United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2015 No. 140

Senate

The Senate met at 4:30 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.

From the depths of gratitude, O Lord, we lift our hearts in prayer. Hear our petitions and fill us with Your peace. Lord, still and quiet our hearts, bringing to us a serenity that comes from trusting the power of Your providential love.

Inspire our lawmakers to develop such a close relationship with You that they would strive to please You always. As You fill their hearts with Your life-transforming Spirit, may Your image in them be more clearly seen. Free them from any thoughts, words, and actions that are contrary to Your love, making them spiritually mature through the power of Your Spirit.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The majority leader is recognized.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, a new Senate majority came to office this year with a new outlook on government funding from the previous majority. First, we passed a budget. Then we worked across the aisle to pass through the committee the dozen bills necessary to fund the government. That is the first time either of these things has happened in 6 long years.

Our commonsense approach represented real hope that with the necessary cooperation from across the aisle, a new and better way of funding the government was actually possible. Democrats initially gave Americans reason to believe they might be ready to offer that bipartisan cooperation. Democrats gave bipartisan committee backing to nearly all of the dozen government funding bills, and a majority of these bills attracted support from at least 70 percent of Democratic Appropriations Committee members. Democrats even bragged about supporting these funding bills in press releases to their constituents.

But this was before Democrats hatched their filibuster summer plan—in other words, block all of the government funding bills in the hopes of provoking a crisis Democrats might exploit to grow the IRS and the DC bureaucracy. As a result, you actually saw Democratic leaders declare that they would use procedural moves to prevent the full Senate from even debating the same funding legislation members of their party had already praised in their press releases to the media.

Democrats even voted repeatedly to block the bill that funds our military. Think about that—funds for our military. It would have been cynical enough for our colleagues to block a bipartisan defense spending bill Democrats had hailed as a ''win, win, win'' and a ''victory'' for their States in their press releases, but we are all living in a time of unparalleled international crises. Threats seem to mount less by the day than by the hour. Yet last week Democrats voted again to block the bipartisan bill that funds pay raises and medical care for our troops. It was very extreme.

I wish I could say it was the only extreme position our Democratic friends took last week. On Thursday Senators were given a choice between funding women's health or funding a scandal-wracked organization called Planned Parenthood. Republicans stood up for women's health; Democrats stood up for their political friends.

I think Democrats will come to regret their continued prioritization of the needs of the far left over women, over our military, and over seemingly everything else. The question before us now is how to keep the government open in the short term, given the realities we face.

This is what the president of National Right to Life had to say on the matter:

There are two different roads that we can take. One is to insist that no more money go to Planned Parenthood and cause a government shutdown (which [interestingly enough] won't result in actually defunding Planned Parenthood). The other is to take a slightly longer-term approach, taking advantage of the fact that we have the attention of the country as probably never before. . . .

Had Democrats not prevented the Senate from passing the same appropriations bills they voted for and praised, we wouldn't be having this discussion right now. But they did. They pursued a deliberate strategy to force our country into another of these unnecessary crises. This leaves the funding legislation before us as the only viable way forward in the short-term. It doesn't represent my 1st, 2nd, 3rd or 23rd choice when it comes to funding the government, but it will keep the government open through the fall and funded at the bipartisan level already agreed to by both parties as we work on the way forward.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time during the quorum calls until 5:30 p.m. be charged equally between both sides.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GOVERNING BY CRISIS

Mr. REID. Madam President, a path to avert yet another Republican-manufactured shutdown is before us now. This evening the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on a clean continuing resolution that keeps the Federal Government open and funded. We believe debate should continue on this issue, and that is why we are voting the way we are going to vote. Following that vote, the Senate will then proceed to final passage of a clean funding measure—sometime tomorrow or Wednesday. That will take a simple majority. I am pleased that we are on the verge of avoiding another Republican-sponsored shutdown of the Federal Government. We are fortunate cooler heads are prevailing.

But I would be remiss if I didn't remind everyone—especially my Republican colleagues—that this last-minute scramble to do our most basic job is as unnecessary as it is reckless. We are 2 days from a shutdown—only 2 days. And why? Because Republicans made it their No. 1 priority to undermine women's health. Keeping the government open, funded, and serving the American people was a secondary concern for these extremists in the Republican Party. My friend the Republican leader, in talking about this choice a few days ago, the choice between—he said Planned Parenthood; I say the health of women—understand, the Republicans couldn't even get a majority vote on this. They couldn't get a majority vote; they were down in the forties. So even the Republicans think what is going on now is foolish. Keeping government open and funded and serving the American people was a secondary concern for those extremists. That is too bad.

So while I am pleased that we now have a path forward to avoid a shutdown, I am nonetheless concerned about the Republican modus operandi of always governing by crisis. Remember, this is the fifth time in 2 years the Republicans have manufactured an unnecessary shutdown crisis. Two years ago they actually shut down the government. For 17 days, Republicans shut down the government, and we were only able to get ourselves out of that morass because—for example, in the House of Representatives, two-thirds of the Republicans in the House voted to keep the government closed. That is unbelievable, but that is the way it was. Here it is now 2 years later, and we are on the verge of another shutdown.

Remember this: This is the fifth time in 2 years that Republicans have manufactured an unnecessary showdown crisis—and it is a showdown. Too bad it is leading to a shutdown.

Exactly 2 years ago, as I indicated, of course, they shut down the Federal Government because of health care. Seven months ago, Republicans almost shut down the Department of Homeland Security. Why? Over an immigration issue. The Department of Homeland Security—they were going to shut it down. It was saved in the last minute. These are the agencies within this Department that protect us. They protect us from terrorists, and they protect us from those many things that happen in our country that we need protection from.

This past spring, it shut down key national security programs that were part of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act. Why? They were fighting among themselves. The Republican leader wanted a bill for a certain length of time. People within his caucus wanted one for another length of time. There was a fight among them, not among us, but they came close to wreaking havoc. They did wreak some havoc because the program was shut down for a while.

More recently, Republicans shut down the Export-Import Bank, endangering the hundreds of thousands of jobs this program supports. It is still closed.

Now we are just days from another shutdown—another kind of shutdown but a big one. And although it appears we will sidestep a Republican-manufactured crisis this week, the disaster is looming. We still have a long, difficult road ahead.

The continuing resolution will pass this week, but it is for a short term, and it funds our government through December 11. The measure is very shortsighted—December 11. That means within the coming weeks, we will again be negotiating with Republicans to avoid another shutdown.

We will also have to find a way to pay our bills to avoid a catastrophic default on our debt. Republicans tried that once. We came within minutes of doing that. The Federal Government—this great country of ours—wouldn't be able to pay its bills.

But we see the press. We see all these stories about the Speaker, who is going to step down in 5 weeks, and we hear the Republicans over there. They are joyous. One Republican running for President announced this, and there was cheering. And the person running for President—who serves in the Senate—was part of the cheer. Another Republican Presidential candidate came to the same meeting, and the same thing happened. It is hard to comprehend that people are cheering for this government to be closed. That is what they are doing. We shouldn't pay our debt?

The Republican House is in a sad state. Last week the far right showed that it can depose a Speaker and has emerged more powerful than ever, more outspoken than ever. Members of the House will hold their leadership elections in the coming days, and I hope they elect some sensible leaders. I am deeply concerned.

I came to the floor on Friday and spoke as honestly as I could of my respect for JOHN BOEHNER. I think it is unfair that people are piling on. Did I always agree with him? No. But he never misled me and always told me the way it was.

I am deeply concerned that even those Republican leaders previously inclined toward compromise have already lost the courage to stand up to the far right when it matters the most, and they have said so in the press. That is too bad.

Come November 1, we have no way of knowing what House Republicans will do—this is after their elections to replace Congressman BOEHNER. We have no idea what they are going to do, whether they will try to again steer our government off a cliff, as numerous House Members have said in the last few days. Do they want to go off that cliff or do they want to recklessly hammer the global economy? Maybe both.

We need to get to work immediately to avoid being right back here on December 11 facing another Republican shutdown because if one thing is clear, it is that Republicans see impending catastrophe as a political tool that they need to exploit.

The American people don't want another 15 months of Republican brinkmanship. Our constituents don't want every simple legislative task to turn into a doomsday clock. So I invite my Republican colleagues to quit governing by crisis. Let's put the threat of government shutdown to bed now, and then let's turn our attention to something that both sides agree on—getting rid of the dangerous sequester cuts.

I have heard speeches given by the senior Senator from Arizona—someone who knows a little bit about the military—and he says sequester cuts are terrible. I agree with him.

These devastating cuts were never supposed to happen. They were meant to drive bipartisan budget negotiations. Getting rid of sequestration has wide bipartisan support in both Chambers, I hope. We should start working right now on a bipartisan budget fix that helps the military, helps the middle class, and puts our country on a more sound economic footing. And let's do it without the threat of a government shutdown. We can do it, but only if Republicans don't divert us to yet another catastrophe.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 719, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 719, an act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with McConnell (for Cochran) amendment No. 2689, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016.

McConnell amendment No. 2690 (to amendment No. 2689), to change the enactment date.

McConnell motion to refer the House message on the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2691, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2692 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2691), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2693 (to amendment No. 2692), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote on the motion to concur with an amendment in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 719 will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, Wednesday night is the deadline. On Wednesday night, the authority of the government of the United States to do business ends. The funding for our government ends. It is a scary time. We don't want that to happen—most of us—because we know it will be catastrophic. There will be people who will suffer if we fail to do our job.

Now, this isn't the first time we have been up against a deadline. We have faced them before, and many times we have to buy a little extra time to negotiate the budget. That is understandable. In this circumstance, though, we actually have announced candidates for the Presidency of the United States who are calling for a government shutdown.

What happens when our government shuts down? Well, it is pretty obvious. Agencies stop doing business as usual. What we find, though, is that the impact goes far beyond just that simple statement.

I went back to Illinois this last weekend, and I went for a visit to Scott Air Force Base. It is the largest single employer in the State of Illinois and downstate.

In 2013—the last time we had a government shutdown—the junior Senator from Texas, Senator TED CRUZ, wanted to shut down our government to protest ObamaCare. So he successfully closed down the government and found other Republicans who would join him in that effort, and it went on for a long period of time.

In 2013, at Scott Air Force Base, one of the most important defense facilities in our country, in Belleville, IL, we saw two-thirds of the civilian workforce—that is about 3,400 people—sent home immediately without pay. Those who were required to report for duty, including all of the base's 5,000 military personnel, would have been given IOUs rather than paychecks. Scott Air Force Base families were forced to limit their spending and stretch their savings while the Senator from Texas gave speeches on the floor about Dr. Seuss. I am not making this up.

This had an impact on the entire region of Southwestern Illinois. Scott Air Force Base has a $1.6 billion economic impact on the local area, including supporting thousands of indirect jobs. Every part of this regional economy felt the impact of this decision to shut down the government 2 years ago—gas stations, restaurants, small businesses, contractors, everybody.

Now, this brinksmanship goes far beyond flowery speeches on the floor and press attention. The last shutdown hurt the gross domestic product of the United States of America. Consumer confidence drops when the government shuts down. We saw $2 billion in lost productivity from furloughed employees.

Federal Reserve Chairman Janet Yellen said:

We have a good recovery in place that's really making progress and to see Congress take actions that would endanger that progress, I think that would be more than unfortunate. So to me that's Congress' job.

The CEO of JPMorgan Chase, a man named Jamie Dimon, speaking of the last Republican government shutdown, said, ''Washington has really slowed American down.'' I agree. And if that were the only thing that was happening, it would be bad enough. But there is more.

Today I went to a neighborhood in Chicago, the All Saints Episcopal Church in Ravenswood. They are doing a restoration on this beautiful church built back in the 19th century. I met with the pastor there. We were at the food pantry of this church. This Episcopal Church tries to help neighborhood residents who are struggling to find enough to eat.

We had a little press conference with the local Congressman, MIKE QUIGLEY and JAN SCHAKOWSKY, and people who represented the food pantries of Chicago in that area. They are worried about a shutdown and what a shutdown means to them. How would it affect the All Saints Episcopal Church food pantry and the men and women who go in there on a regular basis to pick up some canned goods to get by? Here is what it means. Many of these people are on food stamps. We call it the SNAP program now. The SNAP program, on average, gives a person food worth $7 a day, so the notion that people are going out for steak dinners on food stamps is not quite accurate.

