 114th Congress, and our Nation is faced with many challenges. Less than 1 year ago, the American people were promised that if Republicans took control of the Senate, our focus would be on committee-reported bills and promoting bipartisanship. Leader MCCONNELL pledged not to fill the amendment tree and instead to allow for an open amendment process when bills were brought to the floor. These promises have already been broken and this week we will likely see them broken again.

We are just a few days before the first debate for the many Republicans seeking their party's nomination for President. Given the crowded stage, they have already resorted to attention-getting attacks designed to excite the most extreme right wing of their base. It should surprise no one then that at the top of the Senate's agenda this week is a bill that would jeopardize the health and well-being of women across the country.

I spoke in opposition to this misguided, partisan effort last week. It is disappointing that instead of using the few remaining weeks before the end of the fiscal year working to reach an agreement on how to fund the government, we are considering ideologically-driven legislation to bar funding for Planned Parenthood health centers. This issue is unfortunately all too familiar. A few years ago, a small but vocal minority nearly shut down the Federal Government over a provision prohibiting funding for Planned Parenthood. Thankfully, we prevailed in the end, removing the rider and assuring women's access to vital health care. I hope the Senate makes the right choice again today.

This latest attack on women's health is fueled by an extreme organization that is in the process of releasing surreptitiously recorded videos, which the group heavily edited in a misleading way to suggest wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood. The Attorney General is currently reviewing the matter, and I have every confidence that if there is credible evidence to warrant an investigation of any of the parties involved in the videos, the Justice Department will act.

The bill before the Senate today would affect the lives of millions of American women, men, and young people who trust and depend on Planned Parenthood for their basic health care needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screenings, and HIV screenings. Last year in Vermont, Planned Parenthood centers provided critical primary and preventive services to over 16,000 patients. In a small State like Vermont, this impact cannot be overstated.

Proponents of this bill argue that if we defund Planned Parenthood, women will find care at other health centers. This is simply not the case. Planned Parenthood centers overwhelmingly serve populations in rural and medically underserved parts of the country where access to health care, especially for low-income individuals, is difficult. In fact, over 90 percent of Vermont's Planned Parenthood centers are located in rural or medically-underserved areas. Many women in my State describe Planned Parenthood as their primary source of health care. What this partisan bill would do is force the women in Vermont who have trusted Planned Parenthood for their health care to try to find another doctor where few are available, or, more likely, go without care at all. That undermines all of our efforts to strengthen our Nation's health care system, and ensure access to care for everyone.

Planned Parenthood health centers are eligible for Federal funds in two ways, and under the Hyde amendment, funds cannot be used for abortion services except in very limited circumstances. First, Planned Parenthood centers can receive Federal grant funding through title X of the Public Health Service Act. Title X is the only Federal grant program dedicated to offering people comprehensive family planning and related preventive health services. President Nixon was instrumental in enacting this legislation, and it has long been supported by lawmakers and Presidents of both parties. It cannot be emphasized enough that title X was a remarkable breakthrough in women's health care. The second way Planned Parenthood receives Federal funding is through Medicaid reimbursements, when women using Medicaid choose a Planned Parenthood provider as their doctor.

The federally supported services offered by Planned Parenthood are the core of their work and mission. Despite the misleading and blatantly false statements of some ideologically-driven advocates, more than 90 percent of the care Planned Parenthood health centers offer is preventive care like cancer screenings, annual checkups, and contraception. As noted by several observers over the weekend, the irony is that defunding Planned Parenthood would result in more unintended pregnancies, and probably more abortions.

Should we walk back from the remarkable progress we have made as a nation in women's health? Of course not. But I am concerned that we still see this same irresponsible attack surfacing again and again. It is 2015. It is time for the mean-spirited and ideological assaults on women's health care to end.

The arrogance and shortsighted attitude of a minority has put at risk the lives and health of millions of women. Does this Congress care more about what looks good on a bumper sticker or what matters in the daily lives of real people? My wife Marcelle is a cancer survivor. We were lucky. We had good health care and the ability to pay the bills when she got sick. Others are not so lucky. Without the services that Planned Parenthood provides, thousands of low-income women in Vermont would lose their ability to have regular cancer screenings that could save their lives too. That we are even considering the elimination of these health services to America's women is shameful.

What a travesty it would be to gut health services that have literally meant the difference between life or death, health or grave illness, to countless American women. This bill is merely an effort to score political points at the expense of women's health. I hope the Senate rejects this irresponsible, partisan legislation. I urge the Senate majority leadership to return to its promise that it would lead this Chamber responsibly and act through regular order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am strongly opposed to the bill before us today, S. 1881, introduced by Senator ERNST.

I stand in strong support of Planned Parenthood, which every year provides 2.7 million people—including over 30,000 Marylanders and one in five women—with important health care services, such as breast and cervical cancer screenings, sexually transmitted disease, STD, testing and counseling, and birth control.

The bill before us today does one thing. It defunds Planned Parenthood.

Every year Planned Parenthood health centers receive approximately $520 million in Federal funds to provide preventive health services to 2.7 million people in the United States, including one in five women. These services include cancer screenings, STD testing and counseling, and birth control. If the Ernst bill passes, Planned Parenthood would lose that money and could no longer provide those services to women and men in need.

For decades, anti-choice activists have looked for any excuse to eliminate funding to Planned Parenthood health centers because they use non-Federal funds to provide legal abortions. This time around, the excuse is that we should defund Planned Parenthood because of some misleading videos. Videos that, while uncomfortable in nature, have shown nothing illegal to date.

Let us talk about what Planned Parenthood means to Maryland. In my

State, Planned Parenthood is a leading provider of high-quality and affordable health care for so many women, men, and young people. Every year in MD, more than 33,000 patients receive health care from Planned Parenthood health centers. And what types of health care are Marylanders getting from these health centers? Approximately 5,000 breast exams every year. Nearly 4,000 cervical cancer screenings and Pap tests. More than 34,000 STD tests and counseling sessions. And more than 26,000 Marylanders rely on Planned Parenthood health centers for birth control.

The bill before us today is just the latest in a series of unrelenting attacks on Planned Parenthood. Those supporting this bill are simply latching on to yet another misguided attempt to try and eliminate Planned Parenthood in an effort to undermine women's reproductive rights.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill on behalf of the 2.7 million people, and 1 in 5 American women, who rely on Planned Parenthood for their health care.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, before us this evening is a decision whether or not to take money away from Planned Parenthood.

For close to 100 years, Planned Parenthood has provided critical health services to millions, providing care to 2.7 million people in 2013 alone.

In fact, many Planned Parenthood affiliates operate in rural and medically underserved areas. In some cases, closing these facilities could cause patients to travel great distances to receive health services.

Now, that said, I find the videos at issue to be extremely disturbing and I believe we have a responsibility to determine all the facts.

More investigation is needed before we even start talking about taking away vital health services like annual wellness exams and cancer screenings from the millions who rely on them for care.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to express my sincere disappointment in Planned Parenthood's apparent disregard for human life. As a father of four and a strong advocate for the sanctity of life, I am deeply disturbed by reports of the gruesome and inhuman actions being performed by Planned Parenthood and their affiliates.

I am proud to be a lead coauthor of Senator ERNST's bill that we are considering today to defund this organization and hope my fellow Senators will put the sanctity of life ahead of any political interests.

Last year, Planned Parenthood received $528 million in taxpayer funding, or more than $1.4 million per day, accounting for 41 percent of Planned Parenthood's overall revenue. Although the organization claims to use this funding to provide necessary health services to women, the fact is that abortions made up 94 percent of Planned Parenthood's pregnancy services in 2013, while prenatal care and adoption referrals accounted for 5 percent and 0.5 percent, respectively.

Given our current fiscal climate and the level of division among Americans on this issue, there is no justification for continuing to subsidize Planned Parenthood's profitable venture with taxpayer dollars. It is time for big abortion businesses like this one to be investigated and defunded.

Senator ERNST's bill, of which I am very proud to be a lead co-author, would prohibit Planned Parenthood, or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics, from receiving any Federal funds. Instead, funds that are currently offered to Planned Parenthood would be available to other eligible entities to provide women's health care services, including diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postnatal care, immunizations, and cervical and breast cancer screenings.

The sanctity of human life is a principle that Congress should proclaim at every opportunity. The time has come to respect the wishes of the majority of Americans who adamantly oppose using taxpayer dollars for abortions by denying Federal funds to these abortion providers. I strongly encourage the support of my fellow Senators on efforts to defund Planned Parenthood and protect these innocent babies from being the target of Planned Parenthood's gruesome practices.

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to legislation that would defund Planned Parenthood and jeopardize women's access to health care.

Each year Planned Parenthood opens its doors to millions of Americans, including more than 54,000 people in my State of Minnesota, people who need affordable, quality health care, such as breast and cervical cancer screenings, pregnancy tests, and family planning services. One in five women in this country has received that care at Planned Parenthood, and for many women Planned Parenthood is their primary source of health care. Yet today the Senate is considering opening debate on a proposal to defund Planned Parenthood—a proposal to block this health care provider from continued participation in our Federal safety net health programs. It is a proposal that would close Planned Parenthood's doors and leave millions without a provider.

Make no mistake, this proposal has nothing to do with protecting women's health. Instead, it advances a political agenda that threatens women's ability to receive often lifesaving care. In my State of Minnesota alone, Planned Parenthood provided more than 9,000 cervical cancer screenings and nearly 14,000 screenings for breast cancer in just 1 year. These screenings save women's lives, women such as Liz Steele from Minneapolis.

Liz's first job after graduating from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire didn't offer health insurance, so she relied on Planned Parenthood for basic health care services. When a blood sample taken during a routine physical exam more than 25 years ago indicated that Liz had a deadly form of leukemia, the nurse practitioner who cared for Liz at Planned Parenthood tracked her down and connected her with a physician who treated her cancer and saved her life. Liz said, ''Without [the nurse's] persistence, I quite frankly wouldn't be here right now. Planned Parenthood is responsible for saving my life.''

Unfortunately, the bill we are discussing today ignores women like Liz. Rather than recognizing Planned Parenthood's role in protecting women's health, the legislation continues a series of unrelenting attacks on Planned Parenthood and on women's access to basic health care. We have seen this strategy before. In 2007, the Senate voted on a measure that would have eliminated support for any health care provider—including Planned Parenthood—that provides safe, legal abortion services. In 2011, the Senate voted on a proposal that singled out Planned Parenthood by name and would have disqualified it from receiving Federal support. Each time, these attempts to place political hurdles between a woman and the health care provider of her choice failed—by a vote of 41 to 52 in 2007 and 42 to 58 in 2011. Today's attempt will fail as well.

Recently, antiabortion activists secretly recorded videos of Planned Parenthood doctors and staff. In these videos, some of the physicians captured on tape did not treat the issue of reproductive health services with the appropriate level of sensitivity. I was glad to see that the president of Planned Parenthood apologized for the tone of those remarks. But these videos—deceptively edited to paint a misleading picture of the organization—were designed to distort the truth and create controversy, a controversy that opponents of reproductive rights are now exploiting by pushing the same failed strategy, only this time they have focused their opposition to reproductive rights in disingenuous rhetoric that purports to value women's health.

The bill's lead sponsor claimed that ''[t]here will be no reduction in overall federal funding available to support women's health.'' Another cosponsor of this legislation claimed the bill would ''provide additional money for women's primary health care services,'' but the bill's operative language makes no

such commitment. It merely provides that ''no federal funds may be made available to Planned Parenthood.'' What the bill's proponents choose not to acknowledge is that Planned Parenthood health centers serve 36 percent of all patients who receive health care from a federally supported women's health center—more than any other provider—but those sponsors have no plan for where the millions of patients currently receiving health care from Planned Parenthood would go if this legislation were successful—no plan.

Moreover, claims that opponents of Planned Parenthood support continuing or even increasing funding for women's health services are especially hard to believe in light of the fact that some of the same people also support cutting the very programs that fund women's health services now. Just a little over 1 month ago, House appropriators approved a spending bill that would completely eliminate the title X family planning program—the Nation's only Federal program exclusively dedicated to reproductive health care. Senate appropriators proposed slashing title X—a program that is already running on fumes—by $30 million. So claims that a bill to ban one of America's most trusted health care providers from Federal programs would support women's health—claims made while the bill's proponents are working to gut Federal programs that provide services like breast and pelvic exams, contraceptives, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections and HIV—are nothing short of preposterous.

It is no secret that attacks on Planned Parenthood are part and parcel of a longstanding campaign to make safe and legal abortion in this country virtually impossible to access. Ironically, the defunding of Planned Parenthood would interfere with the delivery of health care that actually prevents unintended pregnancy and reduces the need for abortion. If the proponents of this bill were truly sincere in their desire to support women's health, they would embrace efforts to improve contraceptive coverage and increase access to birth control rather than continue to attack the Nation's No. 1 provider of basic women's health services.

The ability to access reproductive health care by the services that Planned Parenthood provides has a powerful effect on the choices women and families make every day—choices about finishing college or graduate school, whether to buy a home or start a business. The ability to decide whether or when to start a family shapes lives, and for nearly 100 years Planned Parenthood has played an important role in ensuring that women are able to make that decision for themselves and shape their own destinies. I urge my colleagues to resist the impulse to let politics stand between a woman and her health care and to oppose legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield to my colleague from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Thank you, Madam President.

