

In closing, I want to again extend my appreciation to Senators CORNYN and LEAHY for their hard work on this measure, which our Judiciary Committee reported last month and congratulate them on Senate passage of the Justice for All Reauthorization Act of 2016.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMPREHENSIVE ADDICTION AND RECOVERY ACT OF 2016

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying S. 524.

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

Resolved, That the House insist upon its amendments to the bill (S. 524) entitled "An Act to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use," and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators GRASSLEY, ALEXANDER, HATCH, SESSIONS, LEAHY, MURRAY, and WYDEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is now pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to disagree to the House amendments, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators Grassley, Alexander, Hatch, Sessions, Leahy, Murray, and Wyden with respect to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, and to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni

Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXVIII, there will now be up to 2 hours of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I wish to start by commending the majority leader who just came to the floor and offered a motion to go to conference on CARA, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016. This is an incredibly important piece of legislation because it will allow the U.S. Congress to be a better partner in fighting against this heroin and prescription drug epidemic that is seizing our communities.

This is a big step today because it says we are going to send a few Senators over to work with the House to come up with a consensus bill between CARA, which passed in this body on March 10, by the way, by a 94-to-1 vote. That never happens around here, and it happened because after 2½ weeks of debate on the floor, everybody realized this is an issue that had to be addressed and that the legislation we came up with was the sensible and responsible way to do it.

It was legislation we developed over a 3-year period. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I were the leads on it. We had five conferences here in Washington, bringing experts in from around the country. We took the best ideas, regardless of where they came from, and came up with a way to deal with the prevention and education aspect of this, to prevent people from getting into the funnel of addiction in the first place, but then, for those who are addicted, to treat addiction like the disease that it is, to get them into the treatment and recovery services that they need, as well as to help our law enforcement; specifically, to help our law enforcement with regard to Narcan, which is naloxone, which helps to stop the overdose deaths. We also help to get prescription drugs off of people's shelves and to avoid this issue of people getting into the issue of opioid addiction, sometimes inadvertently, through prescription drug overprescribing.

This is a bill that actually addresses the problem in a responsible way. It is comprehensive.

The House then passed its own legislation. They passed 18 separate bills, smaller bills, not as comprehensive but which included some good ideas that were not in the Senate bill; one, for instance, raising the cap on doctors who are treating people with Suboxone. Some of those ideas should be incorporated as well, but the point is, we have to move and move quickly.

If we think about this, since the Senate passed its legislation, which was on March 10, we have unfortunately seen roughly 129 people a day lose their lives to overdoses. So many thousands of Americans have lost their lives even

since March 10. This legislation takes the right step to address that problem and not to address just those who have overdosed and died but those who are casualties of this epidemic, who have therefore lost their job, lost their family, lost their ability to be able to function.

As I talk to recovering addicts around my State of Ohio, I hear the same thing again and again: The drugs become everything, and this does cause families to be torn apart. It does cause crime. When I talk to prosecutors in my State, they tell me that most of the crime—in one county, recently a county prosecutor told me that 80 percent of the crime is due to this heroin and prescription drug epidemic. So this is one we must address for so many reasons, and we must address it right away.

I am pleased we are finally appointing conferees. I hope the other side will not consider blocking this because we need to move on with this to get this legislation to the President's desk. We have been talking with the House about their legislation that was passed subsequent to our legislation and talking about how to make some of these compromises to be able to come up with a consensus bill. I think we are very close. Again, I think there are some ideas in the House bill we should incorporate, and I think there are some ideas in the Senate bill that must be included in the House bill that are not included now. I think one is with regard to recovery services.

We know that the best evidence-based treatment and recovery can make a difference in turning people's lives around, and therefore we do support recovery services. For those in the field, they will tell us it is not just about the medication-assisted treatment, it is that longer term recovery that creates the success we are all looking for.

Then, on the prevention side, we have focused more specifically on a national awareness campaign to get people again focused on this issue of the link between prescription drugs and the dangers there that are narcotic prescription drugs and the opioid addiction issue. I can't tell you how sad it is to talk to parents back home who have lost a child because that child started on prescription drugs. In two cases, I can tell you about parents who have come to talk to me—one testified at a hearing that we had back in Cleveland, OH—two cases where the teenager went in to get a wisdom tooth extracted and was given painkillers—prescription drugs—and from that became addicted and from that went to heroin and from that, sadly, had an overdose and died.