Sara—and I won't use her full name—who is 81 years old, came up to talk about what life is like for her. She was a hard-working person, stricken with cancer in 2002, which recurred in 2004, and she had to quit working. She has a walker now and she gets around, but all she has is her Social Security check and food stamps. That is how she survives from week to week and month to month.

What happens when there is a government shutdown? They cut off food stamps. Did that happen last time? No. The last time the Senator from Texas shut down the government, it didn't happen because President Obama had a surplus in his recovery fund and he took the surplus and put it in the food stamps so there would be no interruption of service. You see, most of the recipients of food stamps are children. Single moms raising kids and not making enough money supplement their income with food stamps and buy food for their kids. Food stamps are also used by elderly people like Sara who are struggling on a fixed income.

This time is different. If these Presidential wannabes who are determined to shut down the government this time are successful, we are going to have problems right away. It turns out the only surplus left in the food stamp or SNAP benefit fund is about $3 billion. That will keep the program going for 2 weeks. After 2 weeks, they cut off the food stamps. What does that mean? Well, for a lot of people it means a lot of suffering—primarily for the poorest people among us.

Did anyone notice last week what happened in Washington? The city was transformed by the visit of Pope Francis. Congress was in awe of this man who came and spoke to us in very human terms about what he thinks would be our obligation, not just as elected officials but as human beings. One of his highest priorities is that we have some caring and sensitivity for those who struggle—the poor, the people on food stamps.

So for all the applause and all of the posing for pictures that went on last week with the Pope, here we are this week discussing a government shutdown. Here we are this week discussing whether we are going to cut off food stamps for poor people in America.

It is a sad reality to think of what a government shutdown would do in human terms to those wonderful folks working at Scott Air Force Base in Belleville, IL, or to Sara who will go into the All Saints Episcopal Church food pantry and try to get by, as food stamps are cut off.

Why? Why would we do that? How can we possibly be serving this Nation—this great Nation—by stalling our economy and hurting innocent people and punishing those who are serving our country in uniform and otherwise?

Some think it is a grand strategy—a great political strategy. It may move

them up from the smaller debate to the big-time debate when it comes to running for President. To me it is an indication we have lost our way.

In June, I joined with the other leaders on this side of the aisle in sending a letter to the Republican leader saying: Please, don't wait until the end of September to face this budget reality. Sit down now—back in June—with the President, with the leaders on the Republican side and the Democratic side. Let us compromise in good faith. Let us meet our responsibilities.

Well, that is what we face. As Senator REID said a few minutes earlier, there is a suggestion that maybe as a parting gift to Speaker BOEHNER we will extend the budget temporarily until December 11, 2 weeks before Christmas, just days before the Hanukkah season—that we would extend the budget until then and then, once again, be up against the deadline and the prospect of shutting down our government.

We can do better. We should do better. We need to make certain we keep faith with the people who send us here. We need to make certain we do our job—not just to send a continuing resolution to the President but to resolve this issue. We should not be threatening a government shutdown now or in December when we know how devastating that can be.

I hope Congress gets busy taking care of the work we were sent here to do. I think it is time for those bipartisan budget negotiations. It is beyond time. Now is the time for Congress to act responsibly to develop a budget that allows America to thrive.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. 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. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk about an amendment I plan to offer in a little while, once somebody comes from our side or the other side because they would like to be here to talk about it with me, as I understand it—maybe even to object to it, maybe to agree with it. But I wish to speak about the amendment, if I could, for a moment.

Right now, we are debating the continuing resolution. This would be to continue a level of spending from now until December 11. There are a bunch of changes in that from last year's spending, but it is basically a continuation of the previous year until we can work out our differences. It is not the way to govern around here. What we should be doing instead is having individual spending bills come up. There are 12 different appropriations bills.

The ideal way to handle this is the way it used to be done, which is that the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittees deal with these individual spending bills. For instance, one is for Commerce, the State Department, and the Justice Department. One is for the Department of Health and Human Services, and one is for the Department of Defense. When we do that, what happens is we have oversight hearings, and we have Congress playing its rightful role of saying: Are these agencies doing the right thing? Are these programs working or aren't they working? We might increase spending with a program that is actually working well, decrease spending from another program, and eliminate a third program that is not working well at all. That is what Congress is supposed to do. That is our job here.

Under the Constitution, Congress was given the power of the purse, meaning that every dime has to be appropriated by the Congress. What has happened over the years—particularly in the last several years—is that Congress has not moved forward on these appropriations bills because they have been blocked. In this case, this year we have been trying to bring up appropriations bills and the other side, the Democrats, have been blocking even considering an appropriations bill.

We have had this debate here on the floor. Many of us have heard it. But the bottom line is the committees have actually done their work and reported out 12 different appropriations bills. So 12 bills are ready to come to the floor. By the way, most of these bills have been reported out with huge bipartisan majorities. I saw one the other day. It was 24 to 3, for instance. I know the Presiding Officer has been involved in some of these issues over the years. It is typical, actually, that appropriators do their jobs. Senator MIKULSKI, Senator COCHRAN, and others work out the differences, but we simply can't get them voted on on the floor.

People may say: Why can't you? Well, because it requires 60 votes. We have to overcome a 60-vote hurdle in order to even proceed to the legislation. So we haven't been able to vote on a single appropriations bill before September 30, which is the fiscal year-end and which is coming up this week. It is no way to run a railroad, much less a government—by the way, the government that has the biggest budget of any government in the world, the government of the greatest nation in the world. We can't even bring these individual spending bills up here for a debate and a vote. It is just wrong.

Again, when we don't do that, what we don't have is the oversight. I would think both sides would want to have oversight over these agencies and departments so we understand what is working and what is not working and so that those tax dollars are spent wisely. That is the kind of stewardship that we are responsible for. As taxpayers, as representatives of taxpayers, we should want to be sure those dollars are spent in a way that is most effective. Yet, without having these appropriations bills, it is just impossible to do. Instead, we are faced with this possibility of on September 30 not having any of what is called discretionary spending, which is not all of the spending of government, but it is the spending that Congress appropriates every year, and having the possibility of parts of government actually not being able to operate because September 30 is the fiscal year-end. It is just the wrong way to do business.

So the amendment I am going to offer later this afternoon is an amendment that simply says: Let's adopt a new bill, new legislation that says: Let's end government shutdowns.

How would we do it? We would say that as of September 30, if there is any bill that is not passed, any one of the 12—remember that this year none of the 12 were passed—none of them. But on any year, if any one of those were not passed, then we would simply continue the spending from the previous year, but there would be a reduction in that spending over time. After 120 days there would be a 1-percent reduction, giving 120 days to work with the Appropriations Committee to say: OK, we know you don't want to see the spending cut, and we know you have priorities you would like to fund, but it is going to be cut 1 percent after 120 days, then 1 percent after the next 90 days, 1 percent after the next 90 days, and 1 percent after the next 90 days. So we get to a point where we have to see a reduction in spending every year, which is not necessarily a bad thing because Congress spends more than it takes in every year. But if appropriators and others here in Congress don't want to see that, they would have to get their act together and actually pass appropriations bills. Once an appropriations bill is passed, the End Government Shutdowns Act would not apply.

This seems to me to be a really logical bipartisan commonsense solution to the problem that we are facing here. Again, the problem is Congress is not doing its work. We are not getting these appropriations bills done. It is not for lack of work in the committees this year. Again, all 12 bills were reported out of committee. I believe the same is true in the House. Yet we cannot get here on the floor of the Senate the 60 votes needed to come up with the ability to proceed to these appropriations bills. It is called a filibuster. They are being filibustered. We are not even debating them. This is just wrong. I think, again, the way to get around that is to say: OK, if you want to try to block these bills, what is going to happen is we are going to have automatic spending from last year with no increases—in fact, decreases—and decreasing more over time, until Congress gets its act together and actually passes this legislation.

This idea is so commonsense that when we had a vote on it a couple of years ago, when I was able to bring it

up for a vote—and we will see tonight whether I am permitted to do that—we actually had 46 Senators support it. Now, not everybody supported it on the Appropriations Committee. Some of them obviously had concerns about it. Not every Republican supported it. There were a few Republicans who didn't support it. By the way, one Republican who didn't support it last time is now a cosponsor of the legislation because she has looked at it, she has understood the system is not working, and she has been persuaded it is the right way to go. It was bipartisan last time. Senator TESTER and I were the two cosponsors of it.

So I hope I will have the opportunity to offer that amendment here this afternoon because I think it makes all the sense in the world. As we are debating a continuing resolution again, the so-called CR—which is the wrong way to govern—let's also pass as part of that a new discipline, a new idea, a new approach that says: Let's not do this again. Let's not ever have the threat of a government shutdown hanging over us. Instead, come September 30, if an appropriations bill isn't done, fine, continue the spending from last year, with a slow ratcheting down of that spending. I think that makes all the sense in the world. It takes away this political football that is being thrown back and forth. It takes away the specter for our economy, for our businesses, and for our families of not knowing whether they are going to have this government operation continue after September 30 in whatever area is affecting our economy or those businesses or those families. I think it makes a lot of sense, and I think it provides an incentive for Congress to get its work done. And Congress should be doing every year all 12 appropriations bills—doing the oversight that goes into that, deciding what gets more money, what gets less money, what gets thrown out altogether. It doesn't make any sense.

In the huge bureaucracy of the vast Federal Government, not every program is perfect. Let's be honest; a lot of them need reform. If we don't have this process of the power of the purse—the leverage of the power of the purse to be able to say ''Prove this program is working,'' and when it doesn't, ''We are going to pull the funding away''—you lose the ability for Congress to be an effective partner with the executive branch and the judicial branch the way our Founders set it up.

Again, Congress alone has the power of the purse. Every dime has to be appropriated by this Congress, and Congress is not doing its job. This amendment, if we put in place this new practice, would be a tremendous help to get Congress back on track. It wasn't too long ago that this happened. I have been here almost 5 years now or 4½ years. We haven't had a single year where all the appropriations bills were done. In fact, very few appropriations bills have been voted on at all. This year not a single appropriations bill—zero—has come to the floor of the Senate because they have been blocked. They have all come out of committee now, but not a single one is allowed to get voted on here in the Senate.

I do hope that my own leadership on the Republican side will keep bringing these bills up. At least then we have an opportunity to talk about them—what is in the bills and why it is a good idea for us to have the oversight. Again, the reforms to these programs—the spending cuts, the spending increases for programs that are working well, the elimination altogether of programs that aren't working—we should at least have the opportunity to discuss them and talk about it.

I was hopeful we would see a colleague from the other side of the aisle show up or a member of the Appropriations Committee. I was told I could give this little talk at 5, and I had the opportunity to offer this amendment. I will have to come back later and offer it again.

I don't know if my colleague from Iowa is planning to speak——

Mr. GRASSLEY. No.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, earlier I had the opportunity to talk a little about the amendment I am about to offer. This is an amendment to the underlying bill, which is a continuing resolution. The amendment has to do with a piece of legislation called the End Government Shutdowns Act.

Excuse me.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to speak for 5 minutes in order to finish the conversation that we started earlier this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I talked about the fact that here we are, once again, without the appropriations bills done and forced to do a continuing resolution from now until December 11, and that is because later this week, on September 30, when the fiscal year ends and comes to a close, we will not have done the appropriations bills. It is not that we haven't done one or two or three; we haven't done any of them, and there are 12 of them.

I think it is time for us to take a new approach; that is, to have an end government shutdowns discipline put before this Congress which says: Any time you get to this point with any of the appropriations bills—including now where we have all of them—that we instead have a continuation of last year's spending but that it ratchets down over time to provide an incentive for all of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans alike, the Appropriations Committee, and all of us—to get our work done and to do our job under the Constitution. The power of the purse is exclusively delegated to the Congress. It will help us to get our job done if we had this by having the end government shutdowns discipline in place.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up my amendment No. 2702, the end government shutdowns amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's suggestion correctly, his amendment would create an automatic continuing resolution to fund the Federal Government in the event an annual appropriations bill is not enacted by the time the fiscal year expires. That may sound harmless enough, but what we are saying is that not only is the power of the Senate suspended and put on hold but the obligations of the committee system are put under a threat—that unless you complete action on legislation that is referred to the committee of jurisdiction by a certain time, you are out of business, and whoever wants to offer an amendment as a substitute gets to offer that and pass it on a majority vote. We are already required to have three-fifths of the Members vote to cut off debate in order to be sure that all Senators—not just a bare majority—get to decide the decisions of the Senate and get to actively participate in the process by offering amendments.