Once again, this 114th Congress is proving its priorities are completely misguided. Last week the House of Representatives adjourned for a 6-week recess instead of taking up the Senate 6-year highway bill. That bill would strengthen our transportation infrastructure and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, which helps businesses compete globally and returns hundreds of millions of dollars to the Treasury. By skipping town, the House forced another short extension, delaying long-term investments and denying States and businesses long-term certainty.

Today we are debating whether to defund Planned Parenthood and deny thousands of women access to primary health care. Outside of these walls, this debate was settled decades ago. Most voters—including over 70 percent of Independents—oppose this effort because they see it for what it is: an aggressive assault on women's health care.

If you don't believe me, let me tell you the story of one of my constituents named Liz from Billings. Planned Parenthood has been Liz's primary health care provider for 30 years. The doctors and nurses at her local facility found precancerous cells and got her the treatment she needed to prevent a life-threatening disease. Despite a complicated medical history, she was able to start a family thanks to the prenatal care she accessed at Planned Parenthood. Now she has a daughter of her own and trusts the providers of Planned Parenthood to provide critical health care to her and her family. But Liz isn't alone.

In 2013, in my home State of Montana, over 15,000 men and women were patients at Planned Parenthood for everything from affordable primary care to cancer screenings, to family planning services. Four out of ten women who receive care at a title X-funded health care center consider it their only source of health care. Taking away this funding is political, shortsighted, and outright dangerous. Unfortunately, it is not their only attempt to rob women of their health care choices. As it sits now, next year's U.S. House appropriations bill for Health and Human Services eliminates all of the title X family planning health clinics. While that is the kind of shortsightedness we have come to expect from the House in recent years, the Senate Labor-HHS appropriations bill isn't much better because it significantly cuts title X funding. It cuts teen pregnancy prevention funding by 81 percent. In a large rural State like Montana, access to quality health care is always a serious challenge. Without a serious effort to recruit more doctors and nurses, we could soon be facing a crisis-level shortage of qualified medical providers.

This bill is designed to score political points, no doubt about it. It is certainly not designed with women's health or public health in mind. This is crazy. We need to be giving the American people more options when it comes to their health care, not fewer.

I would urge my colleagues to stop the political gaming and simply vote no on this bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, there comes a time in the history of nations when a civilized people must stand up and decide whether life is important, whether life is something special, and whether there is maybe something greater than just us that has to do with life.

It sickens me to see what has been going on with Planned Parenthood. Some of my first memories of my children were the ultrasounds I saw before they were born. We still keep those. We now find out, though, that this technology that can do wonders, that can save babies—now you can perform surgery in the uterus and the baby can survive. These same techniques are being used by Planned Parenthood to manipulate the baby into a position to harvest the baby's organs. I think all America should be sickened by this. It should also trouble us if we are a society that is not sickened by this.

I think the time has come to have a full-throated debate. The time has come to end all taxpayer funding for Planned Parenthood. Some will say: Well, where will people get their health care? We have 9,000 community health centers and 700 Planned Parenthood clinics. The only difference is abortion. In fact, you can get many things at a community health center you cannot get at Planned Parenthood, but the only thing you get at Planned Parenthood that you cannot get anywhere else is an abortion.

But this debate is not just about abortion; this debate is about little babies who have not given their consent.

It is about time we had a debate in our country about this, and it is about time we said enough is enough. The question is, Can a civilization long endure that does not respect life? Do we lose everything else that makes us human if we are unwilling to protect life? Can we stand up and defend our other rights if we are not willing to stand up and defend the most basic of rights?

I come here today to ask my fellow Senators to vote to defund Planned Parenthood. I hope they will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have a colloquy with several Members on the floor.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would first like to enter into a colloquy with Senator DAINES. This is an issue which many of us here in this body feel extremely passionate about. We will talk about Planned Parenthood and what is going on and the basic issue of children.

This has been spun multiple different ways, but really this is not about a lot of other issues other than one thing. This is about children—children who are recognizable outside of the womb, and once they have been carved up and set out on a table to be sold as parts, they can be plainly seen to be children.

So my conversation today will circle around a little bit about what we are doing, where we are headed, what this vote this evening is all about, and what this debate is that should begin here in America about what happens with Planned Parenthood.

So I would like to entertain a conversation with Senator DAINES.

Mr. DAINES. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for having this colloquy today because I do believe we are at a crossroads. With this vote we will have in about 20 minutes, we have a choice set before us, one that each one of us must make as a Senator and one that each American must make with us.

With a ''yes'' vote—a ''yes'' vote is to defund Planned Parenthood—we reaffirm our dedication to women's health. In fact, we recommit every dollar made available to support things such as well-baby care, cervical and breast cancer screening, prenatal and postpartum care, immunizations, family planning services, including contraception, sexually transmitted disease testing, and relevant diagnostic, laboratory, and radiology services.

This bill does not take a single dollar away from women's health. I think it is very important, as we debate this decision in front of us, that we do not get caught up in rhetoric. Let's get focused on the facts, on what this does and what it does not do. This is a vote about our culture. This is a vote about our ethics. Most importantly—and I say this as a daddy of four children, two boys and two girls—this is about the value of our children.

Over the last few weeks, we have seen these videos. Americans have been horrified at high-level Planned Parenthood executives who are callously discussing the price of baby organs harvested from the tiny bodies of aborted babies. In fact, just last week we witnessed an abortion doctor poking through the pieces of a tiny and broken body. He was pointing out the heart and lungs and discussing what each of them should cost when sold, meanwhile exclaiming it is a baby.

We have heard so many arguments today: Well, this is about the woman's body. We respect the body of the woman, and we want to make sure that the proper services are allowed to protect a woman's health. But this is not about the woman's body. This is about a different body with a different DNA. This is about a little baby—a baby who now has a price not just on its head but on literally every part, as these videos exposed.

When we place a price on the outcome of the destruction of our children, we incentivize it. In another setting, we would call this price-per-specimen arrangement a bounty scheme, because with potential for such financial gain, there is little wonder why there are 149 abortions to every 1 adoption referral at these clinics—149 abortions to every 1 adoption referral at these clinics.

The discussions we heard are not exceptions or even the actions of a single clinic. This is a systemic issue within Planned Parenthood. We heard direct testimony that clinics act in concert, with the consent of their corporate headquarters at Planned Parenthood, and that no single clinic acts alone.

We learned that an overarching legal department works to build layers upon layers of defenses so that no one clinic is left holding the bag. Such a culture shows little regard for women's health. This is a culture that has been embroiled in a number of lawsuits about making false reimbursement claims to the Federal Government and helping to facilitate the covering up of sexual abuse and statutory rape. In fact, just last week a complaint was filed with the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies against one of these clinics regarding a little 13-year-old girl who was sexually abused, had an abortion, and was returned to her abuser. No report was made by the clinic or the abortionist. Her parents were not contacted—all in violation of the laws of Colorado.

So a ''no'' vote on this bill supports this culture. It devalues both the woman and that tiny little baby, that child.

We do have a choice today. We can work to change that culture if we choose to vote for women, if we would choose to vote yes, because a ''yes'' vote redirects—again, let's get the facts straight here and separate them from the rhetoric—funds from Planned Parenthood and provides that money for women's health services to the numerous community health centers.

You heard Senator PAUL talk about 9,000 community clinics around the country versus 700 Planned Parenthood centers. It would provide these dollars to those clinics, to local clinics, to hospitals, to other providers that already serve the majority of women.

I must tell you I was deeply disturbed—as a daddy of four—with this most recent video where a doctor pokes around the aborted baby's parts until she finds the legs, and she shouts and exclaims: It is another boy.

There can be no denying what she was saying. We hear those words for the first time. I heard those words for the first time from a doctor during an ultrasound when Cindy and I were seeing the doctor as we were pregnant or in that ecstatic phone call that comes from an expecting mom or as the new father takes that newborn son into his arms. That doctor was the same one to say: It is a baby.

There is no doubt that this is what the little boy is; it is a baby.

I cannot support an organization that would place a dollar amount on body parts. I cannot support an organization that would incentivize his death. That is why I will vote for this bill, and my vote will be a vote for women's health.

To be very clear, this bill won't touch 1 cent of funding for women's health—not 1 cent. That means that this vote is for one thing and one thing only. A ''yes'' vote is a vote for women. It is a vote for our children. I urge my colleagues: Let us vote for women. Let us vote for our children. Let us vote yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this ongoing conversation has happened. I would like to be able to demonstrate what we are really up against and what this really looks like in practical terms.

I brought a chart with me here for when we talk about women's health because there is an accusation that is sitting out there that this is about cutting off access to women's health. The chart I have on the right shows all Planned Parenthood licensed mammogram facilities. They would be a dot on this map. If you were looking close at the map, you would see no dots on it. It is clear there is not a single one. The accusation is, over and over, that if women are going to get access to mammograms, they have to be able to get to Planned Parenthood. The dirty secret is they are referred to other locations. They recommend that you go get a mammogram, but Planned Parenthood doesn't do any of them. On the left, these are the 8,000-plus facilities—the dots on the map here—where you can actually get a mammogram. We are talking about taking funding from a location that refers patients to the location that actually does the mammogram.

This is about women's health, but it is also about the health of children. I have a very difficult time talking about things such as early childhood education on this floor with individuals who are passionate about early childhood education, but if that child was just a couple of years younger, they would have no issue with them being aborted and their body parts being sold.

That is the same child. That is the same child whose early childhood education we are passionate about. That is the same child whom we are passionate about in the Women, Infants, and Children funding to make sure that they get proper nutrition at birth. That is

the same child. The only difference between the child in the womb and the child who is a preschooler is time. We just think it is important in this incredibly divisive issue of abortion that we treat this seriously as a nation.

What has happened in the last couple of weeks with the Planned Parenthood video coming out is that for the first time in a long time, this is not an invisible thing that is happening somewhere in secret. Now it is something that is actually happening where people can see it. I think our culture, for the first time in a while, is having to slow down and deal with the reality of this: Is it possible that this culture has been wrong, that this really is a child?

I spoke last week to a friend of mine. His child was born a year ago at 14 ounces. So 14 ounces was the birth weight. The child was born very, very premature. Their child is now 14 pounds, a year later, and doing extremely well. That 14-ounce child is a child that everyone sees now, but that 14-ounce child is exactly what Planned Parenthood was harvesting, was turning in the womb so they could crush the head to be able to gather the organs to be able to sell them.

As a culture, we have to deal with this one simple reality. That child is important. This is not about Cecil the lion. This is not about whales at SeaWorld. This is about children.

Maybe we as a culture should slow down and be able to answer that one simple question and at least for this moment with Planned Parenthood to say this to an organization where there are a couple of things that are hanging over them right now that are very serious. One is that it is not legal under Federal law to sell parts of a human for profit. Now, it is still yet to be determined what was done. But it is also not legal to be able to change the timing, procedure or method of an abortion to be able to gather organs to be sold. That is very clear in Federal law as well.

So if the method is changed, if the timing is changed, if the procedure has changed, specifically to harvest organs, that is not legal. In the videos, over and over you hear doctors talking about how they changed the method, how they used the ultrasound to turn the child around, how they used a different technique than they would have normally done because they wanted to be able to gather these organs for sale.

Those are serious accusations. These are children—children. We think it is entirely reasonable to say let's take the funding that has been committed to Planned Parenthood, which is the single largest abortion provider in the country—40 percent of their revenue comes from the Federal taxpayer, 40 percent. Let's take that funding and let's commit it to organizations that do full women's health—mammograms, testing, contraceptives, and the works—not just recommending it to others and also do abortions, but we would commit it to those individuals.

With that, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana in this colloquy. I see my colleague from California as well. I think she would also like to have a moment in our colloquy.

Would the Senator like to be able to speak for a moment in our colloquy?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I was going to ask unanimous consent that following my friend from Louisiana I be given 2 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Could we just swap and go straight to the Senator now? Would that be appropriate?

Mrs. BOXER. Whatever the Senator wants.

Mr. LANKFORD. Let's do that then.

I have a unanimous consent for an ongoing colloquy, and I would be pleased to have the Senator join this conversation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his generosity here. I tell him that I would really rather work with him on transportation.

I gave birth to two premature kids, and I just don't like lectures from men about what it is like—and thank God they made it.

I am pro-choice. I just have to say that using pregnancy as a political football doesn't sit well with the people I represent and the people of this country.

We have to respect one another. I respect your view entirely. I am asking you to respect mine. Keep Uncle Sam out of my private life, and that of my children, my grandkids, and yours.

Families will make these decisions with their God and their doctor. Ninety-seven percent of the work Planned Parenthood does has nothing to do with abortion. It is primary health care.

I have to say that in 2011 Republicans threatened to shut down the government if Planned Parenthood wasn't defunded. I heard my friend from Washington, PATTY MURRAY, say they were serious. They were going to shut down the government to deny health care to 2.7 million women and men every year—for some of them, basic health care.