So I think this awareness is incredibly important because most people don't realize that four out of five heroin addicts in Ohio started on prescription drugs. That awareness alone will save so many lives and create the opportunity for us to keep people out of that funnel of addiction in the first

place. The grip of addiction is so strong that once you are in it, it is a huge challenge, but it is one that can be overcome, again with the right kind of treatment and the right kind of recovery.

Again, I am pleased that the majority leader came to the floor today to actually begin this process of the formal conference, to get this bill to the President's desk and, more importantly, to get this bill out to our communities so it can begin to help and it can begin to turn the tide.

It is not getting better. I wish I could say it was. When I talk to people who are staffing the hotlines back home, they tell me, unfortunately, there are more calls coming in. When I talk to people in our hospitals, they tell me, unfortunately, there are more babies born with addiction who are showing up in neonatal units. There has been a 750-percent increase in my State of Ohio in babies born with addiction just in the last dozen years.

Unfortunately, when I talk to people about the emergency room—I talked to an emergency room nurse last weekend when I was in Cleveland. I was at a festival talking to people, and an emergency room nurse came up to me. I heard the same thing I have heard many times, which is you have to do something about this issue. More and more people are coming to our emergency rooms seeking help.

Of course, it is creating an issue in terms of jobs and employment because people who are addicted often are not able to work, cannot hold down a job, and cannot pass a drug test. So it is affecting our economy in so many ways, and of course affecting our families. Ultimately, it is about individuals not being able to pursue their God-given purpose in life because these drugs are getting them off track.

CARA passed in the Senate by a 94-to-1 vote, as I said. So there is common ground here among Republicans and Democrats alike. This is not a partisan issue. It never has been. From the start, over the last few years we have worked together. In fact, we worked with the House, not just bipartisan but bicameral, and put together legislation both Chambers could support. There were about 129 House Members who were cosponsors of the legislation that passed the Senate. Initially, we took ideas from the House and the Senate, and this is why I am a little frustrated, frankly, that we haven't made more progress already. Now is the time to move. Let's get this done before July 4. Let's get it done next week. Let's get it to the President and to our communities. There is no reason for us to wait. With this step today, of the formal naming of the conferees, there is no reason for us not to move forward with this and move forward with it in a way that shows we can work together as a House and Senate to solve these problems.

Some have said: Well, there might be some other ideas that will come up.

That is fine. I hope there will be lots of new ideas that will come up because there is no silver bullet, but we know this legislation will help. We know it is comprehensive. We know it is well-thought-out. We know it is based on best practices. Let's move forward with this now because it is urgent.

One American every 12 minutes loses his or her life to overdoses. Since CARA passed, this means more than 11,000 Americans have died of overdoses. So since March 10, when this legislation passed on the Senate floor, 11,000 Americans lost their lives. Again, it doesn't include the hundreds of thousands more who are affected in some fundamental ways.

People back home get this. When I was on a tele-townhall meeting recently, one of my constituents called in, and he started talking about the CARA legislation and the importance of more funding for evidence-based treatment that works. There was something about the way he was describing it, and I could tell this was personal. So I said: Sir, can you tell us why you know so much about this and why you are so interested?

There was a pause. I knew what was coming because I heard it too many times before. He explained that he had lost his daughter. She had been in and out of treatment programs, and relapsed. She had been in prison and out. She had finally decided that she was ready, that she wanted to accept a treatment program to be able to turn her life around. She was in a position to do so. They took her to a treatment center to get treatment, and there was a waiting list. During the time she was on that waiting list—I believe it was 14 days—was when they found her. She had overdosed. His point was very simple. You can imagine the emotion on the call.

His point was very simple. When someone is ready to seek treatment, we need to have treatment available for them. We are told that eight out of ten heroin addicts—nine out of ten overall—are not seeking treatment who need it. Some of that is because of the stigma associated with addiction. We need to wipe that stigma away to get people into treatment. Some of it is because there is not the availability of treatment in some parts of Ohio. In some parts of Ohio, in some of our rural areas, there literally is no effective treatment available. In other areas, in some of our urban areas, where there is good treatment available and some amazing places that are doing incredible work, they do have a waiting list at some of them. We also have a waiting list with regard to some of the longer term recovery centers and residential centers in Ohio. That again is helped by this legislation. We also have difficulty with some of our detox centers in some areas of Ohio. There is not enough room in the detox center so the police don't know where to take people to get them started in this process.