My friend's amendment abolishes offering any other alternatives for a full debate—unlimited debate—which is why the Senate is here, to cool down the passions of the moment. A Senator might have a good idea and want to change a law, repeal a resolution, deny access to Federal funds for this, that or the other that goes to a State that is very important, and their interests are just as important.

This is a terrible amendment, and it ought to be rejected. I hope the Senator will withhold offering the amendment. We can have hearings on this and see what other Senators may think about it, but at first blush, this seems like this is an amendment whose time has not come. We are not ready to dismantle the rules of the Senate piece by piece. Well, we have the right of unlimited debate, and Senators can talk as long as they wish to. We don't have to go through a rules committee to get permission or get permission from any other Senator. These are direct responsibilities of individual Senators selected by their States to stand up for their interests, not to go to Washington and cave in on something that might be a good-sounding amendment

or might have the passions of the moment behind it so that there appears to be a wave of support, but until you have a chance to seriously consider the individual issues involved, until three-fifths of the Senate decides to cut off debate—I strongly object to this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of my friend and my colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. I look forward to talking to him more about this. As I said earlier, 46 Senators supported this in the past, including all but two or three Republicans, by the way, and one of them is now a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived with respect to today's cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I wish to have 1 minute in order to debate the matter that is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I stand with the Senator from Mississippi. We may be from opposite political parties, but I certainly agree with him that the suggestion by the Senator from Ohio does not serve the best interests of this country.

Imagine if his proposal went through and we were faced with inadequate funding for medical care for our veterans. I am sorry to say the Senator from Ohio has suggested that we would have last year's level of funding with potentially a 4-percent cut. It would be the same for fighting fires and the National Institutes of Health. There would be a 4-percent cut in medical research.

I think what we are doing, if we accept this approach, is giving up our responsibility that the taxpayers sent us to carry out; that is, to make careful choices when it comes to budgets.

I just want to be on the record supporting my colleague from Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I hadn't planned to have a debate on this, but I am happy to have one. Let me just be very clear. This is about putting the Appropriations Committee in business, not out of business. This is not about cutting spending; it is about forcing Congress to get its work done.

Here we sit about to pass a continuing resolution because none of the 12 appropriations bills has been voted on because each of them has been blocked in the Senate. The committee has done its work. Yet we can't get them to the floor. Yet we have the other side saying: Gosh, this would somehow hurt the process.

How can the process be hurt any worse? We want the process to work, and that is why 46 of us, on a bipartisan basis, have supported this idea. What it says is, if at the end of the day, on September 30, appropriations bills have not been passed, then we would simply continue the spending from last year, and, yes, over time we would ratchet it down, giving 120 days for the committee to get its act together that it did not in the previous year when it was supposed to, to get these bills done, to do the oversight, and to make the decisions about NIH, as the Senator has said, and to make the decisions about our veterans.

If we truly want to help our veterans, a CR is not the way to do it. The way to do it is to let the VA bill come to the floor, have a debate, and take the committee's good ideas—and, by the way, it came out of committee with a large bipartisan vote. That is how we should be legislating. That is our job. The power of the purse resides exclusively with us. Yet once again this year we are not doing our job. It is not that we are just doing a couple of appropriations bills; we are not doing a single appropriations bill. I think it is time for us to change course and that is what this legislation is about. I am simply saying that in the process of passing the CR, which we now have to do, set up a discipline for the future that provides an incentive for us to get our work done so the good work being done by Senator COCHRAN and others—including Senator MIKULSKI—in the Appropriations Committee can come to the floor for a vote, and we can get back to governing.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to waive the mandatory quorum?

Mr. DURBIN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 719 with an amendment, No. 2689.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Michael B. Enzi, Cory Gardner, John Barrasso, Lindsey Graham, Lamar Alexander, Thad Cochran, Chuck Grassley, Kelly Ayotte, Susan M. Collins, Deb Fischer, Richard Burr.

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 concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 719 with amendment No. 2689, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 77, nays 19, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 271 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Flake	Murphy
Ayotte	Franken	Murray
Baldwin	Gardner	Nelson
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Perdue
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Hatch	Portman
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boxer	Heitkamp	Reid
Brown	Hirono	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Cantwell	Isakson	Sanders
Capito	Johnson	Schatz
Cardin	Kaine	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Kirk	Stabenow
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Thune
Coons	Markey	Tillis
Cornyn	McCain	Udall
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—19

Boozman	Inhofe	Scott
Coats	Lankford	Sessions
Cotton	Lee	Shelby
Crapo	Moran	Toomey
Cruz	Paul	Vitter
Daines	Risch	
Heller	Sasse	

NOT VOTING—4

Blunt	Graham
Corker	Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, the nays are 19.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The Senator from Texas.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2690

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I move to table the McConnell amendment No. 2690 for the purpose of offering my own amendment No. 2701, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There does not appear to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, there is a reason the American people are fed up with Washington. There is a reason the American people are frustrated. The frustration is not simply mild or passing or ephemeral; it is volcanic. Over and over again, the American people go to the ballot box. Over and over again, the American people rise and say: The direction we are going does not make sense; we want change. Over and over again, the American people win elections—in 2010, a tidal wave election; in 2014, a tidal wave election. Yet nothing changes in Washington.

I would like to share with the Presiding Officer and the American people the real story of what is happening in Washington, why it is that our leaders cannot stop bankrupting this country, cannot stop the assault on our constitutional rights, cannot stop America's retreat from leadership in the world. It is a very simple dynamic when you have two sides allegedly in a political battle, one side that is relentlessly, unshakably committed to its principles and the other side that reflectively surrenders at the outset. The outcome is foreordained.

I will give President Obama and the Senate Democrats credit. They believe in principles of Big Government. They believe in this relentless assault on our constitutional rights. They are willing to crawl over broken glass with a knife in between their teeth to fight for those principles. Unfortunately, leadership on my side of the aisle does not demonstrate the same commitment to principles.

How is it, you might wonder, that a preemptive surrender is put in place? Well, it all begins with a relatively innocuous statement: There shall be no shutdowns. That is a statement leadership in both Houses—Republican leadership in both Houses has said: We are not going to shut the government down.

You can understand—to folks in the private sector, folks at home, that sounds pretty reasonable, except here is the reality in Washington. In today's Washington, there are three kinds of votes. No. 1, there are show votes—votes that are brought up largely to placate the voters, where the outcome is foreordained, where most Republicans will vote one way and most Democrats will vote the other. Republicans will lose, and the conservatives who elected Republican majorities in both Houses are supposed to be thrilled that they have been patted on the head and given their show vote that was destined to lose.

We had a vote like that in recent weeks on Planned Parenthood. Leadership told us: You should be thrilled. We voted on it. What else do you want?

We voted on it in a context where it would never happen. Indeed, it did not.

The second kind of vote is a vote that simply grows government, dramatically expands spending, and expands corporate welfare. Those votes pass because you get a bipartisan coalition of Republican leadership and Democrats, both of whom are convinced that career politicians will get reelected if they keep growing and growing government and in particular handing out corporate welfare to giant corporations. Oh boy. If you have the lobbyists on K Street pushing for something, you can get 60, 70, 80 in this Chamber because Republican leadership loves it and Democrats are always willing to grow government.

Then there is the third kind of vote—votes on must-pass legislation. In an era when one side—the Democratic Party—is adamantly committed to continuing down this path that is causing so many millions of Americans to hurt, must-pass votes are the only votes that have real consequence in this Chamber. They typically fall into one of three categories: either a continuing resolution, an omnibus appropriations bill, or a debt ceiling increase. All of those three are deemed must-pass votes. If you actually want to change law, those are the only hopes of doing so. But, as I mentioned before, you have one side who has preemptively surrendered.

Republican leadership has said they will never ever shut down the government, and suddenly President Obama understands the easy key to winning every battle: He simply has to utter the word ''shutdown'' and Republican leadership runs to the hills. So President Obama demands of Congress: Fund every bit of ObamaCare—100 percent of it—and do nothing, zero, for the millions of Americans who are hurting, millions of Americans who have lost their jobs, who have lost their health care, who have lost their doctors, who have been forced into part-time work, the millions of young people who have seen their premiums skyrocket.

President Obama: You can do nothing for the people who are hurting.

Senate Democrats say: We don't care about the people who are hurting. We will do nothing for them.

Here is the kicker. President Obama promises: If you try to do anything on ObamaCare, I, Barack Obama, will veto funding for the entire Federal Government and shut it down.

Republican leadership compliantly says: OK. Fine. We will fund ObamaCare.

President Obama then understands he has got a pretty good trump card here he can pull out at any time. So next he says: OK. Republicans, fund my unconstitutional Executive amnesty. It is contrary to law. It is flouting Federal immigration law. But you, Republicans, fund it anyway or else, I, Barack Obama, will veto funding for the entire Federal Government and shut it down.

Republican leadership says at the outset: OK. We will fund amnesty.

Now we turn to Planned Parenthood. Barack Obama—this will surprise no one—says: Fund 100 percent of Planned Parenthood with taxpayer money.

Mind you, Planned Parenthood is a private organization. It is not even part of the government. But it happens to be politically favored by President Obama and the Democrats.

Planned Parenthood is also the subject of multiple criminal investigations for being caught on tape apparently carrying out a pattern of ongoing felonies. In ordinary times, the proposition that we should not be sending your or my Federal taxpayer money to fund a private organization that is under multiple criminal investigations—that ought to be a 100-to-0 vote. But, as I mentioned before, Barack Obama is absolutely committed to his partisan objectives. He is like the Terminator. He never stops. He never gives up. He moves forward and forward and forward.

So what does he say? If you don't fund this one private organization that is not part of the government, that is under multiple criminal investigations, I, Barack Obama, will veto funding for the entire Federal Government and shut it down.

What does Republican leadership say? Well, it will surprise no one. Republican leadership says: We surrender. We will fund Planned Parenthood.

You know, President Obama has negotiated a catastrophic nuclear deal with Iran. Republican leadership goes on television all the time and rightly says: This is a catastrophic deal. The consequences are that it is the single greatest national security threat to America. Millions of Americans could die.

I would suggest that if we actually believed the words that are coming out of our mouths, then we would be willing to use any and all constitutional authority given the Congress to stop a catastrophic deal that sends over $100 billion to Ayatollah Khamenei. Yet President Obama says he will veto the entire budget if we do, and, to the surprise of nobody, Republican leadership surrenders.

You know, I will draw an analogy. It is as if at a football game, the beginning of the football game the two team captains go out to flip the coin. One team's coach walks out and says: We forfeit. They do it game after game after game right at the coin flip.

Leadership says: We forfeit. We surrender. We, Republicans, will fund every single Big Government liberal priority of the Democrats.

If an NFL team did that over 16 games, we know what their record would be; it would be 0 and 16. You know, I am pretty sure the fans who bought tickets and who went to the game would be pretty ticked off as they watched their coach forfeit over and over again.

You want to understand the volcanic frustration with Washington? It is that Republican leadership in both Houses will not fight for a single priority we promised the voters we would fight for when we were campaigning less than a year ago.

You know, this past week was a big news week in Washington. The Speaker

of the House, JOHN BOEHNER, announced he was going to resign, and there was lots of speculation in the media as to why the Speaker of the House resigned. I am going to tell you why he resigned. It is actually a direct manifestation of this disconnect between the voters back home and Republican leadership. Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCONNELL promised there will be no shutdown. Therefore, they will fund every single priority of Barack Obama.

We are right now voting on what is called a clean CR. I would note it is clean only in the parlance of Washington, because what does it do? It funds 100 percent of ObamaCare, 100 percent of Executive amnesty. It funds all of Planned Parenthood, and it funds the Iranian nuclear deal. It is essentially a blank check to Barack Obama. That is not very clean to me. That actually sounds like a very dirty funding bill, funding priorities that are doing enormous damage.

In the Senate the votes were always there for a dirty CR, a CR that funded all of Barack Obama's priorities. The Democrats will all vote for it—heck, of course they will. They have the other side funding their priorities. Of course, every Democrat will vote for that over and over and over and twice on Sunday. The simple reality on the Republican side is when leadership joins with the Democrats, about half of the Republican caucus is happy to move over to that side of the aisle. So the votes were always preordained.

The motion I made just a moment ago was a motion to table the tree. You remember filling the tree. It is something we heard a lot about in the previous Congress. HARRY REID, the Democratic leader, did it all the time.