I will show you a particular person, Doreen from California, who said:

> I went to Planned Parenthood and I talked to the clinician. . . . She gave me a referral to a breast care center where I had a mammogram and a biopsy [and] was ultimately diagnosed with breast cancer. . . . I was scheduled for a lumpectomy in about two weeks.

That woman could have died, and you say: Go to community health care centers. First, I find it ironic because they were set up in ObamaCare and all of you voted no on ObamaCare. We expanded community health centers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the community health care center association in California.

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

CALIFORNIA PRIMARY CARE ASSOCIATION,
July 30, 2015.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: The California Primary Care Association has recently become aware of new legislation by Senator Joni Ernst that would redirect federal funding from Planned Parenthood to other health care providers. The purported goal of such legislation is to prevent a decrease in federal funding for women's health services, while eliminating Planned Parenthood as a health care provider.

As the state-wide representatives of community clinics and health centers in California, who serve 5.6 million patients annually, we believe this action would negatively impact the health of our community.

Planned Parenthood currently operates 115 health centers in California and serves nearly 800,000 patients through 1.5 million encounters annually. Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our state's comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining providers. We do not have the capacity for such an increase in care and building such capacity would require significant capital investment on par with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act expansion.

Even then, the legislation would still eliminate patient's ability to choose the provider with which they feel most comfortable. Planned Parenthood is seen by many as women's health centric, which provides their patients with a level of comfort that cannot be easily duplicated. The women's health focus allows them to be a provider of choice to hundreds of thousands of women who seek out a variety of services that include well woman exams, breast exams, birth control and sexually transmitted disease testing.

In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood conducted 733,641 tests for Chlamydia—the leading cause of preventable infertility—that resulted in 37,014 positive results and follow-up treatment.

Planned Parenthood is a vital component of the health care system in California and for that reason, we are opposed to legislation that will diminish their capacity to provide care in our state. We respectfully request that you oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

ANDIE MARTINEZ PATTERSON, MPP,
Director of Government Affairs.

They say they cannot take any more patients. They cannot take those 800,000 patients.

So they say to the women: Go to the community health care centers. They voted against ObamaCare, which expanded the community health care centers, and the health care centers are saying no, they are sorry, they cannot do it. Planned Parenthood does a great job.

So this is a continuation of the Republican war on women. I hope we will defeat this ill-considered bill that is about to come our way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I wish to be able to continue this conversation because it is extremely important that we continue this as a nation.

I wish to make a couple of comments to you as well.

I am a dad with two daughters. I had something to do with the birth as well

and was also there. I was there during the sonograms. My wife and I are extremely close. As a dad of two daughters, I am very passionate—not only about my own wife but about my mom, who is a cancer survivor. She is a multiple-time cancer survivor. I am passionate about my daughters having every single opportunity. So this is important to us as well. This is not just a women's issue. This is a men's issue as well because this is a family issue, and families are extremely important to all of us.

But I would say that community health centers don't serve 3.2 million people, like Planned Parenthood. Community health centers serve 23 million people around the country. There are around 650 Planned Parenthood locations around the country. There are 9,000 community health centers around the country. The Planned Parenthood facilities refer people to go get breast cancer screenings. The community health centers actually do that testing there. They actually do the mammograms there and not just say that you should get one.

So this is about women's health. It is also about the efficiency of what we are going to be about.

I would also say one other thing on this issue about ObamaCare and the community health centers. The community health centers were funded under ObamaCare, but they long preexisted before ObamaCare. Community health centers are not an invention of ObamaCare. There was a section of ObamaCare that funded some of them an additional amount, but they have been around for decades and decades. They are an extremely efficient form of health care, especially to those on Medicaid.

I yield to my friend and fellow Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am a physician, a doctor. For the last 25 years, I have worked in hospitals for the uninsured. So when my friend from California mentions the need to ensure access for those who might not otherwise afford it, that is what I have been attempting to do in my medical practice for the last 25 years.

As a practicing physician, one of the first things you are taught in medical school is ''first, do no harm.'' Tragically, these videos demonstrate that some do not share that perspective.

When patients see their doctors, they want an honest, objective opinion. But what the video suggests is that Planned Parenthood puts profits and special interests before the women who call on them for their advice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator should be advised that the time for the vote, scheduled for 5:30, has arrived. He can ask unanimous consent for additional time if he so wishes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Oh, is it 5:30 now? I am sorry. I ask unanimous consent for another 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASSIDY. Now, again, for 30 years, I have been working to get health care for folks, and I think it is important we ensure access for women to health care.

Currently, Planned Parenthood gets $500 million in Federal funding per year. If we redirect this funding to the community health centers, which I have worked with for 30 years, their health can be better served.

There are two Planned Parenthood facilities in Louisiana, and there are 160 community health centers. The two Planned Parenthood offices, one in New Orleans and one in Baton Rouge, are in the southeastern portion of the State. The community health centers are scattered all over the State, and, again, there are 160 of those.

For every American who is troubled by these videos, we should be equally troubled by the fact that the Planned Parenthood provision of health care is geographically centered in some areas but not as broadly as the community health centers.

I will also point out, as a physician, that the Planned Parenthood model of care is outdated. We now talk about clinics which are medical homes, not which are siloed into only the provision of birth control pills and, in the case of Planned Parenthood, abortion. The community health centers can provide the whole range of services including those for diabetes, hypertension, et cetera.

It is time for Congress to act. I ask my colleagues to support this redistribution of money, sending it closer to where those patients live, to better ensure a woman's access to health care, and to address the troubling issues raised by these videos.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I will not object if Senator BLUMENTHAL can respond with 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, the question before us today is clear: Who do we want to be as a nation?

It is hard for anyone to defend these morally reprehensible videos as Planned Parenthood callously harvested the organs of unborn babies to be sold at a price. The American people, Republicans and Democrats alike, are horrified by the blatant disregard and utter lack of compassion shown by Planned Parenthood for these women and their babies.

It is wrong. The American people know it, and they should not be asked to foot part of the bill. We can no longer turn a blind eye. This is human life, and Planned Parenthood, the Nation's single largest provider of abortion services, is harvesting baby body parts.

Before you now is a critical opportunity to vote for legislation that will protect the most vulnerable in our society and fund women's health.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am tempted to say there they go again, because we have seen this attack on women's health care again and again and again. It is a very weak excuse to defund Planned Parenthood.

We know 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's activities have nothing to do with abortion. Let's stand strong for women's health care to protect women against cancer, against hepatitis, against sexually transmitted diseases. Eighty percent of Planned Parenthood's clients have nowhere else to go for those vital services. We will not tolerate this attack on women's health care under the guise of stopping abortion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I am grateful for this conversation about children.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is regular order at this point?

Parliamentary inquiry. What is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that all time has expired.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would advise my colleague from California I have a unanimous consent request under rule XXII.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Rand Paul, Pat Roberts, Ben Sasse, James Lankford, Joni Ernst, Daniel Coats, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Lindsey Graham, Michael B. Enzi, Jerry Moran, Tim Scott, John Cornyn.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood

Federation of America, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted ''yea.''

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Enzi	Paul
Ayotte	Ernst	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Roberts
Burr	Grassley	Rounds
Capito	Hatch	Rubio
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Manchin	Toomey
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Donnelly	Murkowski	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Kirk	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	McConnell	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

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

The majority leader.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 754.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 754, a bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 28, S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Marco Rubio, Susan M. Collins, John Thune, Daniel Coats; Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be brief.

I understand why our colleagues want to respond in some way to the horrendous hack at the Office of Personnel Management. I wish to say to my colleagues that it needs to be a response that is going to work. My concern is that this bill, in its present form, will create more problems than it solves, and it would be a mistake to bring it up without agreeing to an inclusive process for considering relevant amendments.

I appreciate that the sponsors of the bill have been working on a managers' amendment to address some of the very serious concerns that have been raised. My own view is that the bill needs a lot more work. For example, the managers' amendment does not fix the provision of this bill that will allow private companies to hand over large volumes of their customers' personal information to the Government with only a cursory review, even if that information is not necessary for cyber security.

Cyber security experts and privacy advocates have been raising concerns about these issues for many months. They state that they have sent something like 6 million communications to the Hill in the last few days.

For me, the bottom line is that the legislation, as it stands today, doesn't do a whole lot to protect U.S. networks against sophisticated hacks, and it will do a lot to undermine the privacy rights of the American people.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from California here, and I know she has a different view. My colleague from North Carolina is here. I look forward to working with both of them and the Senate and hope that we will have an inclusive debate that will ensure that all sides get a chance to raise their concerns.

Cyber security is a very real problem in America. My constituents have been hacked. In fact, the Chinese were indicted for hacking my constituents. Information sharing can play a valuable role. Yet information sharing without vigorous and robust privacy safeguards will be seen by the American people as a surveillance bill. That is a fact.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Ohio.

DRINKING WATER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have come back to the floor again this afternoon to plead with my colleagues to pass legislation that deals with the toxic algal blooms that affect many of our States, including my State of Ohio.

It turns out this is the 1-year anniversary of the water crisis that occurred in Toledo, OH. I see my colleague from Ohio is now on the floor also. He will remember this well. But it was a year ago when we found that there were toxic algal blooms around the intake valve in Toledo, OH, making the water unsuitable. There was an advisory sent out to 500,000 people that said: Do not drink the water.

You can imagine the chaos that occurred. You can imagine how difficult this was for the people who live in the Toledo area, who rely on this water. By the way, there are about 3 million Ohioans who rely on Lake Erie water and more than twice that many around the country and in other States, such as Michigan.

This is a critical issue. Last week it turned out that there were algal blooms that were moving within a few miles of this same intake valve—the same kind of blue-green toxic algal blooms. I was on the lake the weekend before last to see some of this. Within a couple of days, the city of Toledo changed the city's water quality status from ''clear'' to ''watch.'' We are on a ''watch'' status right now because of the amounts of toxins that have drifted closer to the intake valve.

We have a problem right now. We know that the toxic algal blooms prediction for this year in Lake Erie is projected to be worse than it was last year, almost as bad as it was during another crisis period in 2011, when a lot of the beaches were closed down and people weren't able to take their pets to the water and when fishing was pretty much shut down because of the algal blooms. This is a huge issue. It is an economic development issue. It is a health and safety issue. It is an issue that goes to the heart of the economy in this part of Ohio where we have relatively high unemployment and where Lake Erie is the single biggest driver of economic activity. In fact, it is the biggest destination in the State of Ohio. It is our biggest resource for tourism.

It is not just Lake Erie. We now have this in Grand Lake St. Marys. There is an advisory out on water in Grand Lake St. Marys, which is a reservoir that is inland that is a freshwater reservoir south of Lake Erie. It is the same thing—toxic algal blooms. We had a lot of rain earlier this spring and

summer, as those of us in the Midwest will remember, and that washed a lot of effluent into the lakes, a lot of nitrogen, a lot of phosphorous—the things that cause algal blooms to grow. Then we had some hot weather. That is a bad combination.

Again, I see my colleague Senator BROWN is on the floor too. We drafted legislation to get the EPA more engaged in this issue, to help Ohio more, and to help all of the States represented here.

We have had this legislation on the floor of the Senate for over 40 days—45 days, I think. We have had it cleared on both sides of the aisle. In other words, there is no substantive concern about it. It took a while to do that.

We had to work with some people on my side of the aisle who thought maybe EPA didn't have a role here. But EPA does have a role. It is a really important role. It can bring best practices, and it certainly can bring the best research done in the country. It happens to be done in Cincinnati, among other places, at EPA. We have required EPA under this legislation to come up with a plan to deal with this issue immediately for Lake Erie, working with the other agencies, such as USGS, NOAA, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and USDA, and to come up with a plan that helps us to deal with this issue right now.

If you live in the Toledo area this evening, you are worried. There is a watch on. Once again, you are worried that you are not going to have water supply that is safe for you and your kids. If you live somewhere else along the lake—say, in Cleveland or Sandusky—you are worried too because these same toxic algal blooms know no barriers, know no boundaries, and they move around the lake.

All we are asking tonight is that we be able to pass legislation that is straightforward, that is nonpartisan. It is not just bipartisan. I would say it is nonpartisan. It is very sensible, and it highlights the need for us to take immediate action because it talks about some of the issues that are involved.

There are 42 water systems in Ohio that are now susceptible to harmful algal blooms, for instance. It talks about the fact that we have to be sure that we are not just protecting Lake Erie but other bodies of freshwater, and it forces the EPA to come up with a plan that helps us deal with this issue right now.

This legislation passed the House already. It didn't just pass the House; it passed the House with a vote of 375 to 37. Not many pieces of legislation pass the House with those kinds of numbers. Again, Senator BROWN and I have been trying for more than 4 months to get that House-passed bill passed here in the Senate. We have worked through the substantive problems. I tried to do this on Thursday evening, and I was told I had to stop and I was going to get blocked from doing it because the other side had other legislation they wanted to consider that had not been passed in the House—much less passed in the House 375 to 37.

If we pass this legislation tonight and if we are able to get it through with a voice vote and get it done, it will go to the President and he will sign it. In other words, it will become law. That is what the people I represent are looking for.