We hear stories constantly back home in Ohio about this issue because, sadly, we are one of the States that is hardest hit. We are in the top five in the country in overdoses, and in fentanyl overdoses we may be No. 1. Fentanyl, by the way, is a synthetic form of heroin.

People ask: Is it about prescription drugs or heroin? It is about the drugs. If it is not heroin, it may be fentanyl. If it is not fentanyl, next year it may be something else. It may go back to methamphetamines. It may be about cocaine. It is about the drugs, and we can't take our eye off of this issue because when we think we solve one problem another problem will crop up.

Fentanyl is produced synthetically. It is usually in the mail, and it is mailed mostly from Ohio. From our experience, it is coming from China to the United States. It is made by chemists who don't care about our kids or our citizens, because they are making this deadly poison. Sometimes it is mixed with heroin. Sometimes it is put into a pill form to try to indicate that it might be a prescription drug pill that people might think is more safe, which it is obviously not. This fentanyl is causing more deaths in my hometown of Cincinnati and Cleveland, OH, than heroin these days.

We hear stories such as the story of Nicholas Dicillo of Cleveland, OH. Nicholas was a bright young man, a gifted musician. He had a full scholarship to Northwestern University. His father died of a heroin overdose when he was a child. Two decades later, sadly, Nick became a heroin addict himself after experimenting with it with some friends. It was an experiment, and he got addicted. I hope people who are listening today understand this is something that cannot be played with. You are playing with fire.

He soon realized that he had made a tragic mistake. He said: "Heroin took me to the depths of hell." That was his quote.

Then his mother Celeste died of a heroin overdose in January. Nicholas was the one who found her body. That heartbreaking experience motivated Nick to get clean. He made a promise to himself that he would not suffer that same fate, the fate of both of his parents. After his mother died, he was homeless. He tried quitting cold turkey. That didn't work. He wasn't able to do it. Most heroin prescription drug addicts are not. He sought help, he sought treatment, and he was clean for 2 months.

I am just starting to like myself again. I have a whole lot more life to live. I have a whole lot more I want to do. I don't want to become another statistic.

But then, sadly, he relapsed. He overdosed. He was found dead with a needle in his arm on May 4 in west Cleveland, OH. Memorial services are being held for him in Cleveland this week.

That is what is happening in northeast Ohio. In southwest Ohio, a woman

arrested by the Cincinnati Police pled guilty last week to repeatedly trafficking her own 11-year-old daughter to her 42-year-old drug dealer in exchange for heroin. Sadly, she even gave this girl—her 11-year-old daughter—heroin.

You get the picture. This is not in one ZIP Code. This is not in one community. It knows no ZIP Code. It is in our rural areas, in our suburban areas, and in our inner cities. It is affecting every person regardless of their station in life, regardless of their background. No one is immune from it, and no one is unaffected by it. Ohioans know this is happening and they are taking action. That is positive. Terri Thompson, of Bluffton, OH, has founded a group called Ohio Moms Against Heroin, and I commend her for it. She has seven kids, by the way, and five of them have been addicted to heroin at one point or another over the past 20 years. They are from a middle-class Ohio home. One son went to prison. Over the next year, 12 of his peers died of heroin overdoses. Terri's youngest daughter—a cheerleader, a soccer player, and a talented piano player—made the mistake of trying heroin with her boyfriend. She became addicted. One of her brothers who got treatment and is now leading a productive life, is a small business owner. He encouraged her to get treatment, too, as he had gotten. She did, and now she is living a sober, clean, and a productive life.

Seven hundred Ohio moms have now joined Terri's group. We already know they have been saving people. They tell me a story about one woman who contacted the group when she needed treatment. Terri personally picked her up and drove her to detox and the woman has been clean for 3 months and is now back on track. On June 18, Terri and dozens of other moms will be rallying and marching in Findlay, OH, to educate people that addiction is a disease and it needs to be treated. Again, I commend her. I want to thank Terri and all those involved in this body. She is a brave woman who is channeling her grief toward something constructive, and that is helping others to avoid this disease.