Senators on this side of the aisle stood over and over and said: It is abuse of process. In fact, we even campaigned with our leadership saying: We are going to have an open amendment process. Yet what has happened here is that Majority Leader MCCONNELL has taken a page out of Leader REID's playbook and filled the tree. I moved to table the tree, and what you then saw was leadership denying a second.

What does ''denying a second'' mean? Denying a recorded vote. Why is that important? When you are breaking the commitments you have made to the men and women who have elected you, the most painful thing in the world is accountability. When you are misleading the men and women who showed up to vote for you, you don't want sunshine making clear that you voted no. A recorded vote means each Senator's name is on it.

Now, why did I move to table the tree? Simply to add the amendment that I had, which, No. 1, would have said that not one penny goes to Planned Parenthood, and No. 2, not one penny goes to implementing this catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal unless and until they comply with Federal law—the administration complies with Federal law—and hands over the full deal, including the side agreements with Iran. What you saw was that Republican leadership desperately does not want a vote on that.

Tomorrow I intend to make that motion again. And when I make that motion again, I would encourage those watching to see which Senators are here to give a second or not and to vote yea or nay.

I would note that when you deny a second, which is truly an unprecedented procedural trick—it used to be that was a courtesy that was afforded to all Senators. Indeed, in the opposing party routinely over and over when a Democrat or Republican asked for a second, everyone raised their hand. But leadership has discovered: We can do this in the dark of the night.

But I would encourage those watching to see, No. 1, when this motion is offered again, who shows up to offer a second and who either doesn't raise his hand or just doesn't come to the floor.

One of the ways you avoid accountability is you are somehow somewhere else doing something very important instead of actually showing up for the battle that is waging right here and now.

But I would also encourage people to watch very carefully what happens after that. After that you have a voice vote. A voice vote is still a vote. Let's be clear. Standing on the floor, there were two Senators—Senator LEE and I—who voted aye, who voted to table the tree and take up the amendment barring funding for Planned Parenthood and barring funding for this catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal.

The remaining Senators on the Republican side—Leader MCCONNELL, Whip CORNYN, Senator ALEXANDER, and Senator COTTON—those four Senators loudly voted no. It is still a vote, even though it is not a recorded vote. It is a vote on the Senate floor.

So why did Speaker BOEHNER resign? Well, I mentioned to you that the votes were always cooked here. The Democrats plus Republican leadership and the votes they bring with them ensure plenty of votes for a dirty CR, a CR that funds ObamaCare, that funds amnesty, that funds Planned Parenthood, that funds this catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal. But the House was always the bulwark.

The Presiding Officer will remember in 2013 when we had a fight over ObamaCare. The Presiding Officer was serving in the House at the time. In that fight we never had the votes in the Senate. Actually, the Senate was under control of the Democrats. They were going to do everything they could to defend ObamaCare regardless of the millions of people who were hurt.

But the House was the bulwark in that fight, and in particular there was a core of 40 or 50 strong, principled conservatives who cared deeply about honoring the commitments they made to the men and women who elected them. That was always the strength we had in that fight.

You know, it has been interesting reading some of the press coverage, speculating that there would be some magic parliamentary trick that would somehow stop this corrupt deal. Well, in the Senate there are no magic parliamentary tricks. When you have the Democrats plus Republican leadership and a chunk of the Republicans, those votes can roll over any parliamentary trick you might use. Even with the Blood Moon we just had, there are no mystical powers that allow you to roll over them.

But in the House we still have those 30, 40, 50 strong conservatives. So how is it that Speaker BOEHNER and Leader MCCONNELL could promise there will never, ever be a shutdown? Because, I believe, Speaker BOEHNER has decided to cut a deal with Leader NANCY PELOSI, the leader of the Democrats, that this dirty CR is going to be passed out of the Senate and is going to go to the House. The Speaker is going to take it up on the floor and pass it with all the Democrats—just as Leader MCCONNELL did—and a handful of Republicans who will go with Republican leadership. A very significant percentage of Republicans will vote no. But here is the problem: Speaker BOEHNER has done that more than once. In this instance, there were too many Republicans who were tired of seeing their leadership lead the Democrats rather than lead the Republican Party.

I believe if Speaker BOEHNER had done that—had passed a dirty CR funding Planned Parenthood, funding this Iranian nuclear deal—he would have lost his speakership. A Member of the House had introduced a motion to vacate the Chair because House Republicans were fed up with their leader not leading—at least not leading their party, leading the Democratic Party.

So Speaker BOEHNER faced a conundrum. If he did what he and Leader MCCONNELL promised, which is to fund all of Barack Obama's priorities, he would have lost his job. And so what did he do? He announced that he is resigning as Speaker and resigning as a Member of Congress. That is unsurprising, but it also telegraphs the deal that he has just cut. It is a deal to surrender and join with the Democrats. Notice he said he is going to stay a month. He is going to stay a month in order to join with the Democrats and fund Barack Obama's priorities.

Now let's talk about some of the substantive issues that we ought to be talking about. Let's start with Planned Parenthood. In the past couple of months, a series of videos have come out about Planned Parenthood. To some of the people watching this, you may never have seen the videos. Why is that? Because the mainstream media has engaged in a virtual media blackout on them: ABC, NBC, CBS, the last thing they want to do is show these videos.

If you watch FOX News, you can see the videos. But the mainstream media, in the great tradition of Pravda, wants

to make sure the citizenry doesn't see what is in these videos. I would encourage every American—Republican or Democrat—regardless of where you fall on the right to life, even—and, in fact, especially—if you consider yourself pro-choice—to just watch these videos. Go online and watch them and ask yourself: Are these my values? Is this what I believe?

These videos show senior officials from Planned Parenthood laughing, sipping chardonnay and callously harvesting and selling the body parts of unborn children over and over and over. One senior official was caught on video laughing and saying she hopes she sells enough body parts of unborn children to buy herself a Lamborghini. Again, I would suggest to just ask yourself: Are these my values?

In another video a lab tech describes a little baby boy—unborn, aborted, about 2 pounds, his heart still beating. She was instructed to insert scissors under his chin to cut open the face of this little boy and harvest his brain because the brain was valuable. Planned Parenthood could sell the brain.

This is something out of ''Brave New World.'' These are human beings. That little boy had a heart that was still beating, had a brain that was being harvested. He had a soul given to him by God Almighty. He was made in the image of God.

We are now a nation that harvests the body parts of little baby boys and girls. It is the very definition of inhumanity to treat children like agriculture, to be grown and killed for their body parts, to be sold for profit. There is a reason that the media and the Democrats don't want these videos shown, because anyone watching these videos will be horrified.

But they are not just horrific; they are also prima facie evidence of criminal activity. There are multiple Federal statutes—criminal statutes—that Planned Parenthood appears to be violating, perhaps on a daily basis. The first and most direct is a prohibition on selling the body parts of unborn children for a profit. Federal criminal law makes that a felony with up to 10 years of jail time.

Now these videos show them very clearly selling body parts. They also show them bartering a price. They will argue it wasn't for a profit. But you watch these videos. You watch the undercover buyer saying: How much will you give me for them? And you see the Planned Parenthood official saying: Well, how much can I get? I don't want to bargain against myself.

On its face, that is evidence of bargaining for a profit. If you want the highest price you can get, it is not tied to your costs. It is tied to whatever dollars, whatever revenue you can bring in. Planned Parenthood is the largest abortion provider in the country. As another one of these videos reflects, it is a volume business—Planned Parenthood—taking the lives of unborn children and then selling them—apparently for profit. It is also a Federal criminal offense to alter the means of an abortion for the purpose of harvesting the organs of the unborn child. That is a separate criminal offense. On video after video, you see Planned Parenthood officials saying: OK. What parts would you like? We can perform a different abortion depending on what parts you want us to harvest. On the videos they essentially admit to this crime. They are filmed in the act.

There is the third criminal offense that provides that you cannot harvest the organs of an unborn child without informed consent from the mother. Yet again these videos seem to indicate that Planned Parenthood treats informed consent as a technicality that is sometimes complied with and sometimes ignored.

Now, I will say as an aside that ordinarily, when a national organization is caught on film committing a pattern of felonies, the next steps are predictable: The Department of Justice opens an investigation; the FBI shows up and seizes their records. Everything on those videos suggests those felonies are still occurring today.

What does it say about the Obama Justice Department that no one on the face of the planet believes there is any chance the Justice Department would even begin to investigate Planned Parenthood? What does it say about the most lawless partisan Department of Justice that there is this group that is a political ally of the President, so that is apparently all that matters. If it is an ally of the President, it doesn't matter that they are videotaped committing a felony. The Department of Justice will not even look at it.

I am an alumnus of the U.S. Department of Justice. I was an Associate Deputy Attorney General. I spent much of my adult life working in law enforcement. The Department of Justice has a long, distinguished record of remaining outside of partisan politics, of staying above the partisan fray, of being blind to party or ideology and simply enforcing the law and the Constitution. I am sorry to say that under Eric Holder and Loretta Lynch, the Department of Justice has completely besmirched that tradition.

No one remotely believes the Obama Justice Department will even begin to investigate this pattern of felonies. You don't see Democrats suggesting it. No one in the media suggests it. And by the way, if this were a Republican administration and the entity that admitted to a pattern of felonies was a private entity that supported Republicans, you would see on CBS, NBC, and ABC an indictment clock every night. You would see the anchors saying: When will this investigation be opened? When will they be indicted? Instead, the media pretends these videos don't exist.

In the face of what appears to be a national criminal enterprise, we are faced here with a much simpler question: Will we continue to pay for it? Will we continue to pay for it with your and my tax dollars? Will we send $500 million a year to a private organization to use to fund this ongoing criminal organization?

What is the position of the Democrats? Hear no evil, see no evil. They do not care. What Democrat do you see calling for the enforcement of criminal laws against Planned Parenthood? What Democrat do you hear saying, at a minimum, let's not send taxpayer money to fund this? Not one. Not a single Democrat stood up and said that.

Let me ask you, Mr. President, what happens if Planned Parenthood gets indicted? Because even though the U.S. Department of Justice under President Obama has become little more than a partisan arm of the Democratic National Committee, there are State and local prosecutors who are investigating Planned Parenthood right now. If Planned Parenthood is indicted, will the Democrats maintain their wall of silence and say: We are going to continue to fund them under indictment. By all indications, that answer is yes. We haven't heard a single Democrat say: Well, if they are indicted, then we will stop.

The response from our leadership is that we can't win this fight. That is their response. They say: Well, we can't win the Planned Parenthood fight. Why? Because we don't have 60 votes; because we don't have 67 votes. If that is the standard, then the Republican leadership standard is that we will do only what HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI approve of. That is what it means.

You want to understand why the American people are frustrated? We were told: If only we had a Republican House of Representatives, then things would be different. In 2010, millions of us rose up in incredible numbers and won an historic tidal wave election. The Presiding Officer was a youth pastor, called to minister, yet he stood up and said: My country is in crisis. I am going to step forward and serve. The 2010 election was historic, yet very little changed.

Then we were told: OK. We have a House of Representatives, but the problem is the Senate. As long as HARRY REID is majority leader, we can't do anything. Over and over again Washington gray beards would go on television, and in gravelly tones they would say: You cannot govern with one-half of one-third of government. The House of Representatives is not enough, but if we had the Senate, then things would be different. The problem is HARRY REID.

The Presiding Officer will recall during the fight over ObamaCare a number of Members of this body—Republicans—said: No, no, no, no. We can't fight on ObamaCare. We have to wait until we have a Republican Senate to fight. So the American people obliged. In 2014, millions of us rose up for the second tidal wave election in a period of 4 years. We won nine Senate seats.

We retired HARRY REID as majority leader. We won the largest majority in the House of Representatives since the 1920s.

It has been now over 9 months since we have had Republican majorities in both Houses, and I ask: What exactly have those Republican majorities accomplished?

I have asked that question all over the country in townhalls. I have never been at a townhall where the response, spontaneous, was not absolutely nothing. That is true in every State I visit.

And sadly, my response over and over again is: You know, it's worse than that. I wish the answer were absolutely nothing. It would have been better if the Republican majorities had done absolutely nothing because what, in fact, have they done? Well, the very first thing that happened, right after that election in November, is we came back to Washington, and Republican leadership joined up with HARRY REID and the Democrats and passed a trillion dollar CR omnibus bill that was filled with pork, corporate welfare, and grew government, grew the debt.