Again, I notice my colleague Senator BROWN is on the floor. If he is interested, I would certainly yield to him. Any comments he has, I would appreciate hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I will be brief and turn it back to Senator PORTMAN.

We worked on this issue for a long time. We remember what happened with algal blooms 4 years ago. We remember just last year—1 year ago—in August, 500,000 people in northwest Ohio didn't have drinking water. Imagine what that does to a community for 2½, 3 days.

We know that the Western Basin of Lake Erie is the shallowest part of any of the Great Lakes—only 30 feet deep in the Western Basin. Contrast that with Lake Superior, where 600 feet deep is the average. You can see the vulnerability of Lake Erie and what it means. Whether it is from runoff, whether it is from agriculture and homeowners and commercial and industrial establishments, the Maumee River Basin is the largest river feeding any of the Great Lakes. Whether it is coming together on climate change and heating of the water and all the issues that affect the short term and long term, our legislation will help us this year and help us the next couple of years. We obviously need long-term solutions. This is critical.

I called the mayor of Toledo today, and I know Senator PORTMAN is working with the city, the county, the State EPA, and the U.S. EPA on this. This is very crucial for people in our State and ultimately throughout the Great Lakes as these problems proliferate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his good work on this bill. He helped to improve this legislation and make it more effective. It is about having the EPA play a bigger role on not only how we monitor but also how we treat the water and how we establish when there is a problem. This is needed, it is needed now, and it is immediate.

This is a photograph that was taken about 8 days ago—not this past week but the weekend before—on the lake. The jar in the photograph was collected by the charter boat captain. He is actually one of the charter boat captains who go out every day and collect samples that are then used by the experts to determine not just where the algal blooms are but the level of toxicity. This is what we found. As you can see, that doesn't look very appetizing. It is thick and green. It is filled with the kinds of toxins that can affect people in very negative ways if they get in the drinking water. We know that people are getting rashes right now from some other freshwater reservoirs in our area, from being in contact with the water.

If we don't deal with this issue, we know we are going to have more of this. We know it has already cost our communities a lot to mitigate it. In Grand Lake St. Marys, as I mentioned earlier, they have already shut down some of the beaches because of this. The city of Celina spends $450,000 annually to deal with this. So this is also a taxpayer issue. Columbus was recently forced to spend $700,000 to mitigate an outbreak in their reservoir. This is happening right now as we speak.

We just want this legislation to be out there as one of the tools in the toolbox to deal with it, and it is a very sensible one. It gets the EPA engaged in a way so that Republicans and Democrats in both the House and Senate can agree on it. Let's get this done tonight.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212

Mr. President, I ask that we get this legislation done now by asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 212, which is at the desk, and that the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we have been through this before, so I think the Senator from Ohio knows what I am going to say. The bill he proposes to go forward on these terms has been paired by our side with the National Estuary Program, which, like his bill, is bipartisan and, like his bill, is not controversial. It has been passed over and over again by the Senate. Indeed, I think it was originally the work of Republican Senator John Chafee of Rhode Island. It has been passed by the House over and over again. This is a reauthorization. If we clear it through the House, it will go to the President for signing.

Our bill came through the Environment and Public Works Committee in regular order, whereas this came over from the House, was held at the desk, was never reviewed by the committee of jurisdiction, and is now being hotlined, which is fine except that I understand it to be a tradition around here that we compare noncontroversial bills.

I don't understand. Our bill, the estuary bill, is noncontroversial also. Our bill is also bipartisan. It is the work of Senator VITTER, who is the chairman of the committee. Why is there this effort week after week to separate the two rather than just pass them both?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212 AND S. 1523

So I ask that the Senator amend his unanimous consent request to read as follows: I ask unanimous consent that the EPW Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 212, which is the Drinking Water Protection Act, a bill to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and S. 1523, a bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program; further, that the Senate proceed to their immediate consideration en bloc, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bills, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

If the Senator will agree to that so that the pairing is maintained, then I will have no objection. If he will not agree to it, then I must object because I don't know why these bills are being repeatedly taken apart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio modify his request?

Mr. PORTMAN. No, I can't modify my request because his bill has not cleared, and he knows that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. There is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Look, this is ridiculous. We have a health and safety issue on the floor of the Senate that is ready to go. You just heard from me and Senator BROWN. It is bipartisan, bicameral, and is ready to go to the President.

I must say to my friend the Senator from Rhode Island, who talked about his legislation, that I have no problem with his legislation, but he hasn't had it cleared. The Senator said this has been going on for weeks and weeks, and that is not true. This came onto our radar screen on Thursday night of last week when, after over 40 days on the floor with our bill, we got it all cleared, and then we found out just prior to my going and asking to have a voice vote on it that now they want to pair it with another piece of legislation that has nothing to do with health and safety. It is a reauthorization of a program that has not been passed by the House. The Senator from Rhode Island said it has been passed by the House. It has not been passed by the House. It may have been passed by the House in a previous Congress, but that doesn't count. What counts is that our bill passed the House with a vote of 375 to 37, and it is now on the floor.

The people I represent deserve to have our government work for them right now to help deal with this algal bloom problem, and they are blocking my bill with legislation they say is nonpartisan and noncontroversial?

I am happy to support their bill. In fact, what I did last week when I found out about it on Thursday was I started clearing it for them because they hadn't done it. I put it in the clearance process. As of today, there are some concerns on my side of the aisle. Nobody has seen it yet. They are seeing it for the first time. We went out of session right after I started clearing it, and we are back in session now and people are looking at it. I am happy to support the Senator's bill, but the Senator from Rhode Island shouldn't block our bill because they are looking for me to support their bill. I am happy to support their bill but not if it is going to keep us from moving forward tonight. I can't agree to pair it because there will be an objection because people haven't had a chance to look at it. I know the committee sometimes likes to pair legislation. They don't always pair legislation, by the way.

I think it is ridiculous that we can't move forward on a very simple piece of legislation that we worked on for over 40 days. And everybody is fine with it. There are no substantive problems. It is a health-and-safety issue. Let's go ahead with this. In this instance, let's put partisanship aside.

I support the Senator's bill. I will support his bill. I will vote for his bill. I will continue to try to clear it even though they didn't clear it. I am the one trying to clear it. I don't know if they have even cleared it on their side. I don't know if they even put it in the process yet. But obviously you have to do that in order for this to happen.

I am amazed that we are going to actually stop legislation that is needed right now for legislation that has not passed the House, is not going to the President for his signature, and is not due to an imminent health-and-safety issue.

The Federal Government is not going to be there for the people in northern Ohio and throughout our State who are worried about the algal blooms right now, because of some disagreement on the floor of this Chamber where at the very last minute Democrats stepped forward and said: No, we are not going to let this bipartisan bill go forward because we want to insist that it be paired with one that has not gone through the clearance process.

I commit to my friend that I will support his bill. I have had a chance to look at it over the weekend. I am OK with it. But it has not been cleared, and it is not going to go to the President for signature.

The House of Representatives is not in session this week, so even if by some miracle they could get their bill cleared here, they can't get it cleared by the House because the House is out of session. They are coming back in September. We are in session. We can get this done. We can send it to the President. We can let people know they can sleep a little more comfortably at night, with a little more peace of mind, knowing that we have actually taken action here to get this expert agency that deals with water quality engaged and involved to help the local folks, the State folks, and experts back home to be able to do the right thing so they can avoid another water crisis and all of the issues Senator BROWN and I saw when we were up there.

I went up with bottles of water, threw them in the back of my pickup, and they were gone like that. Why? Families were desperate to be sure they had water for their kids. Mothers were desperate to make sure they had water to be able to ensure that their families weren't going to be left without access to what is perhaps the most important thing any of us can imagine, which is clean water one can drink and use for cooking.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212

I again ask unanimous consent that my colleague yield and that we allow this bill to go forward. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 212, which is at the desk, that the bill be read a third time, and that the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PORTMAN. I am sorry to hear that. I will be back again tomorrow and the next day. I will be back again and again because we want to get this done. This is simple. There is no real mystery here. This is an opportunity to get something done that helps people not just in my State but around the country deal with a very real problem they are facing this summer, now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I suggest to my friend the Senator from Ohio that if he is going to keep coming back every day, it might be productive if during the course of the day he were to get his side to clear the paired piece of legislation, which, as I have said, is bipartisan. His colleague Senator VITTER, for instance, is the coauthor of it. It has cleared the EPW Committee, which is chaired and run by the Republicans now. If their side isn't aware of this bill, it came through regular order through the committee that they run. If their side isn't aware of this bill—it has been sitting over here ever since it cleared the committee. All they have to do is clear it, and we will be done.

So perhaps if the Senator will put his effort into clearing a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill that for decades has been passed and reauthorized by this body, then we can move forward. It should be a fairly easy task. I would be very happy to support him in any way I can.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. So this is all about leverage—to leverage me to be able to help you on your bill, which I told you I support, in order for us to get something done that has been on the floor for over 40 days.

Look, I am happy to talk to my colleagues. I am the one who started

clearing this on our side of the aisle. You guys didn't. I am happy to talk to colleagues who have concerns. But they get a chance to look at it, just as you had a chance to look at our bill over the last 45 days.

So if this is all about leverage, you got me. You have leveraged me. You have already done it. You have succeeded. I already started clearing it. I support it. I am happy to help, and I am sure Senator BROWN is happy to help also, but let's not block this in the meantime.

We will be able to get your bill done; I am sure of it. I am sure, if it is as popular as you say it is, we can get it done in the House too. It has not cleared the House at this point. In the meantime, let's not block this legislation. This is ridiculous. This is not the way this Senate ought to operate.

We have a smart bill on the floor that has been looked at over 40 days. It is ready to go. It has been cleared by both sides. There are no substantive concerns. And it is time that we deliver for the people we represent.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I respect the Senator from Ohio greatly. I know this lake is important to him. We are a State that is wrapped around the estuary, Narragansett Bay, and that, too, is important to us. If my friend is sure, as he just said, that this bill will clear on his side, then I urge him to please go ahead and clear it, and let's clear this unnecessary blockage and move both good bills forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, just a short time ago, the Senate rejected legislation that would promote and protect women's health and protect the lives of unborn children. The legislation introduced by Senator JONI ERNST would deny the Nation's largest abortion provider taxpayer funding and shift that funding to local health organizations to provide necessary health care and medical treatment for women.

This issue arises once more after the release of several undercover videos that successively have become more gruesome than the last. The videos of Planned Parenthood that have been released so far reveal the breadth of institutionalized disregard for human life at its earliest stages.

At the basic level of decency, we are repulsed by these videos because science and reason inform our consciences and lead us to the inescapable conclusion that lives are being ended through this exploitation. If individual organs and tissues can be harvested from aborted babies, it is impossible to make the case that this is not a human life that is being destroyed. Why do we place more value on the parts and the pieces of a human life than the life as a whole?

In one of those videos, Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services noted: ''We've been very good at getting heart, lung, and liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part, I'm going to basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact.''

Another Planned Parenthood official in another video—this one from California—said this:

> It's been years since I talked about compensation, so let me just figure out what others are getting. If this is in the ballpark, it's fine. If it's still low, then we can bump it up. I still want my Lamborghini.

These words by two different officials in two different settings reflect a view that unborn children are nothing more than a commodity to be exploited and abused and they seemingly would do that for material gain. Is this where we would want our scarce tax dollars to go? In fact, if we had an abundance, is this a place we would want those dollars to go?

Critics contend that the videos are heavily edited. Yet the videos have been released in their entirety and the transcripts of the full conversations have been provided. It is telling that despite full access to what was discussed, these critics have not been able to justify their grotesque practices being described, nor the inappropriate tone adopted with regard to selling tissues and organs of an unborn child.

This isn't news. We have long known of the hundreds of thousands of abortions Planned Parenthood performs each year. If we can only avert our eyes and look the other way, as critics would have us do, we can avoid what is obscene and hugely uncomfortable. That can no longer happen. Light needs to be shed on an organization that destroys human lives while hiding behind the veil of women's health services.

It is alarming that Politico reports that Planned Parenthood's public relations firm is requesting that members of the media refrain from airing the videos that expose the truth of Planned Parenthood practices. We cannot allow atrocities such as this to be swept under the rug because of the power this organization wields.

Kansans have long made it clear they don't want their tax dollars contributing to abortion providers, and I have worked to make their voices heard in Washington. Taxpayers should not fear that their money is going to fund actions they find sincerely and seriously morally wrong. This legislation would prevent taxpayer dollars from funding Planned Parenthood, allowing our taxpayers peace of mind and a sense of morality that their hard-earned money is not facilitating something they abhor.

Instead, S. 1881 would reallocate the funds Planned Parenthood receives through grants back into their communities. The money would go to local health care providers that offer important women's health services, allowing them to care for more women in their communities. By distributing the funds Planned Parenthood currently receives through a grant process to community health centers, we can increase the number of women's health care providers instead of funding a contentious organization that ends life. In fact, in our State, there are two offices of Planned Parenthood, but there are 50 community health centers. It would actually be more available. Women would have more access to health care services if the money was provided through community health centers. We are a rural State and only through that process would many women be able to access this service. Hard-working Americans—our constituents—deserve to have their taxpayer dollars going toward local community centers and county health departments, places that value life instead of destroying it.