Then Republican leadership took the lead in funding ObamaCare. Then Republican leadership took the lead in funding Executive amnesty. Then Republican leadership took the lead in funding Planned Parenthood. And then, astonishingly, Republican leadership took the lead in confirming Loretta Lynch as Attorney General.

Now, I ask: Which one of those decisions is one iota different from what would have happened with HARRY REID and the Democrats in charge of this Chamber? Those decisions are identical.

And I would note, by the way, with Loretta Lynch, the Republican majority could have defeated that nomination. The Senate majority leader could have done so. She looked at the Senate Judiciary Committee, and she looked at the Senate, and when asked how she would differ from Eric Holder's Justice Department—the most lawless and partisan Justice Department we would ever see—and she said: No way whatsoever. When asked to point to a single instance in which she would be willing to stand up to President Obama to stop his lawlessness, to stop his abuse of power, she could not identify any circumstance in which she would ever stand up to the President who appointed her. Attorneys general from both parties have done that, for centuries.

Now, with Eric Holder, the Senate could be forgiven because his lawlessness manifested primarily after he was confirmed. With Loretta Lynch, she told us beforehand. She looked us in the eyes and said: Hey, I am going to do exactly what my predecessor has done. And Republican leadership confirmed her anyway.

Is it any wonder the American people are frustrated out of their minds? We keep winning elections, and the people we put in office don't do what they said they would do.

Now, some people across the country ask me: Is Republican leadership just not very capable? Are they not that competent or are they unwilling to fight? Mr. President, it is neither. They are actually quite competent, and they are willing to fight. The question becomes what they are fighting for.

There is a disconnect right now. If you or I go to our home State and to any gathering of citizens and we put up a white board and we ask the citizens in the room to give the top priorities they think Republican majorities in Congress should be focusing on, and we wrote the 20 priorities that came from the citizens of Oklahoma or the citizens of Texas or, for that matter, the citizens of any of the 50 States, those top 20 priorities—at least 18 of them—would appear nowhere on the leadership's priority list.

On the other hand, if you drive just down the street in Washington to K Street—K Street is the street in Washington where the lobbyists primarily reside, where their offices are—and you get a gathering of corporate lobbyists that represent giant corporations and ask them their top priorities, the list that comes out will not just bear passing similarity but will be identical to the priorities of the Republican leadership. That's the disconnect.

Do you know why we are not here fighting on this? Because not giving taxpayer money to Planned Parenthood is not among the priorities of the lobbyists on K Street, so leadership is not interested in doing it. That is the disconnect.

Leadership does know how to fight. Just a couple of months ago, in dealing with the Export-Import Bank, we saw leadership in both Chambers go to extraordinary lengths with Herculean procedural steps to reauthorize a classic example of corporate welfare—hundreds of billions of dollars of taxpayer-guaranteed loans to giant corporations. Now, for that, leadership is incentivized because those corporations hire lobbyists and those lobbyists distribute checks, typically by the wheelbarrow.

There is no incentive greater in this body than getting reelected, and the view of leadership is that you get reelected by raking in the cash. How do you think we have gotten an $18 trillion national debt? Because the way you reach bipartisan compromise in this body today, in the broken world of Washington, is you grow and grow and grow government, and you sit around in a room and say: I will spend for your priority, your priority, your priority—another trillion dollars and we are done.

The only people to lose are your children and mine. The only people to lose are the next generations who find themselves mired deeper and deeper and deeper in debt. I think of my little girls Caroline and Catherine. They are 7 and 4. If we don't stop what we are doing, your children and my children will face a debt so crushing they will not be able to spend in the future for the priorities of the future—for their needs, for their wants, for whatever crises come up that the next generation confronts. They will spend their whole lives simply working to pay off the debts racked up by their deadbeat parents and grandparents. No generation in history has ever done this to their children and grandchildren. Our parents didn't do it to us. Their parents didn't do it to them. The reason is the corruption of this town, and it boils down to a simple proposition: The Democrats are willing to do anything to push their priorities, and the Republicans, the leadership, are not listening to the men and women who elected us.

But it is actually an even deeper problem than that. On the Democratic side, the major donors that fund the Democratic Party, they don't despise their base. The billionaires who write the giant checks that fund President Obama, Hillary Clinton, and the Democrats on that side of the aisle don't despise the radical gay rights movement or the radical environmentalist movement or all the people who knock on doors and get Democrats elected. The simple reality is a very large percentage of the Republican donors actively despise our base—actively despise the men and women who showed up and voted you and me into office. I can tell you, when you sit down and talk with a New York billionaire Republican donor—and I have talked with quite a few New York billionaire Republican donors, California Republican donors—their questions start out as follows. First of all, you have to come out for gay marriage, you need to be pro-choice, and you need to support amnesty. That is where the Republican donors are. You wonder why Republicans will not fight on any of these issues? Because the people writing the checks agree with the Democrats.

Now mind you, the people who show up at the polls who elected you and me and who elected this Republican majority—far too many of the Republican donors look down on those voters as a bunch of ignorant hicks and rubes. It is why leadership likes show votes.

It wasn't too long ago when the Washington cartel was able to mask it all with a show vote or two, and they told the rubes back home: See, we voted on it; we just don't have the votes.

When I was first elected to this body, many times I heard more senior Senators saying some variation of the following: Now, TED, that is what you tell folks back home. You don't actually do it.

Here is what has changed. The voters have gotten more informed. They now understand the difference between show votes and a real vote. They understand the vote we had 1 week ago on Planned Parenthood was designed to lose, to placate those silly folks who think we shouldn't be sending taxpayer funds to a criminal organization that is selling the body parts of unborn children. But on the actual vote that could

change policy, leadership has no interest in fighting whatsoever.

In the past couple of weeks, one of my colleagues sent me a letter that really embodied the leadership message. This letter said: ''Explain to me how you get 67 votes to defund Planned Parenthood. If you can't produce 67 votes, I won't support it.'' If that is our standard, then we should all be honest with the men and women who elected us: We do not have 67 Republican votes in this Chamber, and there is no realistic prospect of our getting 67 votes any time in the foreseeable future. If the standard is, unless we get 67 votes, Republican leadership will support no policy issue, then each of us when we run should tell the voters: If you vote for me, I will support whatever policy agenda HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI decide because that is my standard. If I don't have 67 votes—do you ever recall HARRY REID and the Democrats saying: How can we get Republican votes? No. Their side is absolutely committed to their principles. You don't see them holding back at all.

If the standard is, how do we get 67 votes, name one thing that leadership will fight for. Well, the answer I mentioned, the three types of votes are they will fight for big government, they will fight to grow government, and they will fight to expand corporate welfare. Well, that can indeed get 67 votes. But I have never been to a townhall once where citizens said to me: The problem is we don't have enough corporate welfare. I need more subsidies for Big Business. If 100 percent of the agenda of Republican leadership is more subsidies for Big Business, what the heck are we doing in the Senate in the first place? That certainly wasn't why I ran, and I know it wasn't why you ran either. You don't have to win every fight, you don't have to fight every fight, but you do have to stand for something.

Let's look beyond Planned Parenthood for a minute. Let's look to Iran. Of all the decisions the Obama administration has made, there may be none more damaging than this catastrophic Iranian nuclear deal. If this deal goes through, there will be three consequences: No. 1, the Obama administration will become, quite literally, the world's leading financier of radical Islamic terrorists. Now, when I said that a couple months ago, President Obama got very, very upset. He said it was ridiculous that I would say such a thing, but despite attacking me directly, President Obama didn't actually endeavor to refute the substance of what I said.

So let's review the facts: Fact No. 1, Iran is today the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. That fact is undisputed even by this administration. Fact No. 2, if this deal goes through, over $100 billion will go directly to Iran to the Ayatollah Khamenei. Fact No. 3, if that happens, billions of those dollars will go to Hamas, to Hezbollah, to the Houthis, to radical Islamic terrorists across the globe who will use those billions to murder Americans, to murder Israelis, and to murder Europeans.

It is worth remembering, 14 years ago this month, the horrific terrorist attack that was carried out on September 11. Osama bin Laden hated America, but he never had billions of dollars. He never had $100 billion. The Ayatollah Khamenei hates America every bit as much as Osama bin Laden did, and this administration is giving him control of over $100 billion. Imagine what bin Laden could have done. Look at the damage he did with 19 terrorists carrying box cutters. Now imagine that same zealotry with billions of dollars behind it. The consequences of this deal could easily be another terrorist attack that dwarfs September 11 in scale, that kills far more than the roughly 3,000 lives that were snuffed out. Who in their right mind would send over $100 billion to a theocratic zealot who chants ''Death to America''?

A second consequence of his catastrophic deal is that we are abandoning four hostages—four American hostages—in Iranian jails: Pastor Saeed Abedini, an American citizen whose wife Naghmeh lives in Idaho. I have visited with Naghmeh many times. Pastor Saeed has two little kids who desperately want their daddy to come home. Pastor Saeed was sentenced to 8 years in prison for the crime of preaching the Gospel. Just last week was the 3-year anniversary of Pastor Saeed's imprisonment. Reports are that he is being horribly mistreated, that his health is failing, and yet President Obama cannot bring himself to utter the words ''Pastor Saeed Abedini''—$100 billion to the Ayatollah Khamenei, and Pastor Saeed Abedini remains in prison.

Also in prison is Amir Hekmati, an American marine the President has abandoned. Also in prison is Jason Rezaian, a Washington Post reporter—I note to the reporters in the Gallery, a colleague of yours—abandoned by President Obama in an Iranian prison, thrown in jail for doing his job, reporting on the news—and Robert Levinson, whose whereabouts remain unknown.

Why is the President refusing to even utter their names?

The third consequence of this deal is this deal will only accelerate Iran acquiring nuclear weapons.

The administration claims the deal will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Why? Because they promised not to do it. We have learned from Iran, they break their promises over and over and over again. And what we do know is that they will have an extra $100 billion to develop nuclear weapons. Now, I will say the administration laughingly suggested: Well, they will use that on infrastructure, to rebuild their roads, to rebuild their energy industry. Right now they are sending vast sums to Hamas and Hezbollah, funding terrorism across the world, and they have those same infrastructure needs. With another $100 billion, you don't think they are going to funnel an awful lot of it to developing nuclear weapons?

I would point out, it is not by accident that the Ayatollah Khamenei refers to Israel as the Little Satan and America as the Great Satan. This is the one threat on the face of the Earth that poses a real possibility of millions of Americans being murdered in the flash of an eye.

Everything I am saying the Republican leadership has said over and over again. Yet Republican leadership refuses to enforce the terms of the Iran review legislation—Federal law that the administration is defying by not handing over the entire deal. I have laid out a clear path, a detailed path that leadership can follow to stop this deal, and leadership refuses to do so. Instead, we had a show vote that was designed to lose, and it did exactly what we expected. The Democrats, by and large, put party loyalty above the national security of this country, above standing with our friend and ally the nation of Israel, above protecting the lives of millions of Americans.

If we truly believed what so many of us have said, that this poses the risk of murdering millions of Americans, is there any higher priority? The most powerful constitutional tool Congress has is the power of the purse. If we had the ability to stop this deal—and we don't—and millions of Americans die, how do we explain that to the men and women who elected us?

I am not advocating that we fight willy-nilly. I am advocating that we fight on things that matter. Don't give $500 million to Planned Parenthood, a corrupt organization that is taking the lives of vast numbers of unborn children and selling their body parts, in a criminal conspiracy, directly contrary to Federal law. Don't give $100 billion to the Ayatollah Khamenei, who seeks to murder millions. In both instances, those are defending life. Yet Republican leadership is not willing to lift a finger. If only all the people who might be murdered by a nuclear weapon could create a PAC in Washington and hire some lobbyists, maybe leadership would listen to them. But the truck-driver at home, the waitress at home, the schoolteacher at home, the pastor, the police officer, the working men and women—the Washington cartel does not listen to them.

I will note where this deal is headed. In December, when this dirty continuing resolution expires, leadership is already foreshadowing that they plan to bust the budget caps. Why? We talked about it at the beginning. Barack Obama has discovered that when he says the word ''shutdown,'' the Republican leadership screams, surrenders, and runs to the hills. Obama, understanding that quite well, says: If you don't bust the budget caps, I will shut the government down.

In this bizarre process, Republican leadership will blame whatever Obama

does on other Republicans. You noticed how much energy leader McConnell devotes to attacking conservatives? You notice how much energy Speaker BOEHNER devotes to attacking conservatives? Just yesterday the Speaker of the House went on national television, and on national television he directed an obscene epithet at me personally. He is welcome to insult whomever he likes. I don't intend to reciprocate. But when has leadership ever shown that level of venom, that level of animosity to President Obama and the Democrats who are bankrupting this country, who are destroying the Constitution, who are endangering the future of our children and grandchildren, who are retreating from leadership and the world, and who have created an environment that has led to the rise of radical Islamic terrorists?

One of the dynamics we have seen in fight after fight is that HARRY REID and the Democrats sit back and laugh. Why? Because it is Republican leadership that leads the onslaught, attacking conservatives, saying: No, you can't, and we will not do anything to stop ObamaCare. No, you can't, and we will not do anything to stop amnesty. No, you can't, and we will not do anything to stop Planned Parenthood. No, you can't, and we will not do anything to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

If Republican leadership really believes we can accomplish nothing, then why does it matter if you have a Republican House or Senate? Every 2 years come October, November, we tell the voters it matters intensely. To paraphrase the immortal words of Hillary Clinton, what difference does it make if the standard for Republican leadership is, anything that gets 67 votes we will support. That means HARRY REID and NANCY PELOSI remain the de facto leaders of the Senate and the House.

I would note, by the way, if leadership goes through with their suggestion to bust the budget caps, they will have done something astonishing. Historically, the three legs of the conservative stool have been fiscal conservatives, social conservatives, and national security conservatives. Between Planned Parenthood, Iran, and the budget caps, leadership will have managed to abandon all three. No wonder the American people are frustrated. No wonder the American people do not understand why leadership isn't listening to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's postcloture time has expired.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my time be extended.

The Democrats are objecting to my speaking further, and both the Democrats and Republican leadership are objecting to the American people speaking further.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of calendar Nos. 196 and 197 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard as a member of the Coast Guard Permanent Commissioned Teaching Staff under title 14, U.S.C., section 188:

To be lieutenant commander

Brian J. Maggi

The following named officers of the United States Coast Guard for appointment as members of the Permanent Commissioned Teaching Staff and appointment in the grades indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 188:

To be commander

Anna W. Hickey

To be lieutenant

Kimberly C. Young-McLear

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN783 AIR FORCE nomination of Kyle J. Weld, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN804 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning KATHLEEN E. AKERS, and ending SAIPRASAD M. ZEMSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN806 AIR FORCE nominations (11) beginning PAUL R. BREZINSKI, and ending THOMAS E. WILLIFORD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN809 MR FORCE nominations (30) beginning DWAYNE A. BACA, and ending LIANA LUCAS VOGEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN812 AIR FORCE nominations (45) beginning RENI B. ANGELOVA, and ending GRANT W. WISNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN813 AIR FORCE nominations (101) beginning DAVID R. ALANIZ, and ending DEVON L. WENTZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN814 AIR FORCE nomination of John M. Gooch, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN815 AIR FORCE nomination of Herman W. Dykes, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN785 ARMY nominations (259) beginning JONATHAN S. ACKISS, and ending D012659, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN786 ARMY nominations (357) beginning MICHAEL H. ADORJAN, and ending G010310, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN787 ARMY nominations (420) beginning MATTHEW T. ADAMCZYK, and ending D012593, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN788 ARMY nomination of Gregory I. Kelts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN789 ARMY nominations (8) beginning STEPHEN H. COOPER, and ending DAVID G. WORTMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN790 ARMY nomination of Lesley A. Watts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN818 ARMY nomination of Kirby R. Gross, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN819 ARMY nomination of Franchesca M. Desriviere, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN820 ARMY nomination of Jerry L. Tolbert, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN821 ARMY nomination of Christopher R. Forsythe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN822 ARMY nomination of Francis G. Maresco, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN851 ARMY nominations (258) beginning DAVID S. ABRAHAMS, and ending D012627, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN852 ARMY nominations (176) beginning STEPHANIE R. AHERN, and ending G010384, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN853 ARMY nominations (115) beginning CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT, and ending D011026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN854 ARMY nomination of Neil I. Nelson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN855 ARMY nomination of Benjamin J. Bigelow, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN791 NAVY nominations (7) beginning ENRIQUE R. ASUNCION, and ending TIMOTHY J. SAXON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN792 NAVY nominations (38) beginning CHRISTIAN J. AUGER, and ending CHESTER J. WYCKOFF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN793 NAVY nominations (44) beginning CARA M. ADDISON, and ending JOEL A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN794 NAVY nominations (59) beginning OLUWAFADEKEMI N. ADEWETAN, and ending JUSTIN I. WATSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN795 NAVY nominations (89) beginning FREDERIC ALBESA, and ending FRANZ J. YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN796 NAVY nominations (92) beginning MARICAR S. ABERIN, and ending CARDIA M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN797 NAVY nominations (104) beginning JAMES P. ADWELL, and ending MARESA C. J. ZENNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN798 NAVY nominations (203) beginning RICHARD R. ABITRIA, and ending DAVID J. ZELINSKAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN799 NAVY nomination of Michelle D. Carter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 8, 2015.

PN823 NAVY nomination of Regine Reimers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN824 NAVY nomination of Joel V. Finny, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN825 NAVY nomination of Ernest C. Lee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN826 NAVY nomination of Natalia C. Henriquez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 9, 2015.

PN857 NAVY nominations (841) beginning WHITNEY A. ABRAHAM, and ending BETHANY R. ZMITROVICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN858 NAVY nominations (44) beginning REBECCA K. ADAMS, and ending MICHAEL L. ZUEHLKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN859 NAVY nominations (19) beginning CHRISTOPHER M. BADE, and ending CASSANDRA M. SISTI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN860 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JAMIE P. DRAGE, and ending RICHARD M. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN861 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JASON M. BAUMAN, and ending MARK A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN862 NAVY nominations (12) beginning JOSHUA A. AISEN, and ending SCOTT M. THORNBURY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN863 NAVY nominations (11) beginning RICHARD S. CHERNITZER, and ending BETH A. TEACH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN864 NAVY nominations (3) beginning NICHOLAS A. DENISON, and ending THEODORE J. STOW, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN865 NAVY nominations (168) beginning TRAVIS C. ADAMS, and ending ANTONIO ZUBIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN866 NAVY nominations (57) beginning MICHAEL K. ALLEN, and ending JERRY W. WYRICK, II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN867 NAVY nominations (52) beginning BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH, and ending RICHARD S. ZIBA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN868 NAVY nominations (38) beginning GILBERT R. BAUGHN, and ending SERGIO B. WOODEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

PN869 NAVY nomination of Gregory A. Grubbs, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of September 16, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SOUTHERN NEVADA GROUP OF THE SIERRA CLUB

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Southern Nevada Group of the Sierra Club.

The Southern Nevada Group of the Sierra Club was established in 1965 and encompasses Clark, Lincoln, Nye, Esmerelda, and White Pine Counties. During that time, its membership has helped shape Nevada's future by honoring the pristine beauty of Nevada.

Today, Nevadans and visitors from around the country travel to southern Nevada to see the life, history, and culture of the Silver State. The Southern Nevada Group of the Sierra Club has worked tirelessly to protect places, such as the Great Basin National Park, the Spring Mountain National Recreation Area, the Sloan Canyon and Red Rock Canyon National Conservation Areas, and the recently designated Tule Springs Fossil Beds and Basin and Range National Monuments. These special places have inspired tens of millions of people and will continue to inspire our children and grandchildren. The Sierra Club has also been key to the protection of millions of acres of pristine landscapes as wilderness in southern and eastern Nevada. Today, the Sierra Club's dedication to Nevada continues in its efforts to protect treasured sites that highlight Nevada's unique geological and cultural history, including Gold Butte.

These wonderful parts of Nevada are owned by everyone, and their protection has helped solidify Nevada's status as a world class destination. The progress the Southern Nevada Group has made to protect these wonderful parts of Nevada continues through its work to fully realize Nevada's clean energy potential. These efforts notably began with opposition to the construction of new coal plants in White Pine County. More recently, the Southern Nevada Group teamed with the Moapa Band of Paiutes and others to support meaningful legislation that resulted in the closure of the Reid-Gardner coal plant and its replacement with clean energy.

I have been gratified to work with the Southern Nevada Group on so many of these efforts and was honored earlier this year to receive the Sierra Club's Edgar Wayburn Award. I commend the Southern Nevada Group of the Sierra Club on their 50 years of success and wish the organization continued success in the years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 160TH BIRTHDAY OF MILLER BREWING

• Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, as the son of a former general manager of a brewery and a loyal customer I wish to acknowledge the founding of a true American success story, Miller Brewing, and to congratulate it on the occasion of its historic 160th anniversary celebration.

In 1855, just a few years after Wisconsin joined the Union, 30-year old Frederick J. Miller brought his brewing passion from his native Germany to the United States, taking over what was then the Plank Road Brewery in Milwaukee. Now, 160 years later, Milwaukee is known worldwide as Brew City, and the company he founded is celebrating the accomplishments of this young, brash entrepreneurial brewmaster who turned a pocketful of yeast into a global beer brewing icon. From its founding, through its expansions and partnerships, Miller Brewing has become a quintessential success story, having forever woven itself into the fabric of American society and culture.

As Miller Brewing celebrates its 160th anniversary, guests from around the world have come to Milwaukee to hear and read stories of a young Frederick Miller. Each week the company is highlighting a different era from Miller's storied past, and visitors to the historic Miller Valley plant can even taste a sample of 1855 celebration Lager during brewery tours. Earlier this month, I toured Miller's Milwaukee brewery and enjoyed some of the same sights and smells I experienced as a young boy hanging around

the small brewery managed by my father.

After decades of continued success, Miller joined with Colorado-based Coors in 2008, thus combining more than 300 years of brewing heritage. Operating out of eight breweries in eight States, the most talented and professional brewmasters in the world now provide beer drinkers in America with a portfolio of beers that are second to none. But, Miller Brewing and MillerCoors are more than the product they make; they are greater than the sum of their parts. They are economic engines in Wisconsin, Colorado, and throughout the country, providing family-supporting jobs to more than 8,000 employees nationwide. Because of their presence, over $5 billion is injected in the economy each year, money that is spent on goods and services, and which helps support the businesses of thousands of suppliers. Miller pays more than $1 billion annually in State, local and Federal taxes.

As they celebrate the past 160 years, current employees are taking note of the efforts made by the earliest employees of Miller Brewing, who knew the importance of civic leadership and sustainable business practices. We see those traditions continue today, as Miller Brewing and MillerCoors remain a deeply rooted presence in the communities in which they brew and sell their beer. Support of local charities and responsible consumption programs, and efforts to reduce water and energy usage and waste are only a few examples of how the company proves itself to be a valuable corporate citizen.

Frederick J. Miller arrived in Milwaukee with a passion and ambition. He committed himself to brew ''confoundedly good beers'' with ''uncompromising quality.'' After founding Miller Brewing Company in 1855, he worked hard to achieve that goal. For the past 160 years, millions of Americans have reaped the benefits of his efforts, one bottle, one can, or one glass at a time.●

REMEMBERING BEVERLY C. DAGGETT

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today we solemnly remember Senator Beverly Daggett. A dedicated public servant, Beverly died on September 6, 2015, 3 days before her 70th birthday, after a valiant, lifelong battle with kidney disease. Bev will be remembered for her dedication to her family, community, and State. The State of Maine has lost a woman of true integrity, and she will be greatly missed.

Bev was an exceptionally intelligent and hard-working woman who found countless successes in life. She began her tenure in the Maine House of Representatives in 1987 as a member of the 113th legislature. She served in the Maine House of Representatives from 1987 through 1996 and in the Maine Senate from 1997 through 2004. In the Senate, Bev rose to leadership as the Senate Democratic leader in 2000. She worked closely with members on both sides of the aisle to achieve the historic power-sharing deal that stemmed from the Senate's first ever partisan tie.

In 2002, in recognition of her strong leadership, her colleagues elected Beverly Daggett to serve as the first woman President of the Maine Senate.

Bev's dedication to community was obvious as she served in countless ways other than her political activities. Senator Daggett was also Kennebec County Commissioner for several terms. She served for 25 years on the Board of Crisis and Counseling, culminating in her role as board chair. She also sat on the school board and was a member of the Green Street United Methodist Church, where she was a substitute organist. Above all else, Beverly was a devoted wife, mother, and friend.