Women deserve affordable health care, and it is being provided by a number of organizations that have nothing to do with abortion. We can and should support these health providers and we can and should protect the unborn. We can do both. S. 1881 would be a significant step, an important step, in accomplishing both of those goals, and I believe it should have passed with broad support.

Though I am deeply disappointed by the result of tonight's vote, I remain hopeful for a solution that will advance the life and health of both mother and child. In fact, as science improves our understanding of the unborn and the practices of abortion providers are further exposed, I think a solution will be inevitable.

Unfortunately, that time apparently has not yet come, but I and others will remain focused on this goal. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to act appropriately to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

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

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise to speak again about the 198 North Dakotans who died during the Vietnam war. In a moment I will speak about some of the things I have learned about who they are.

I also wish to thank Vietnam veterans who have served our State and our country, and one of those Vietnam veterans is Robert ''Bob'' Wefald of Bismarck.

The year Bob graduated from the University of North Dakota, he enlisted in the Navy. He served 3 years on Active Duty during the conflict in Vietnam. In Bob's 2010 autobiography titled ''Moments,'' he wrote: ''Going to WESTPAC and Vietnam was the biggest and most intense experience of my 27 years in the Navy.'' After his Active-Duty service, Bob continued to serve his country in the Naval Reserve.

In 1970, Bob began law school at the University of Michigan and saw his

classmates being drafted to serve in Vietnam. As a part of the university's student board of governors, Bob led the movement for the dean to promise to allow drafted students to return to law school after completing their service.

While in Michigan, Bob met and married the love of his life, Susan. They moved to Bismarck, ND, and spent their careers and even now their retirement in public service.

Bob's first job after law school was clerking for the North Dakota Supreme Court. He later worked in private practice as an attorney. In 1981, he was elected North Dakota's Attorney General. I have him to thank for appointing me as assistant attorney general in the tax department and for fighting for me to earn a decent wage while I was in that position. Bob made me say that.

In 1998, Bob was elected as a district court judge and served there until his retirement in 2010. While working, Bob and Susan, who was North Dakota's public service commissioner for 16 years, raised three children. Throughout their careers, and now, Bob and Susan have both volunteered to serve on many boards and organizations throughout our State, including the Boys and Girls Scouts, the American Legion, and Boys State.

Bob was the spark that lit the fire in making two significant military projects a reality for North Dakota. One was establishing a State veterans cemetery and the other was having a Navy ship named after North Dakota—the USS *North Dakota*. Both ideas became a reality. For over 20 years, the vets cemetery outside my community of Mandan has been a beautiful resting place for those who gave so much to our country. In 2013, I had the honor of attending the 2013 christening of the USS *North Dakota*, and I could see Bob's involvement in every thoughtful detail.

Bob is an example of a true public servant. Thank you, Bob, for your continued drive and your dedication to service. North Dakota loves and appreciates you.

Bob also wanted to make a point to publicly recognize other people's service and sacrifice. One of Bob's University of North Dakota Sigma Chi Fraternity brothers, Bill Potter served in the Air Force and died serving in the Vietnam war. Bob regularly writes about Bill to encourage others to remember and honor Bill.

Now I am going to conclude my series of speeches on the floor of the U.S. Senate by remembering Bill Potter, as well as other North Dakotans who died during the Vietnam war. Today is the last of my weekly trips to the Senate floor to talk about the men from our State who died during the war. I have taken to the floor 15 times to honor these fallen soldiers, these fallen heroes, and every time has been an enormous and special privilege. I have made it a point to reach out to the families of each of the 198 North Dakotans who lost their lives in Vietnam. I wanted to speak about each man so his family, friends, and people who served with him would know how much we appreciate who he was and what he did for us. Learning from family members about each man has truly been a great honor. To everyone who shared with us, I imagine it was difficult to speak about your loved one, and I can honestly say that doing so made a difference to my staff, made a difference to so many people, made a difference to many of the Senators who have listened to these speeches, and I hope it has made a great difference to the young pages who have been so patient as I have talked about these fallen heroes.

WILLIAM ''BILL'' POTTER

Today I begin with William ''Bill'' Potter. Bill was from Grand Forks. He was born December 28, 1942. He served as a pilot in the Air Force's 432nd Tactical Recon Wing. Bill was 25 years old on February 5, 1968, when his plane was shot down and burned.

The Air Force awarded Bill the Air Medal and the Distinguished Flying Cross in recognition for his heroism in aerial flight. For 7 years after Bill's plane crashed, the Air Force listed Bill as missing in action.

Bill was survived by his wife Betsy. Betsy wrote the following poem regarding the need in her life to file for divorce from Bill while he was listed as missing. Eyewitnesses had described watching his plane crash and burn. This is her poem:

In my adult life as a serviceman's wife
I stayed home so ''the man'' could deploy.
Had dependent I.D. card—and first passport got stamped
'66 was a year of some joy
'67 not bad—'68 very sad
Potter's body got lost in Nam's shuffle
MIA was the status, completely non-gratis
And the Air Force told me that I should muffle.
Crashed in Laos (the site)
and try as I might
D.O.D would not call it a death.
Civil court was my choice if I wanted a voice
for my life to move forward with breadth.
As I saw no dishonor to distance myself
from a pilot flown into the earth.
The life I have led since Bill Potter was dead
Second husband, kids/grandkids and mirth.
Peter Rice career Navy,
now our son in the Army
continued our serviceman's code
As a widow, wife, mother, North Dakotan or OTHER
I have carried my share of the load.

HERBERT ''HERB'' LAPP

Herbert ''Herb'' Lapp was from Hebron. He was born February 1, 1923. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Herb was 43 years old when he died on July 3, 1966.

He had seven brothers and eight sisters. Herb's sister Betty remembers him as someone with a great sense of humor and that he was easy to get along with.

Herb enlisted in the Army as a young man and served in World War II prior to serving in Vietnam. Five of his brothers served their country by serving in the military, and Herb's younger brother Edwin was killed in action in the Korean war.

Herb was then killed early in the Vietnam war, when he was shot in the stomach.

In addition to his mother and siblings, Herb was survived by his wife Juanita; daughter Diana; and son Marcus.

ROGER ALBERTS

Roger Alberts was from Fort Totten. He was born on July 11, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Roger died on February 5, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Roger was the ninth of 10 children, and his older sister Winona helped her parents raise Roger. Winona remembers Roger as a quiet person who did many great things, including helping his family around their home. Winona said, ''Everything was good about that young boy.''

Roger had a desire so strong to serve his country that he enlisted in the Army before he graduated from high school. At the same time that Roger was serving in Vietnam, his brother Allen was serving in the Navy on a ship close to Vietnam. Allen remembers looking toward Vietnam and seeing flares and wondering where Roger was and if he was OK.

When he had less than a month to serve in Vietnam, Roger was shot. On February 2, his family received notice that Roger was missing. Finally, at the end of February, the Army confirmed that they found his body and that Roger had been killed. They later learned from another North Dakota soldier, Wesley Howling Wolf, that when Roger died, Wesley hid his body so the opposing forces would not be able to find his body, but after hiding Roger's body, Wesley was hurt and went into a coma. When he awoke, he told the Army officials that he had hidden Roger's body to protect him and Roger was found.

Roger's family appreciates the Army for sending an escort to remain with Roger's body until he could reach them in North Dakota, and to Roger's girlfriend for giving them the letters he wrote while Roger was serving in Vietnam.

MITCHEL ''MITCH'' HANSEY

Mitchel ''Mitch'' Hansey was a native of Scranton and was born March 25, 1947. Mitchel died December 14, 1968. He was 21 years old.

He grew up on his family's farm and was the oldest of eight children, born to Dennis and Bertha Hansey. In his early years, he attended country school, and later graduated from Scranton High School.

His youngest sister Gwyn laughs and remembers the time she felt Mitchel saved her life by kicking a grasshopper off her leg despite his arms being full of the groceries he was carrying.

Mitchel's family is dedicated to serving their country. His father Dennis served in the Army during World War

II. His brother Terry served in the Marines, and his brother Gail served in the Army.

Mitchel's siblings remember him sending them letters from Vietnam with pictures of himself on a boat. They understand that when he was on his way to mail them Christmas cards, Mitchel fell off a plank as he was walking between two ships and drowned.

MICHAEL ''MIKE'' WOLF, JR.

Michael ''Mike'' Wolf, Jr., was from Beulah, and he was born June 27, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps H Company, 2nd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division. He was 21 years old when he died on September 10, 1967.

He was the fifth of 12 children. Mike's sister Laurel said Mike was a quiet man who was involved in just about every sport offered in high school. His dream was to work as a high school coach someday. Mike enlisted at the same time as his cousin Rick Wolf and two of their friends from Beulah enlisted. The day he died, Rick was sent ahead as a scout and was killed in an ambush. He had been expected to return home about 3 weeks later.

Mike's 1955 Pontiac Chieftain sat in the yard for 30 years. Laurel's husband spent 10 years restoring Mike's car and gave it to Laurel's son Donovan, who is currently having it painted. As a tribute to Mike, they made a scrapbook which shows the process of restoring his car.

RANDOLPH ''RANDY'' MARTHE

Randolph ''Randy'' Marthe was from Esmond. He was born November 17, 1950. He served in the Army's 52nd Artillery Group. Randy died March 31, 1971. He was 20 years old.

He was the youngest of his family of 10 children. His older siblings enjoyed spoiling him and treating him like the baby of the family. Randy's sister Rita said he was a good, quiet boy who liked to have fun and never caused his parents any problems. Rita remembers that after she was married and living on a farm, Randy and two of his brothers, Pat and Dale, would go to Rita's farm to help. Rita's basement bathroom shower had a window in it, and Randy had a great time surprising his showering brothers with a blast of cold water from the garden hose.

Randy's family appreciates the calls he made and letters he sent them from Vietnam. Rita remembers Randy calling her from Vietnam. He said he would be going on duty for a while, so she would not hear from him again for a while. She never heard from him again.

The Army awarded Randy the Silver Star for gallantry due to his heroic actions the day he was killed in Vietnam. That day, Randy's firebase was under heavy attack and he defended his position, despite being injured and ultimately sacrificing himself, which saved the lives of many of his fellow soldiers.

In 2010, Randy's family was touched to read a Benson County Farmer's Press column written by a young woman, Shell Eyl, who was born after Randy died but thought about Randy because she spent time as a child at the Randy Marthe Memorial Park in Esmond. Shell wrote about what giving up your life for country truly means. She described a lifetime of moments Randy didn't get to have, such as hot summer days by the lake and walking his daughters down the aisle. Shell concluded her column describing that Randy didn't die so his name would be etched on a granite wall or for a park named after him. He died and gave up everything so you and I could have it all.

THOMAS ''TOM'' SENNE

Thomas ''Tom'' Senne was from Valley City, and he was born November 14, 1948. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Tom died on October 26, 1968. He was 19 years old.

Tom worked at the Red Owl store in Valley City and was looking forward to a future in that business. He was a great athlete and top wrestler at his high school. Everyone knew and loved Tom. He made friends easily. He was so well liked that sometimes folks would look the other way when he did things like take part in an impromptu drag race down Central Avenue in Valley City on a Sunday morning. Now, I would just tell you that is hearsay.

Tom came from a family with a deep history of serving their country. His dad served in World War II, his uncles from both sides of his family served in either World War II or Korea, and two of his brothers served with the National Guard.

CLEO LEVANG

Cleo Levang was from Forman. He was born February 6, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps, Company I, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division. Cleo died on January 5, 1967. He was just 20 years old.

He was the third of four children born to Cliff and Leckny Levang and grew up on his family's farm northwest of Forman. His sister Bev said Cleo loved to tease in good fun. She recalls Cleo visiting her, sneaking around behind her in the kitchen and opening the cupboard doors behind her. After closing them several times, she finally realized her jokester brother was behind the recurring problem. Bev's son Rick also went into the Marine Corps. Bev said that seeing Rick wearing a marine uniform is a striking similarity to Cleo in his uniform.

My friend from Rutland, Bill Anderson, remembers Cleo well. He said that Cleo was a tall, good-looking guy with a ready smile. He particularly remembers Cleo's exceptional musical talent, playing ''Bugler's Holiday'' in a trumpet trio with the Sergeant Central Cadets Marching Band. Bill said that band, ''The Governor's Band,'' was, in fact, the best in the State.

After high school, Cleo moved to Wisconsin to work, but his love of the trumpet and music drew him back to North Dakota and he enrolled in college to study music. With the Vietnam War beginning, Cleo joined the Marines. After learning of his death, his family said the 2 weeks it took for his body to arrive felt like an eternity.

Bev appreciates the meaningful yet difficult phone call she received about 10 years ago from the marine who was with Cleo the day he died.

DAVID ''DAVE'' NESSET

David ''Dave'' Nesset was from Fargo. He was born April 16, 1942. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Dave died on April 19, 1968, 3 days after his 26th birthday.