I had the honor of working with Beverly during my time as the Governor of Maine and witnessed firsthand her strong leadership and commitment to the betterment of Maine. I am deeply saddened by her passing and would like to join her friends and family in reflecting on her many life accomplishments and honor her memory.

Beverly will be remembered for her deep and abiding faith, her leadership, encouragement of those around her, ceaseless advocacy for those without a voice, sense of humor, and wisdom. Her firm devotion to the betterment of Maine will never be forgotten. I, along with all the people of Maine, am thankful for her immeasurable contributions to our State and the Nation.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:33 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 348. An act to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes.

At 6:21 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 6:42 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 261. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse.

S. 994. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1 Walter Hammond Place in Waldwick, New Jersey, as the ''Staff Sergeant Joseph D'Augustine Post Office Building''.

S. 1707. An act to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the ''Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House''.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 348. An act to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2089. A bill to provide for investment in clean energy, to empower and protect consumers, to modernize energy infrastructure, to cut pollution and waste, to invest in research and development, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 766. A bill to limit the retrieval of data from vehicle event data recorders, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–147).

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 627. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–148).

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

S. 2083. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 2084. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to modify the authority of the National Labor Relations Board with respect to rulemaking, issuance of complaints, and authority over unfair labor practices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2085. A bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity may accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. KIRK, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2086. A bill to prohibit the lifting of sanctions on Iran until the Government of Iran pays the judgments against it for acts of terrorism; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2087. A bill to modify the boundary of the Fort Scott National Historic Site in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 2088. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 90 Cornell Street in Kingston, New York, as the ''Staff Sergeant Robert H. Dietz Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. REID, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COONS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KING, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2089. A bill to provide for investment in clean energy, to empower and protect consumers, to modernize energy infrastructure, to cut pollution and waste, to invest in research and development, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2090. A bill to ensure that Social Security contributions made by workers are available to pay all benefits which they have earned; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 271. A resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of Dinosaur National Monument and designating October 4, 2015, as ''Dinosaur National Monument Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 524

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

S. 618

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 618, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 relative to the powers of the Department of Justice Inspector General.

S. 628

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 628, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the designation of maternity care health professional shortage areas.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 812

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 812, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, supra.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term ''waters of the United States'', and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1446

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system.

S. 1779

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1779, a bill to prevent conflicts of interest that stem from executive Government employees receiving bonuses or other compensation arrangements from nongovernment sources, from the revolving door that raises concerns about the independence of financial services regulators, and from the revolving door that casts aspersions over the awarding of Government contracts and other financial benefits.

S. 1818

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1818, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to reform the rule making process of agencies.

S. 1820

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1820, a bill to require

agencies to publish an advance notice of proposed rule making for major rules.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) 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. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to prohibit the sale of arms to Bahrain.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2028

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 2042

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2042, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2043

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2043, a bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans and for other purposes.

S. 2067

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2067, a bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases.

S. RES. 222

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 222, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federation Internationale de Football Association should immediately eliminate gender pay inequity and treat all athletes with the same respect and dignity.

S. RES. 267

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 267, a resolution expressing support for the continuation of the Federal Perkins Loan program.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2090. A bill to ensure that Social Security contributions made by workers are available to pay all benefits which they have earned; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to discuss the enormous importance of America's most critical safety net program—Social Security. In particular, I want to talk about the Social Security Disability Insurance program and introduce a proposal to secure the financing of Social Security. Of all the strands woven together in America's safety net, disability insurance is one of the most successful at keeping vulnerable people in Oregon and across the country out of poverty. It is a vital lifeline for people who suffer from catastrophic illnesses or disabilities, including a million veterans. The time has come for Congress to take an expected but important step to preserve Social Security's strength into the future.

The trust fund for the disability insurance portion of Social Security is set to be depleted in 2016. This doesn't mean the program will stop paying benefits but does mean that it will only have dedicated tax revenue to pay about 80 percent of benefits. This isn't a late-breaking crisis; this is something that Congress has anticipated for more than two decades. And it is a simple issue to resolve.

For a defined-benefit system like Social Security, it is not unusual to adjust the dials of funding between the retirement program and the disability program as needed. That way, the entire program remains as strong as possible. Benefits go out in full and on time. Nobody in Oregon or elsewhere is stuck in limbo, worrying about suddenly being unable to make rent or pay the bills.

Congress has adjusted resources within Social Security 11 times and has shifted funding both to and from the disability insurance program. The last time it did, in 1994, it set the disability insurance program on strong footing for about 20 years. That is the practical way to strengthen disability insurance for the future. I am introducing legislation today along with 27 colleagues that would do just that, and Ways and Means Ranking Member LEVIN is introducing a similar measure in the House of Representatives.

This is a straightforward, commonsense proposal supported by a number of prominent advocates for Americans with disabilities, including the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities Social Security Task Force, Social Security Works, and the Strengthen Social Security Coalition.

Despite that, there are some members of Congress who are ringing false alarm bells and insisting on changes to the program that may be harmful to workers and beneficiaries. They make the misguided case that disability insurance is plagued by fraud or that it is a big giveaway. That is not the case—as I will explain in a moment.

The reason I am introducing this legislation now is the House of Representatives has adopted a rule that prevents a clean reallocation of funding between the retirement and disability programs. I want to make sure that harmful changes to these programs are not included in end-of-year or other must-pass legislation.

In my view, there are opportunities to further strengthen Social Security,

and I believe the Congress should be open to policies that would not harm workers and beneficiaries. However, it is important that Congress not take any action that would reduce protections for those who desire to attempt work, add more complexity in benefits or administration, or rig up another trust fund depletion scenario. There have been some ideas thrown around that don't pass those tests.

As Congress debates the future of disability insurance, it is important to get the facts straight. First, the Social Security Administration makes stopping program fraud and abuse a top priority. Disability insurance payments are more than 99 percent accurate, due in no small part to the agency's robust efforts to combat waste, fraud, and abuse.

For example, the agency uses a highly effective method of preventing improper payments called ''continuing disability reviews,'' which returns $9 in savings for every dollar invested. The agency has demonstrated that it can do this important work when we here in Congress provide it with sufficient resources.

In addition, let me be clear: nobody is getting rich off of disability insurance. The benefits average just over $1,100 a month, which is slightly over the individual poverty level. If SSDI went away, half of the families receiving benefits would fall into poverty.

And it is important to recognize that the qualifications for disability insurance are strict, which means only those who are so impaired they can't perform substantial work receive benefits. The program is not a giveaway. Workers earn coverage by paying into the program. Less than 40 percent of applications for disability insurance are approved, even after appeals. The people who qualify suffer from severe medical conditions that have derailed their lives and left them extremely vulnerable. In my view, it is deeply unfair to delay the simple changes that will keep the disability insurance program running for years to come.

One year ago, the Finance Committee heard testimony from a woman named Stephanie Dempsey who suffered from debilitating chronic illnesses and received disability insurance benefits. Stephanie's long list of health problems began in her late twenties, when she was diagnosed with a hereditary heart disease. She had quadruple bypass surgery at age 30. Over the following years, she had 27 stents placed in her arteries over the course of several more operations. That enormous burden was compounded by Lupus, arthritis, and a seizure disorder. A mountain of prescription bottles was stacked on the witness table the day Stephanie came before the Finance Committee.

As Stephanie told us, she wanted to work, but her illnesses made it impossible. Rather than sliding backward into poverty or having to rely entirely on others to stay afloat, disability insurance benefits helped cover the bills.

I am sorry to say that Stephanie passed away in December. But there are vulnerable people across the country who rely on disability insurance in the same way Stephanie did. On the Social Security Administration's website is a page where many of these individuals have shared their stories.

Let me tell you about three other individuals who rely on disability insurance: Charlotte, Christine, and Carrie.

Charlotte was working three jobs and pursuing her degree in social work when she suffered two strokes in 2007. After the strokes, Charlotte now has trouble getting around and climbing steps. She gets help from her niece with day-to-day chores. She says disability insurance keeps her from becoming homeless and helps her pay her bills, afford her medications, and keep food on the table.

Christine has a disorder of the nervous system that has left her in a wheelchair. Her disability insurance benefits give her independence. She said that without Social Security, she would be stuck in a nursing home, but instead, she is able to be a productive citizen.

Carrie is a mother who suffers from multiple sclerosis, MS. She worked in the insurance industry and shrugged off the early symptoms of her MS. But the fatigue and forgetfulness grew, and she became unable to work. Carrie's Social Security benefits help her family pay for food, clothes, and school supplies.

Mr. President, these individuals and millions more across the country have earned their benefits, and they are relying on Congress to keep both parts of Social Security running at full strength. I urge my colleagues to work on a bipartisan basis to ensure that benefits continue in full and as promised, to guarantee that millions of vulnerable Americans remain protected.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 4, 2015, AS ''DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT DAY''

Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 271

Whereas in 1909, paleontologist Earl Douglass discovered the world-famous Carnegie Quarry, a remarkable window to the dinosaurs of the late Jurassic period;

Whereas on October 4, 1915, President Woodrow Wilson established Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential Proclamation Number 1313 (39 Stat. 1752), which preserved the deposits of extraordinary dinosaur fossils;

Whereas on July 14, 1938, President Franklin D. Roosevelt enlarged Dinosaur National Monument by Presidential Proclamation Number 2290 (53 Stat. 2454), to include the Green and Yampa River canyon country in order to protect additional land of historical and scientific interest;

Whereas October 4, 2015, marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of Dinosaur National Monument;

Whereas Dinosaur National Monument is a State and national treasure that attracts hundreds of thousands of visitors each year and benefits national, State, and local economies by generating millions of dollars in revenue;

Whereas Dinosaur National Monument has the most complete geological record of any unit of the National Park System;

Whereas Dinosaur National Monument protects more than 210,000 acres of exceptionally diverse communities of plants and animals, including bears, mountain lions, bighorn sheep, moose, elk, otters, and beavers;

Whereas Dinosaur National Monument contains the lower section of the Yampa River, and the confluence of the Yampa and Green Rivers within Dinosaur National Monument provides outstanding scientific opportunities to observe and study the effects of the Rivers;

Whereas Dinosaur National Monument preserves and protects significant archaeological evidence of the prehistoric Fremont Indians, providing an excellent opportunity for research and education;

Whereas the National Park Service will continue the long tradition of preserving and protecting Dinosaur National Monument for years to come, providing access to the wilderness and wildlife within Dinosaur National Monument for generations of Americans; and

Whereas on October 4, 2015, the National Park Service intends to celebrate the start of the next century of stewardship for Dinosaur National Monument: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and celebrates Dinosaur National Monument on the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the monument;

(2) encourages all people of Colorado, Utah, and the United States to visit that unique national treasure; and

(3) designates October 4, 2015, as Dinosaur National Monument Day.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2701. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2702. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2703. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2701. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator

positions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) For the 1-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, no funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any purpose to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, or to any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics.

(b) 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.

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for—

(1) any activity to implement the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that involves waiving, suspending, or terminating sanctions imposed with respect to Iran, or

(2) any assessed contribution of the United States to the United Nations,

until the President transmits to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, in accordance with section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 2160e) an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, any other agreement entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related to either such agreement, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to such agreements or to be entered into or implemented in the future.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership'' has the meaning given that term in section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (22 U.S.C. 2160e).

(2) The term ''Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action'' means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy.

SA 2702. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. END GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWNS ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''End Government Shutdowns Act''.

(b) AUTOMATIC CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1310 the following new section:

''SEC. 1311. CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a)(1) If any appropriation measure for a fiscal year is not enacted before the beginning of such fiscal year or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations is not in effect, there are appropriated such sums as may be necessary to continue any program, project, or activity for which funds were provided in the preceding fiscal year—

''(A) in the corresponding appropriation Act for such preceding fiscal year; or

''(B) if the corresponding appropriation bill for such preceding fiscal year did not become law, then in a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for such preceding fiscal year.