Dave and his sister Arlene grew up in Fargo. Their father Oscar worked for the North Dakota State University Extension Service and lived in different parts of the world, including Iran and Korea, with his wife and children. After graduating from Fargo Central High School, Dave earned a degree from NDSU. He enlisted in the Army and became a helicopter pilot.

Dave's sister Arlene named her son David after her brother. The younger Dave remembers his uncle's infectious smile and said it was always a pleasure to see him. He was their ''cool'' uncle. He still clearly remembers when he was in the third grade and his mother received a call in the middle of the night from her parents in Korea explaining that Dave was missing and, a few hours later, an officer coming to his door to deliver his mother a telegram explaining her brother had died.

Dave and Arlene's mother Ruth lives in Colorado and is 104 years old. She is a woman who has buried both of her children during her lifetime.

DAVID JOHNSON

David Johnson was born August 20, 1950. He spent his high school years in West Fargo. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. David was only 19 years old when he died on May 17, 1970.

Right after high school, David chose to enlist in the Army. His sister Eva believes David's trip to basic training in California was his first airplane ride. While David was serving in Vietnam, Eva's first daughter, Stephanie, was born. David became Stephanie's godfather by proxy. About 2 months later, Dave was wounded and died. When she had children of her own, Stephanie named her son Nelson David in honor of the uncle she never met.

In the 1980s, the Fargo area Armed Forces rededicated a building the David F. Johnson United States Armed Forces Reserve Center. Fargo residents chose David for his contributions, recognizing his Army medals, including the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Army Commendation Medal, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Members of David's 3rd Platoon, called the Bobcats, maintain contact with David's family. In June, the Bobcats held their annual reunion in Fargo. They held a memorial service and visited David's grave. His sisters and their families were thankful to the Bobcats for inviting them and helping David's memory to live on.

JON ROBBINS

Jon Robbins was from Dickinson, and he was born November 22, 1947. He served in the Army's 56th Postal Unit as a clerk. Jon died February 23, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Lester Davies is a man who calls himself Jon's Army buddy.

I want to read a poem that Lester shared that he wrote about Jon the day Jon died. I think Lester's poem is a tribute to all of the people who served in the Vietnam War who had little to no combat training. These people were nurses, clerks, and other staff. Lester's poem is titled, ''The February Awakening.''

From peaceful sleep and dreams of home
I'm thrown into the night.
At two A.M. the twenty-third
I know that I must fight,
For sirens blow, as rockets fall
And flares illume the night.
I still recall with saddened heart
The night I went to war
And how I lost, so thoroughly,
My innocence before.
I know that I will ne'er forget
The UGLINESS of war.
When charlie hit from out 'the night
He came intent to kill.
Just office clerks who'd never fought,
We met him on our will.
And so the price we paid was dear—Jon Robbins did they kill!
A shocking hell to see him fall, But one of many more.
And now I wonder why I made it
Through that night of war.
Yes I'm alive and free to do
What Jon will do no more—
And so I'll ne'er forget my friend
Who wanted so to live.
Who gave for us his precious life
The most a man can give.
In freedom's name my buddy died
In his name must I live.

This is the 50th commemoration of the Vietnam War, and we all have an important part to play in recognizing those soldiers and families who gave so much and who were rewarded so little at the time.

This has been a project of great emotion for me and great love, and I encourage other people to pick up the mantle and remember those soldiers who gave their all.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1881, which would transfer Federal funds now granted to Planned Parenthood to other women's health care and counseling centers. It is a modest, commonsense response to the blood-chilling scandal besetting America's leading abortion provider.

To date, only 4 of the promised 12 undercover videos of Planned Parenthood officers and facilities have been released. To be sure, in coming months there will be more revelations about Planned Parenthood's profiteering, violence, and fraud. There will be congressional investigations to cut through the obstructions and obfuscations of Planned Parenthood's army of lawyers, spokespeople, and friends in the media. There will be criminal investigations into whether physicians altered procedures in violation of the law and in violation of medical ethics to maximize the prices they could charge for the remains of their victims. There will be inquiries into Planned Parenthood's army of clerks, lawyers, and bookkeepers who turned barbarism into commerce. There might well be civil litigation brought against Planned Parenthood by former patients who did not realize their harrowing personal ordeals were being exploited for profit by people they thought they could trust.

It may be some time before all the facts come out about the full scope of Planned Parenthood's moral and economic corruption, but the revelations exposed in just the first four videos all by themselves are more than enough to disqualify Planned Parenthood from continued taxpayer support. After all, nobody is entitled to taxpayer money. Nobody is entitled to it. Nobody can just assume that it is theirs. Recipients have to continually demonstrate their worthiness for public support.

I think we can all agree it is not too much to ask that our women's health care grants not finance a criminal conspiracy against American women and children. So, of course, we should pass Senator ERNST's bill. Now, it does not cut any funding. We have to remember that. It does not cut anything; it just transfers Planned Parenthood's grants to other women's and community health centers.

This is a no-brainer. This is something every Member of this body should be able to vote for and do so enthusiastically. Yet this bill did not pass today. It did not get past the cloture vote. Planned Parenthood's defenders don't even want to debate it. They are not willing even to bring it to the floor to allow it to be debated, discussed, and voted on on the merits at the end of the day.

Now, in a sense, I cannot say I blame them, but the fear of open dialogue on the other side of the aisle is itself part and parcel of the unfolding scandal. Now, let's be honest. Let's be honest about the fact that the multibillion-dollar abortion industry includes grisly revenue streams, legal corner-cutting, and the bullying dehumanization of the human family's most vulnerable members. This should not surprise anyone who gives the matter 5 minutes of concentrated thought. For all of the political spin, at the end of the day, Planned Parenthood makes its money doing things any child could tell you are simply indefensible. That is why those things are almost never actually defended, including on this floor today. Defenders of Planned Parenthood offer, instead, gauzy rhetoric about ''care'' and ''access'' and ''choice,'' which are totally irrelevant to Senator ERNST's thoughtful, focused compromise proposal.

On the other hand are the shocking words at the heart of this scandal. Shocking words like ''abortion,'' ''organ,'' ''price,'' ''crunch'' are carefully, almost religiously avoided. That is what you do when you are forced to defend the indefensible. You distract, you confuse, you talk about anything else besides the facts at hand. In this debate, Planned Parenthood's defenders' true adversary is not the Center for Medical Progress or the pro-life movement or the millions of even pro-choice Americans outraged by the scandal. Like all defenders of institutional violence, their real adversary is the truth.

The pro-life movement today may love different sinners and hate different sins than previous social reform movements, but they fight for the same truth: that not only are all men created equal but that all human beings are, in fact, human beings. Abortion on demand survives today as other peculiar institutions once did, violating a universal moral principle by disguising a biological fact.

Such is the nature of violence. As the Russian writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn put it in his Nobel lecture in 1974:

> [L]et us not forget that violence does not live alone and is not capable of living alone: it is necessarily interwoven with falsehood. Between them lies the most intimate, the deepest of national bonds. Violence finds its only refuge in falsehood, falsehood its only support in violence. Any man who has once acclaimed violence as his method must inexorably choose falsehood as his principle. At its birth violence acts openly and even with pride. But no sooner does it become strong, firmly established, than it senses the rarefaction of the air around it and it cannot continue to exist without descending into a fog of lies, clothing them in sweet talk. It does not always, not necessarily, openly throttle the throat, more often it demands from its subjects only an oath of allegiance to falsehood, only complicity in falsehood.

Complicity in falsehood, Mr. President, that some of us created in the image and likeness of a loving God are not; that some of us endowed with inalienable human rights weren't; that because of the color of our skin, the arrangement of our genes, the content of our prayers or the tiny size of a little girl's hand, some of us become them—all to absolve ourselves from doing to them, to the weak, the vulnerable, the voiceless, terrible, unspeakable things that we know are terrible. That is what violence demands.

Because the inhumane but all too common logic goes: If we all do it, and we all agree only to speak of it in comforting words, then, maybe, just maybe, we can tell ourselves it isn't wrong. ''Clump of cells,'' ''tissue specimens,'' ''products of conception''—but even as we grope through this fog of lies, we all know the truth. We know that one day, that truth is going to burn through the euphemisms like the sun through the clouds. When that day comes, we are going to have to choose whether to stay complicit in the falsehood, to crouch down a while longer in our comforting fog or stand up and face the searing truth of what is being done to these little hands and hearts, our

fellow passengers to the grave, still so fresh from God.

The day will come when, in an act not of reckoning but of love, America finally sets these things right in full. That day is not yet here. For now, even though Planned Parenthood apparently breaks some laws, its lucrative business remains protected by others.

So even when we do pass the Ernst bill, and we will one day soon, Planned Parenthood will nonetheless continue at least for a while in its grisly work, but not in our name, and not with our money. Planned Parenthood has betrayed our trust and the trust of the women who came to them for help. Within the community of women's health and services, even among those who support its mission, Planned Parenthood now stands apart.

Planned Parenthood has chosen a path we cannot follow, crossed a line we cannot ignore, and profited from an unspeakable business we cannot support. We can, and under the Ernst bill we will, support health care, especially for vulnerable women and children who are always targets for exploitation. That is why we must pass the Ernst bill, and why I urge my colleagues to support it, to protect America's women and children from Planned Parenthood's ongoing abuse and to protect American taxpayers from financing it.

We no longer have to be complicit in the lie of Planned Parenthood or the violence that it protects. The Ernst legislation, S. 1881, finally accepts the facts, embraces the truth, and would help move our Nation a small step forward toward the culture of life America's every mother and child deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the University of Southern Indiana, USI, on its 50th Anniversary. I also want to recognize the outstanding faculty and staff for the extraordinary impact they have had on the education and lives of hundreds of thousands of students.

USI was founded September 15, 1965, in Evansville to respond to the need for a public higher education institution in southwestern Indiana. It began first as a regional campus of Indiana State University and then on April 16, 1985, legislation was signed into law making USI a separate State university. The university started out small, but quickly expanded, sitting on 330 acres by September 1969 and today covering 1,400 acres.

USI is home to four academic colleges: the Romain College of Business, the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education. USI is a Carnegie Foundation Community Engaged University and offers continuing education and special programs to more than 15,000 participants annually through outreach and engagement. USI also houses the Indiana University School of Medicine-Evansville.

More than 9,300 students are currently enrolled at USI, and the university serves full-time, part-time, commuting and continuing education students. USI takes great care to keep class sizes small to maintain a high quality of individualized instruction; 40 percent of classes have fewer than 20 students and only 7 percent have more than 50. These numbers reinforce an institution committed to its vision of ''Shaping the future through learning and innovation.'' The USI curriculum offers a wide variety of classes in 70 undergraduate majors in the areas of liberal arts, preprofessional, professional, technical, and occupational programs at both the associate and baccalaureate levels, in addition to its 10 master's programs and a nursing doctorate. With more than 140 student groups on campus, USI's student body is living up to the university's mission to be an ''engaged learning community,'' one that always strives to achieve its goal of ''advancing education and knowledge, enhancing civic and cultural awareness, and fostering partnerships through comprehensive outreach programs.''

USI has exceled outside of the classroom as well. The Screaming Eagles compete as a member of the NCAA Division II athletics in the Great Lakes Valley Conference. USI boasts 17 varsity teams and has claimed three national championships—men's basketball in 1995 and men's baseball in 2010 and 2014. The Screaming Eagles have finished as national finalists three times—men's basketball in 1994 and 2004 and women's basketball in 1997. In addition, the USI men's and women's cross country/track teams have combined to capture seven individual national championships since 1997. These teams have accomplished much over the past 50 years, all the while meeting high academic standards in the classroom.

USI has, for the last five decades, provided its students from southwestern Indiana, across our State, and around the country with the opportunity to achieve their dreams through higher education. USI remains representative of the hard work, dedication, and innovation that are such integral parts of the Hoosier spirit. I congratulate president Linda L. M. Bennett, the entire faculty and staff, and students both past and present, on this important anniversary. I am confident USI will continue to be a fixture in southwestern Indiana and know the faculty and staff will continue to provide an outstanding education to our students in the years to come. On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate each and every member of the USI community on this 50th anniversary. I wish the University of Southern Indiana continued success and growth for many more years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BOB FRAUMANN

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am proud to pay tribute to Bob Fraumann on the occasion of his retirement after 60 years of ministry through music. Bob will be honored on Sunday, August 9, at Mt. Zion United Methodist Church in Marietta, GA, where he has been music director for the last 33 years.

Bob Fraumann graduated from Asbury University with a degree in music education and a minor in organ and conducting. Bob was married to the love of his life, Jan, and they raised two sons, Rick and Greg, who are both Christian musicians.

Many have enjoyed Bob's music but none more than those at the National Prayer Breakfast on February 4, 2010, where Bob played selections from his great CD ''To God Be the Glory.'' Over 3,000 dignitaries including the President and many Members of Congress joined Christians and leaders of all faiths to enjoy Bob's testimony through music.

Bob's friendship and music have been a blessing to me, and I am proud to honor him in the Senate Chamber. Join me in wishing Bob Fraumann all the best in his retirement.•

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the National Association of Community Health Centers, NACHC, for their hard work and dedication to providing Americans with the care they need and deserve. The association is celebrating 50 years of providing support through health centers across the Nation. A series of events will be held during National Health Center Week, scheduled for August 9 through August 15, to recognize the importance of health care and to celebrate 50 years of support.

The NACHC was organized in 1965 and held demonstration programs under the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity to help Americans receive medical support regardless of their income. Also during this time, the first four health care centers opened in Massachusetts, Mississippi, Colorado, and New York. Since 1965, the NACHC has worked to address our Nation's widespread lack of access to basic health care services.

Devoted to the mission of, ''promoting the provision of high quality, comprehensive and affordable health care that is coordinated, culturally and linguistically competent, and community directed for all medically underserved populations,'' the NACHC helps educate Americans on the importance of health care. The NACHC also provides health centers with a unified voice and a common source for research, information, training, and advocacy.

Maine currently has 19 organizations that run 135 health center sites. The 19 federally-funded health center organizations in Maine serve 184,546 patients, 17.8 percent of whom are uninsured, and create over 200 jobs. Mr. President, 89 percent of people relying on these centers live in extremely rural areas of the State. These Mainers would not be able to access adequate health care services if these sites did not exist. The work that has been done in Maine continues to help the State become healthier and smarter.

The theme for this year's National Health Center Week is ''America's Health Centers: Celebrating Our Legacy, Shaping Our Future.'' This theme showcases the numerous ways in which America's health centers are driving and empowering healthier communities and Americans. With more than 9,000 delivery sites throughout the Nation, health centers employ hundreds of thousands of individuals nationally which, in turn, powers local economies.

During the National Health Center Week, health centers in all 50 States will be hosting a variety of public events to highlight their work in local communities and to honor the elected officials who have supported the work of the health centers. I would like to join the National Association of Community Health Centers in highlighting the success that has been demonstrated over the last 50 years by local health centers throughout the Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID ALLEN WALKER

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize David Walker of Fenton, MI, as he nears the end of his term as the 110th chairman of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, also known as the Big ''I.'' Mr. Walker was installed as chairman of the Big ''I'' in September 2014, and has been a strong and thoughtful leader for independent insurance agents across the country throughout his term.

Mr. Walker is president of the Hartland Insurance Agency which is headquartered in Hartland, MI. Throughout his career, he has been an active leader at both the State and national level. He previously served as president of the Michigan Association of Independent Agents, president of the Genesee County of Independent Agents, and as the Michigan director on the Big ''I'' national board.

Mr. Walker has also held numerous leadership positions within the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents, including chairman of the education committee and as a member of the Michigan Legislative Affairs Committee. In all his roles, David has sought to promote an environment where independent insurance agents in Michigan and across the country can thrive by providing excellent customer service.

As I recognize Mr. Walker, I would also like to acknowledge his active involvement in his community. He has served on the board of directors for the Hartland Area Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Walker has also worked as a trustee and president of the Fenton Area Public Schools. He currently serves as a Tyrone Township trustee and sits on the board of the Michigan Basic Property Association. He is also a founding member of the Hartland Rotary.

I am pleased to join Mr. Walker's colleagues from across Michigan and the United States in congratulating him as he finishes his term as chairman of the Big ''I.'' I, along with his family and friends, appreciate all that he has accomplished.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY HATFIELD MARINE SCIENCE CENTER

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am a firm believer in the power of higher education. It is our Nation's responsibility to honor the institutions that consistently provide America's youth with the skills necessary to make our country a better place. I am thrilled to recognize the achievements of Oregon State University's Hatfield Marine Science Center, on its 50th anniversary as a center for marine studies.

Over the last half-century, thanks in large part to early collaboration with the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, the Hatfield Center has served students from community college to post-doctoral candidates. In addition to providing educational opportunities, the Hatfield Center works closely with the Environmental Protection Agency to research the most pressing environmental issues of our generation. As climate change and sustainability increasingly impact our Nation's agriculture and energy policies, Oregonians can take comfort in knowing that OSU's Marine Science Center has the technology and partnerships necessary to spearhead State, national and global initiatives.

It always amazes me how quickly novel ideas transform into success stories. Since its establishment in 1965, the Hatfield Marine Science Center has worked extensively with the colleges of Oregon State University and various State and Federal agencies to produce seawater systems, experimental wet labs, and other programs that have attracted some of the Nation's top scientific minds. It gives me great pleasure to say that the Hatfield Marine Science Center is home to the Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station—a program recognized internationally for its innovative approach to the study of marine mammals.

I am particularly excited to witness the results of OSU's world-class Marine Studies Initiative. In addition to the construction of a top-notch research and teaching facility, the Marine Studies Initiative will offer students the opportunity to see how marine studies intersects with the other elements of a liberal arts education. Thousands of young adults, as well as experienced professionals, will gain a greater appreciation for the role of business, government, and big data in the world of marine studies. The addition of an undergraduate degree program in marine studies, projected to attract 500 students in-residence to Newport by 2025, will yield tremendous partnerships in the years ahead. The Federal Area Redevelopment Administration must be incredibly proud of the intellectual profit that its $960,000 investment has produced.

The future of our planet depends upon unique and innovative approaches to the environmental challenges of our era. Higher education is an integral part of the solution. But more specifically, interdisciplinary programs that promote awareness of agricultural, energy, and oceanic issues, and that simultaneously connect the environment to the liberal arts, are a key to building the training necessary to solve imminent problems. I could not be prouder of what OSU's Hatfield Marine Science Center means for our State, our Nation, and for the world.●

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA ACKERMAN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Rebecca Ackerman, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Rebecca is a student at the University South Carolina, where she is majoring in international studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Rebecca for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL ALMEIDA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Daniel Almeida, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Daniel is a student at the University of Edinburgh, where he is majoring in philosophy and politics. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Daniel for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LAUREN BALTIMORE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Lauren Baltimore, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Lauren is currently a student at Pine Crest High School. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lauren for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO MAX BERGER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Max Berger, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Max is currently a student at Western High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Max for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO KASSANDRA CABRERA

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kassandra Cabrera, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Kassandra is a student at the University of Central Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kassandra for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO EMILY CLARK

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Emily Clark, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Emily is a student at the University of West Florida, where she is majoring in agriculture communications. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Emily for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO JOSHUA COCKREAM

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Joshua Cockream, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Joshua is a student at the University Virginia, where he is majoring in political philosophy, policy, and law. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Joshua for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ANTONELLA DAVALOS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Antonella Davalos, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Antonella is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Antonella for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ALLISON DIENER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Allison Diener, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Allison is a student at the University of Michigan, where she is majoring in business. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Allison for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL FALIC

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Samuel Falic, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Samuel is a student at the University of Miami, where he is majoring in accounting. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Samuel for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO HAILEY FROMKIN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Hailey Fromkin, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Hailey is a student at the University of Miami, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Hailey for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO DESTINY GOEDE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Destiny Goede, a 2015 summer intern in my Naples office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Destiny is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in economics. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Destiny for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT GUTIERREZ

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Robert Gutierrez, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Robert is currently a student at Columbus High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Robert for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR HANSEN

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Trevor Hansen, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Trevor is a student at Broward College, where he is majoring in international relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Trevor for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.•

TRIBUTE TO TODD HIGGINBOTHAM

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Todd Higginbotham, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has

done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Todd is a student at the University of North Florida, where he is majoring in political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Todd for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NICHOLAS JOHNSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Nicholas Johnson, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Nicholas is a student at Heidelberg University, where he is majoring in political science and communications. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nicholas for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CARLOS SAN JOSE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Carlos San Jose, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Carlos is a student at Miami-Dade College, where he is majoring in political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Carlos for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ISABELLA LLANO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Isabella Llano, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Isabella is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Isabella for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID MALLIS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize David Mallis, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

David is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to David for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NATALIE MARTINEZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Natalie Martinez, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Natalie is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Natalie for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AMANDA MEADOR

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Amanda Meador, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Amanda is a student at Washington and Lee University, where she is majoring in business, accounting, and environmental studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Amanda for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIANNA MORENO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Brianna Moreno, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Brianna is a student at Vanderbilt University, where she is majoring in public policy. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Brianna for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS MORRISON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Thomas Morrison, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Thomas is currently a student at Lincoln High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Thomas for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCO RIVERA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Franco Rivera, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Franco is currently a student at Belen Jesuit Preparatory School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Franco for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHELLE RIVERA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Michelle Rivera, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Michelle is a student at the University of North Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Michelle for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL RUSSELL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Michael Russell, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Michael is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science and criminology. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Michael for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTIAN SADLER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Christian Sadler, a 2015 summer intern in my Naples office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Christian is currently a student at the University of Florida. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Christian for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIELA SHIED

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Daniela Shied, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Daniela is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in international affairs and political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Daniela for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DRIENA SIXTO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Driena Sixto, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Driena is a student at Florida International University, where she is majoring in political science and international relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Driena for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JACKSON STORY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jackson Story, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jackson is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science and public relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jackson for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCO DEL TORRO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Franco del Torro, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Franco is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Franco for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JORGE TREVILLA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jorge Trevilla, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jorge is currently a student at Columbus High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jorge for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NATHAN WATTERS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Nathan Watters, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Nathan is a law student at Florida Coastal Law School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nathan for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SHANNON WEST

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Shannon West, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Shannon is a student at Boston College, where she is majoring in political science and international studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Shannon for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CONRAD WITTE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Conrad Witte, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Conrad is a student at the University of Arkansas, where he is majoring in political science and international relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Conrad for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1629. A bill to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–110).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1915. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1916. A bill to include skilled nursing facilities as a type of health care provider under section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1917. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to an entity that receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue derived from an abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to extend the import- and export-related provision of that Act to species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 240. A resolution recognizing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its partners for the success of the historic flyby of Pluto by the New Horizons spacecraft; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. REID, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 241. A resolution designating August 16, 2015, as ''National Airborne Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.

S. 404

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 404, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 471

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

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1090

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1090, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1143, a bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeness crab fishery permanent and for other purposes.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1314, a bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes and their safe integration into the national airspace system.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1566

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1566, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 1719

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1722

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1722, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain additional disclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1742

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1742, a bill to improve the provision of postal services to rural areas of the United States.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to combination products, and for other purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities.

S. 1785

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1785, a bill to repeal the wage rate requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1798, a bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr.

TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Timothy Nugent, in recognition of his pioneering work on behalf of people with disabilities, including disabled veterans.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

S. 1876

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, supra.

S. 1881

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to support the sustainable recovery and rebuilding of Nepal following the recent, devastating earthquakes near Kathmandu.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, a resolution designating September 2015 as ''National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month'' .

S. RES. 228

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 228, a resolution designating September 2015 as ''National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month'' .

S. RES. 232

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 232, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that August 30, 2015, be observed as ''1890 Land-Grant Institutions Quasquicentennial Recognition Day''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1917. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to an entity that receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue derived from an abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate will be voting on a motion to proceed to a bill that would completely eliminate all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood. While I do not support this legislation, I have received assurances from the majority leader that should the motion to proceed succeed, there will be ample opportunity to offer amendments. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to propose an alternative approach which Senator KIRK and I will offer as a substitute for the bill.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have been a strong proponent of family planning and measures to promote and protect women's health. The fact is that the best way to reduce the number of abortions in this country is to ensure that women have access to family planning services they need to protect against unintended pregnancies. That is why I have long supported title X family planning programs.

My support for family planning aside, however, I was sickened when I viewed the recently released videos featuring Planned Parenthood physicians in both their edited and unedited versions. The callousness with which Planned Parenthood employees discuss the sale of fetal tissue is appalling. It deserves our attention. The videos also raise valid questions about the ethics and legality of Planned Parenthood's practices in some of its clinics, albeit a minority of its clinics. As a result, I believe a full investigation is warranted to determine whether Planned Parenthood broke the law prohibiting the sale of fetal tissue.

Reviews by State medical boards are also warranted because it appears that some Planned Parenthood doctors may have been putting the procurement of fetal organs ahead of the well-being of their patients.

We do, however, need to keep in mind the fact that Planned Parenthood provides important family planning, cancer screening, and basic preventive health care to millions of women across this country. For many women, Planned Parenthood clinics provide the only health care services they receive. The title X Federal family planning funding that goes to Planned Parenthood already cannot be used for abortions, and the Federal Medicaid funding it receives can only be used for abortions in the case of rape, incest, and where the life of the mother is at risk. In other words, the Hyde amendment—which has been on the books for so many years—applies fully to this Federal funding.

Some contend that other health care providers such as community health centers could somehow fill the gap in family planning and other women's health services if Federal funding were to be cut off to Planned Parenthood. In my State, the four Planned Parenthood clinics see almost 40 percent of the patients seeking title X family planning services, and they treat virtually all of the patients seeking those services in southern Maine. By way of contrast, the 20 community health sites in Maine that receive title X funding see just 17 percent of the patients seeking those services. If we were to defund Planned Parenthood, other family planning clinics in Maine, including community health centers, would see a 63-percent increase in their patient load. They would be forced to absorb 8,583 more patients if Federal funds to Planned Parenthood were eliminated. Moreover, these other family planning clinics are predominantly in central, western, and the northern parts of my State. None is in the area that is served by Planned Parenthood in southern Maine. I don't see how we can ensure that all of the patients currently served by Planned Parenthood can be absorbed by alternative health care providers.