''(2)(A) Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be at a rate of operations not in excess of the lower of—

''(i) 100 percent of the rate of operations provided for in the regular appropriation Act providing for such program, project, or activity for the preceding fiscal year;

''(ii) in the absence of such an Act, 100 percent of the rate of operations provided for such program, project, or activity pursuant to a joint resolution making continuing appropriations for such preceding fiscal year; or

''(iii) 100 percent of the annualized rate of operations provided for in the most recently enacted joint resolution making continuing appropriations for part of that fiscal year or any funding levels established under the provisions of this Act;

for the period of 120 days. After the first 120-day period during which this subsection is in effect for that fiscal year, the applicable rate of operations shall be reduced by 1 percentage point. For each subsequent 90-day period during which this subsection is in effect for that fiscal year, the applicable rate of operations shall be reduced by 1 percentage point. The 90-day period reductions shall extend beyond the last day of that fiscal year.

''(B) If this section is in effect at the end of a fiscal year, funding levels shall continue as provided in this section for the next fiscal year.

''(3) Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for any fiscal year pursuant to this section for a program, project, or activity shall be available for the period beginning with the first day of a lapse in appropriations and ending with the date on which the applicable regular appropriation bill for such fiscal year becomes law (whether or not such law provides for such program, project, or activity) or a continuing resolution making appropriations becomes law, as the case may be.

''(b) An appropriation or funds made available, or authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be subject to the terms and conditions imposed with respect to the appropriation made or funds made available for the preceding fiscal year, or authority granted for such program, project, or activity under current law.

''(c) Expenditures made for a program, project, or activity for any fiscal year pursuant to this section shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a regular appropriation bill or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations until the end of a fiscal year providing for such program, project, or activity for such period becomes law.

''(d) This section shall not apply to a program, project, or activity during a fiscal year if any other provision of law (other than an authorization of appropriations)—

''(1) makes an appropriation, makes funds available, or grants authority for such program, project, or activity to continue for such period; or

''(2) specifically provides that no appropriation shall be made, no funds shall be made available, or no authority shall be granted for such program, project, or activity to continue for such period.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections of chapter 13 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1310 the following new item:

''1311. Continuing appropriations.''.

SA 2703. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2689 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. NO BUDGET NO PAY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''No Budget, No Pay Act''.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''Member of Congress''—

(1) has the meaning given under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

(c) TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

(d) NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be appropriated or otherwise be made available from the Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e).

(2) NO RETROACTIVE PAY.—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under subsection (e), at any time after the end of that period.

(e) DETERMINATIONS.—

(1) SENATE.—

(A) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under clause (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Senators may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(2) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(A) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (B).

(B) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(i) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with subsection (c) and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that subsection;

(ii) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under subsection (c); and

(iii) provide timely certification of the determinations under clauses (i) and (ii) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on February 1, 2017.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 28, 2015, at 5 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Migration Crisis in Middle East/Europe.''

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

IMPROVING ACCESS TO EMERGENCY PSYCHIATRIC CARE ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 180, S. 599.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 599) to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Improving Access to Emergency Psychiatric Care Act''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF MEDICAID EMERGENCY PSYCHIATRIC DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (d) of section 2707 of Public Law 111–148 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended to read as follows:

''(d) LENGTH OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), the demonstration project established under this section shall be conducted for a period of 3 consecutive years.

''(2) TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PARTICIPATION ELIGIBILITY FOR SELECTED STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B) and paragraph (4), a State selected as an eligible State to participate in the demonstration project on or prior to March 13, 2012, shall, upon the request of the State, be permitted to continue to participate in the demonstration project through September 30, 2016, if—

''(i) the Secretary determines that the continued participation of the State in the demonstration project is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act; and

''(ii) the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that such extension for that State is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(B) NOTICE OF PROJECTIONS.—The Secretary shall provide each State selected to participate in the demonstration project on or prior to March 13, 2012, with notice of the determination and certification made under subparagraph (A) for the State.

''(3) EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—

''(A) ADDITIONAL EXTENSION.—Taking into account the recommendations submitted to Congress under subsection (f)(3), the Secretary may permit an eligible State participating in the demonstration project as of the date such recommendations are submitted to continue to participate in the project through December 31, 2019, if, with respect to the State—

''(i) the Secretary determines that the continued participation of the State in the demonstration project is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act; and

''(ii) the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that the continued participation of the State in the demonstration project is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(B) OPTION FOR EXPANSION TO ADDITIONAL STATES.—Taking into account the recommendations submitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (f)(3), the Secretary may expand the number of eligible States participating in the demonstration project through December 31, 2019, if, with respect to any new eligible State—

''(i) the Secretary determines that the participation of the State in the demonstration project is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act; and

''(ii) the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services certifies that the participation of the State in the demonstration project is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(C) NOTICE OF PROJECTIONS.—The Secretary shall provide each State participating in the demonstration project as of the date the Secretary submits recommendations to Congress under subsection (f)(3), and any additional State that applies to be added to the demonstration project, with notice of the determination and certification made for the State under subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and the standards used to make such determination and certification—

''(i) in the case of a State participating in the demonstration project as of the date the Secretary submits recommendations to Congress under subsection (f)(3), not later than August 31, 2016; and

''(ii) in the case of an additional State that applies to be added to the demonstration project, prior to the State making a final election to participate in the project.

''(4) AUTHORITY TO ENSURE BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—The Secretary annually shall review each participating State's demonstration project expenditures to ensure compliance with the requirements of paragraphs (2)(A)(i), (2)(A)(ii), (3)(A)(i), (3)(A)(ii), (3)(B)(i), and (3)(B)(ii) (as applicable). If the Secretary determines with respect to a State's participation in the demonstration project that the State's net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act has increased as a result of the State's participation in the project, the Secretary shall treat the demonstration project excess expenditures of the State as an overpayment under title XIX of the Social Security Act.''.

(b) FUNDING.—Subsection (e) of section 2707 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking ''LIMITATIONS ON FEDERAL'';

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''5-YEAR''; and

(B) by striking ''through December 31, 2015'' and inserting ''until expended'';

(3) by striking paragraph (3);

(4) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively;

(5) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by striking ''and the availability of funds'' and inserting ''(other than States deemed to be eligible States through the application of subsection (c)(4))''; and

(6) in paragraph (4) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in the first sentence—

(i) by inserting ''(other than a State deemed to be an eligible State through the application of subsection (c)(4))'' after ''eligible State''; and

(ii) by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (3)''; and

(B) by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''In addition to any payments made to an eligible State under the preceding sentence, the Secretary shall, during any period in effect under paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d), or during any period in which a law described in subsection (f)(4)(C) is in effect, pay each eligible State (including any State deemed to be an eligible State through the application of subsection (c)(4)), an amount each quarter equal to the Federal medical assistance percentage of expenditures in the quarter during such period for medical assistance described in subsection (a). Payments made to a State for emergency psychiatric demonstration services under this section during the extension period shall be treated as medical assistance under the State plan for purposes of section 1903(a)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396b(a)(1)).''.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS.—Subsection (f) of section 2707 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) RECOMMENDATION TO CONGRESS REGARDING EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF PROJECT.—Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available to the public recommendations based on an evaluation of the demonstration project, including the use of appropriate quality measures, regarding—

''(A) whether the demonstration project should be continued after September 30, 2016; and

''(B) whether the demonstration project should be expanded to additional States.

''(4) RECOMMENDATION TO CONGRESS REGARDING PERMANENT EXTENSION AND NATIONWIDE EXPANSION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1, 2019, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and make available to the public recommendations based on an evaluation of the demonstration project, including the use of appropriate quality measures, regarding—

''(i) whether the demonstration project should be permanently continued after December 31, 2019, in 1 or more States; and

''(ii) whether the demonstration project should be expanded (including on a nationwide basis).

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Any recommendation submitted under subparagraph (A) to permanently continue the project in a State, or to expand the project to 1 or more other States (including on a nationwide basis) shall include a certification from the Chief Actuary of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services that permanently continuing the project in a particular State, or expanding the project to a particular State (or all States) is projected not to increase net program spending under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(C) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL REQUIRED.—The Secretary shall not permanently continue the demonstration project in any State after December 31, 2019, or expand the demonstration project to any additional State after December 31, 2019, unless Congress enacts a law approving either or both such actions and the law includes provisions that—

''(i) ensure that each State's participation in the project complies with budget neutrality requirements; and

''(ii) require the Secretary to treat any expenditures of a State participating in the demonstration project that are excess of the expenditures projected under the budget neutrality standard for the State as an overpayment under title XIX of the Social Security Act.

''(5) FUNDING.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, there is appropriated to the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services Program Management Account to carry out this subsection, $100,000 for fiscal year 2015, to remain available until expended.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2707 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the matter before paragraph (1), by inserting ''publicly or'' after ''institution for mental diseases that is'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''An eligible State'' and inserting ''Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (4), an eligible State'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''A State shall'' and inserting ''Except as otherwise provided in paragraph (4), a State shall''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) NATIONWIDE AVAILABILITY.—In the event that the Secretary makes a recommendation pursuant to subsection (f)(4) that the demonstration project be expanded on a national basis, any State that has submitted or submits an application pursuant to paragraph (2) shall be deemed to have been selected to be an eligible State to participate in the demonstration project.''; and

(3) in the heading for subsection (f), by striking ''AND REPORT'' and inserting '', REPORT, AND RECOMMENDATIONS''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 599), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 271, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 271) recognizing the 100th anniversary of Dinosaur National Monument and designating October 4, 2015, as ''Dinosaur National Monument Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 271) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2089

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2089) to provide for investment in clean energy, to empower and protect consumers, to modernize energy infrastructure, to cut pollution and waste, to invest in research and development, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAINES. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 2015

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Tuesday, September 29; 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 resume consideration of the message to accompany H.R. 719 postcloture; further, that all time during the recess or adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on the motion to concur with amendment No. 2689; 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. DAINES. 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 7:28 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 29, 2015, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 28, 2015:

IN THE COAST GUARD

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF BRIAN J. MAGGI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

COAST GUARD NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANNA W. HICKEY AND ENDING WITH KIMBERLY C. YOUNG–MCLEAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 21, 2015.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF KYLE J. WELD, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATHLEEN E. AKERS AND ENDING WITH SAIPRASAD M. ZEMSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL R. BREZINSKI AND ENDING WITH THOMAS E. WILLIFORD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DWAYNE A. BACA AND ENDING WITH LIANA LUCAS VOGEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RENI B. ANGELOVA AND ENDING WITH GRANT W. WISNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID R. ALANIZ AND ENDING WITH DEVON L. WENTZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN M. GOOCH, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF HERMAN W. DYKES, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN S. ACKISS AND ENDING WITH D012659, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL H. ADORJAN AND ENDING WITH G010310, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW T. ADAMCZYK AND ENDING WITH D012593, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF GREGORY I. KELTS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN H. COOPER AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. WORTMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LESLEY A. WATTS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KIRBY R. GROSS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FRANCHESCA M. DESRIVIERE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JERRY L. TOLBERT, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER R. FORSYTHE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF FRANCIS G. MARESCO, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID S. ABRAHAMS AND ENDING WITH D012627, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHANIE R. AHERN AND ENDING WITH G010384, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH D011026, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NEIL I. NELSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN J. BIGELOW, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ENRIQUE R. ASUNCION AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY J. SAXON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN J. AUGER AND ENDING WITH CHESTER J. WYCKOFF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARA M. ADDISON AND ENDING WITH JOEL A. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH OLUWAFADEKEMI N. ADEWETAN AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN I. WATSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FREDERIC ALBESA AND ENDING WITH FRANZ J. YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARICAR S. ABERIN AND ENDING WITH CARDIA M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES P. ADWELL AND ENDING WITH MARESA C. J. ZENNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD R. ABITRIA AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. ZELINSKAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MICHELLE D. CARTER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF REGINE REIMERS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JOEL V. FINNY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ERNEST C. LEE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NATALIA C. HENRIQUEZ, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WHITNEY A. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH BETHANY R. ZMITROVICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA K. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL L. ZUEHLKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER M. BADE AND ENDING WITH CASSANDRA M. SISTI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMIE P. DRAGE AND ENDING WITH RICHARD M. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON M. BAUMAN AND ENDING WITH MARK A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA A. AISEN AND ENDING WITH SCOTT M. THORNBURY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD S. CHERNITZER AND ENDING WITH BETH A. TEACH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS A. DENISON AND ENDING WITH THEODORE J. STOW, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRAVIS C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ANTONIO ZUBIA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL K. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JERRY W. WYRICK II, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH AND ENDING WITH RICHARD S. ZIBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GILBERT R. BAUGHN AND ENDING WITH SERGIO B. WOODEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY A. GRUBBS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.