The bill that has been proposed by several of my colleagues would require women to give up the health care provider of their choice, when we don't yet know all of the facts about Planned Parenthood's actions.

Therefore, I am joining my colleague from Illinois Senator KIRK in introducing legislation, which we intend to turn into an amendment if we proceed to this bill, that would require the Department of Justice to investigate whether Planned Parenthood or its affiliates have engaged in any illegal activity pertaining to fetal tissue and support a report to Congress on its findings within 90 days.

Activities involving fetal tissue have no relationship to Planned Parenthood's primary mission of promoting and protecting women's health. While Planned Parenthood claims that only a very small number of its affiliates engage in the sale of fetal organs and tissue, let's determine the facts. Those organizations that do engage in this reprehensible practice are the ones that have sparked this outrage and rightly so. I believe these are the organizations that should be the focus of our efforts. I know none of the Planned Parenthood clinics in my State engage in the practice of the procurement and sale of fetal tissue. I think we should keep in mind that we can come up with a more tailored and targeted approach that is

aimed at those clinics that do engage in this practice.

Therefore, our legislation would defund any affiliate or subsidiary of Planned Parenthood Federation of America that received any compensation for engaging in these activities.

So the more targeted approach proposed by Senator KIRK and me accomplishes three important goals: First, it would not cause women served by Planned Parenthood clinics that do not engage in these reprehensible fetal tissue sales to lose their health care provider for basic services like family planning and cancer screening. After all, many of us have been critical of ObamaCare because it has forced families in this country to give up the doctor of their choice. Well, that is what this amendment would do. It would require women and other patients to find alternative health care providers, even if their Planned Parenthood clinic has done nothing wrong and is not engaged in the reprehensible sale of fetal tissue. How is that fair? How is that a targeted approach?

Second, our legislation would allow Congress to get the facts to determine if those few Planned Parenthood affiliates that do engage in fetal tissue procurement have broken Federal law and violated medical ethics. We need to know the answer to those questions, and we need to know how widespread this practice actually is.

Third, our legislation would defund those affiliates, subsidiaries, and clinics that do receive compensation for procuring fetal organs and tissues, thus putting an end to this reprehensible trafficking in fetal tissue.

I believe the proposal that Senator KIRK and I offer to our colleagues is a more targeted approach, a fairer approach, an approach that will be based on the facts, and is the best way forward as we deal with this important issue. I encourage my colleagues to join us in support of our more targeted legislation.

This is the bill that should we proceed to the underlying legislation, would be offered as a substitute to the bill by Senator KIRK and me.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 240—RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND ITS PARTNERS FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE HISTORIC FLYBY OF PLUTO BY THE NEW HORIZONS SPACECRAFT

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 240

Whereas, in 1930, from the Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff, Arizona, Clyde Tombaugh discovered Pluto, the ninth largest known body orbiting the sun;

Whereas, on January 19, 2006, the New Horizons spacecraft launched on an Atlas V launch vehicle from the Space Launch Complex 41 at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station in Florida;

Whereas, on July 14, 2015, after a 9 ½-year journey, the New Horizons probe successfully flew within approximately 7,800 miles (12,500 kilometers) of the surface of the dwarf planet Pluto;

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this preamble as ''NASA'') has now completed missions to each of the 9 largest planetary bodies orbiting the sun;

Whereas the successful New Horizons mission to Pluto was achieved through years of planning, research, design, testing, and mission operations conducted by the dedicated scientists, engineers, and staff at NASA and affiliated academic and private sector partners;

Whereas the New Horizons mission was the first mission to study Pluto, the moons of Pluto, and other planetary building blocks within the Kuiper Belt, which is the ring of icy objects that surrounds the solar system beyond the orbit of Neptune;

Whereas the findings of the New Horizons interplanetary space probe have demonstrated the great scientific value of the continued exploration of Pluto and the outer-region of our solar system;

Whereas New Horizons is the first mission to collect high-resolution images and a variety of other data about the geological and atmospheric composition of Pluto as well as the space environment near Pluto and the moons of Pluto;

Whereas the initial images and data returned from the New Horizons spacecraft have already led to new discoveries about Pluto, the moons of Pluto, and the space environment near Pluto;

Whereas images of Pluto show ice mountains that have never been seen before and that are comparable in height to the Rocky Mountains;

Whereas images of Charon, the largest moon of Pluto, show deep canyons and a row of cliffs and troughs stretching 600 miles wide;

Whereas images of Pluto and Charon show a lack of impact craters, suggesting that their relatively young surfaces have been reshaped by internal geological activity;

Whereas the data collected by instruments on the New Horizons spacecraft confirms that the Pluto system contains a large amount of frozen water, which is considered an essential building block of life;

Whereas the data collected by the New Horizons spacecraft will continue to provide scientific insight, data to train the next generation of planetary scientists, and inspiration to humanity for years to come; and

Whereas the New Horizons spacecraft could continue traveling to the far edges of our solar system and could be capable of exploring the Kuiper Belt and collecting data on our solar system that is not detectable from any other spacecraft or telescope due to its unique position, instrumentation, and long-lasting power supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this resolving clause as ''NASA''), the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Maryland, the Southwest Research Institute in Colorado, and the academic and private sector partners of the New Horizons mission for their roles in the historic flyby of Pluto by the New Horizons spacecraft;

(2) recognizes the importance of the New Horizons mission to the long-term exploration of the solar system by NASA and the training of the next generation of planetary scientists;

(3) recognizes the importance of the continued pursuit of robotic space exploration missions by NASA, which enable extraordinary scientific discoveries about the nature and origin of our solar system and beyond; and

(4) recognizes the significance of the scientific and engineering research by NASA with respect to stimulating economic growth, strengthening national competitiveness, and inspiring humankind.

SENATE RESOLUTION 241—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2015, AS ''NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY''

Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 241

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the experiment of the United States with airborne operations began on June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump, which took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas, included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th

Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider troops;

Whereas individuals from every State of the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2015, as ''National Airborne Day''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2544. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2545. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1881, to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2546. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COATS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2547. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2548. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2544. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 32, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(6) LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—A Federal entity may not receive a cyber threat indicator that another Federal entity shared through the process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) unless the Inspector General of the receiving Federal entity certifies that the receiving Federal entity meets the data security standard for receiving such a cyber threat indicator, as established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

On page 52, strike line 14 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON REDUCTION OF CYBERSECURITY RISK IN AGENCY DATA CENTERS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the feasibility of Federal civilian agencies creating an environment for the reduction in cybersecurity risks in agency data centers, including by—

(1) increasing compartmentalization between systems; and

(2) providing a mix of security controls between such compartments.

SEC. 11. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

SA 2545. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1881, to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds shall be made available to any affiliate, subsidiary, successor, or clinic of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. if that affiliate, subsidiary, successor, or clinic receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue products derived from an abortion.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) affect any limitation contained in an appropriations Act relating to abortion; or

(2) reduce overall Federal funding available in support of women's health.

(c) INVESTIGATION AND REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct an investigation, and submit to Congress a report on the findings of such investigation, concerning whether or not the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics has engaged in any illegal activity pertaining to fetal tissue products.

SA 2546. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COATS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 2015

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Federal Information Security Management Reform Act of 2015''.

SEC. 202. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY RELATED TO INFORMATION SECURITY.

Section 3553(b)(6) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) and inserting the following:

''(B) operating consolidated intrusion detection, prevention, or other protective capabilities and use of associated countermeasures for the purpose of protecting agency information and information systems from information security threats;

''(C) providing incident detection, analysis, mitigation, and response information and remote or onsite technical assistance to the head of an agency;

''(D) compiling and analyzing data on agency information security;

''(E) developing and conducting targeted risk assessments and operational evaluations for agency information and information systems in consultation with the heads of other agencies or governmental and private entities that own and operate such systems, that may include threat, vulnerability, and impact assessments;

''(F) in conjunction with other agencies and the private sector, assessing and fostering the development of information security technologies and capabilities for use across multiple agencies; and

''(G) coordinating with appropriate agencies and officials to ensure, to the maximum extent feasible, that policies and directives issued under paragraph (2) are complementary with—

''(i) standards and guidelines developed for national security systems; and

''(ii) policies and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence under subsection (e)(1); and''.

SEC. 203. COMMUNICATIONS AND SYSTEM TRAFFIC AND DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.

Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) COMMUNICATIONS AND SYSTEMS TRAFFIC.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) ACQUISITION BY THE SECRETARY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), in carrying out the responsibilities under subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of subsection (b)(6), if the Secretary makes a certification described in paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic that are transiting to or from or stored on agency information systems and deploy countermeasures with regard to the communications and system traffic.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not

apply to a communication or other system traffic that is transiting to or from or stored on a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

''(C) DISCLOSURE BY FEDERAL AGENCY HEADS.—The head of a Federal agency or department is authorized to disclose to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (A), information traveling to or from or stored on an agency information system, notwithstanding any other law that would otherwise restrict or prevent agency heads from disclosing such information to the Secretary.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification described in this paragraph is a certification by the Secretary that—

''(A) the acquisitions, interceptions, and other countermeasures are reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information systems from information security threats;

''(B) the content of communications will be retained only if the communication is associated with a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, and communications and system traffic will not be subject to the operation of a countermeasure unless associated with the threats;

''(C) information obtained under activities authorized under this subsection will only be retained, used, or disclosed to protect agency information systems from information security threats, mitigate against such threats, or, with the approval of the Attorney General, for law enforcement purposes when the information is evidence of a crime which has been, is being, or is about to be committed;

''(D) notice has been provided to users of agency information systems concerning the potential for acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications and other system traffic; and

''(E) the activities are implemented pursuant to policies and procedures governing the acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications and other system traffic that have been reviewed and approved by the Attorney General.

''(3) PRIVATE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may enter into contracts or other agreements, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities that provide electronic communication or information security services to acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic in accordance with this subsection.

''(4) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—No cause of action shall exist against a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

''(i) DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.—

''(1) AUTHORITY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3554, and subject to subparagraph (B), in response to a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or incident that represents a substantial threat to the information security of an agency, the Secretary may issue a directive to the head of an agency to take any lawful action with respect to the operation of the information system, including such systems owned or operated by another entity on behalf of an agency, that collects, processes, stores, transmits, disseminates, or otherwise maintains agency information, for the purpose of protecting the information system from, or mitigating, an information security threat.

''(B) EXCEPTION.—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not apply to a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

''(2) PROCEDURES FOR USE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

''(A) in coordination with the Director and in consultation with Federal contractors, as appropriate, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which a directive may be issued under this subsection, which shall include—

''(i) thresholds and other criteria;

''(ii) privacy and civil liberties protections; and

''(iii) providing notice to potentially affected third parties;

''(B) specify the reasons for the required action and the duration of the directive;

''(C) minimize the impact of a directive under this subsection by—

''(i) adopting the least intrusive means possible under the circumstances to secure the agency information systems; and

''(ii) limiting directives to the shortest period practicable; and

''(D) notify the Director and the head of any affected agency immediately upon the issuance of a directive under this subsection.

''(3) IMMINENT THREATS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that there is an imminent threat to agency information systems and a directive under this subsection is not reasonably likely to result in a timely response to the threat, the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary for communications or other system traffic transiting to or from or stored on an agency information system without prior consultation with the affected agency for the purpose of ensuring the security of the information or information system or other agency information systems.

''(B) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The authority under this paragraph may not be delegated to an official in a position lower than an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

''(C) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall immediately notify the Director and the head and chief information officer (or equivalent official) of each affected agency of—

''(i) any action taken under this subsection; and

''(ii) the reasons for and duration and nature of the action.

''(D) OTHER LAW.—Any action of the Secretary under this paragraph shall be consistent with applicable law.

''(4) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may direct or authorize lawful action or protective capability under this subsection only to—

''(A) protect agency information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction; or

''(B) require the remediation of or protect against identified information security risks with respect to—

''(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

''(ii) that portion of an information system used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency.''.

SEC. 204. REPORT TO CONGRESS REGARDING OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACTION.

Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 203, is further amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

''(j) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than February 1 of every year, the Director shall report to the appropriate congressional committee regarding the specific actions the Director has taken pursuant to subsection (a)(5), including any actions taken pursuant to paragraph (5) of title 40 of section 11303(b).

''(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—In this subsection, the term 'appropriate congressional committee' means—

''(A) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

''(B) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.''.

SA 2547. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, beginning on line 11, strike ''knows'' and all that follows through ''knows'' on line 19, and insert ''reasonably believes at the time of sharing to be personal information or information that identifies a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity reasonably believes

---

SA 2548. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, line 22, strike ''knows'' and insert ''reasonably believes''.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 3, 2015, at 5 p.m., to conduct a classified briefing entitled ''JCPOA: The Verification and Assessment Report.''

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

NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 241.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 241) designating August 16, 2015, as ''National Airborne Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.''

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the majority control the first half and the Democrats control the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 754; and finally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 2015, at 10 a.m.