In my hometown of Cincinnati, the Center for Addiction Treatment, also known as the CAT House, has announced a \$5.7 million capital campaign to construct a new 17,000-square foot building to address the opioid epidemic. This will triple their capacity to be able to treat more patients. They will be able to treat about 6,000 patients. They do great work, and they have had great success. Construction has already begun. It is expected to be completed within a year.

I want to thank everyone who has made that possible, including the folks at the CAT House, but also the State of Ohio, the city of Cincinnati, the Deaconess Health Associations Foundation, and Bethesda, Inc.

The University of Cincinnati former law school dean emeritus, Joe Tomain,

who is a friend of mine, has been speaking out about this epidemic, writing in the Cincinnati Enquirer: "There is no more urgent need in our community than to address this drug scourge." I think he is right. I want to thank him for doing his part in helping to lend his voice to those who don't have a voice.

I know the scope of this epidemic can sometimes feel overwhelming. I know the way we talked about it today, it has to be frustrating to everybody hearing it. What are the solutions? How can we get at this? But we know there is hope. We know that prevention can work. It is the right kind of prevention, if it is focused and targeted. We know that treatment and recovery can work. I have given you examples of that. Again, it has to be evidence-based. It has to be stuff that we are funding here because it works, not because we want to throw more money at a problem.

Reggie Gant, of Columbus, OH, was a married father of three who had a good job working at a paint company. He tore his rotator cuff. He was in pain. His doctor prescribed Percocet for his pain. He became addicted. When his doctor stopped filling the prescription, he started buying off of other people in the doctor's waiting room. When the pills weren't available or were too expensive, which is often the problem for these prescription drug addicts who turn to heroin, he switched to heroin. It was less expensive. It was more available. He was trapped in the funnel of addiction, and the drug became everything. He lost his relationship with his wife and his kids. He started stealing from his workplace. "I did things I never thought I would do in a million years," he said.

As I said earlier, the drugs are everything. But he got treatment, spending 40 days at an inpatient facility. He has been clean for 6 months. He is getting help from the Lima Urban Minority Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Outreach Program. He is beating this because he was able to step forward and get into treatment. It was there for him. People can beat this, and they do every day.

Experts tell us 9 out of 10 of those who need treatment aren't getting it. As I said earlier, some of that is because of the stigma, and some of that is because of lack of access to facilities in their communities. This House effort that was undertaken with 18 separate bills combined with the Senate bill, the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, will make a difference. It will provide more help to the type of treatment programs and recovery efforts that actually work.

If we can get this comprehensive bill to the President, we can help more people who are struggling to get treatment. We can help give them more hope. It is time to act and act quickly to find common ground before we lose more of our fellow Americans. Let's get this comprehensive bill into law and begin to help those millions of our fellow citizens who are struggling with this epidemic.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield back my time.

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

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

RADICAL ISLAMIC TERRORISM

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, our Nation is at war. Five days ago, we saw a horrific terror attack in Orlando, FL. From September 11 to the Boston Marathon, from San Bernardino to this attack in Orlando, radical Islamic terrorism has declared jihad on America. As the facts have unfolded, they now indicate that the Orlando terrorist had pledged his allegiance to ISIS in the process of murdering 49 and wounding more than 50 at a nightclub.

All of our hearts go out to those who were murdered. To the families of those who were victims and who are grieving, we stand in solidarity, we lift them up in prayer at this horrific act of terrorism. But it is also a time for action. We need a Commander in Chief who will speak the truth, who will address the enemy we face, who will unleash the full force and fury of the American military on defeating ISIS and defeating radical Islamic terrorists.

In the wake of the attack, many of us predicted what would unfold, and it was, sadly, the same political tale we have seen over and over again. Many of us predicted that Democrats would, as a matter of rigid partisan ideology, refuse even to say the words "radical Islamic terrorist"; that they would suggest this attack was yet another isolated incident, one lone criminal, not connected to any global ideology, not connected to any global jihad; and that, even worse, they would try to use it as an excuse to go after the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. I wish, when we predicted that, that we had been proven incorrect. But this week played out all too predictably.

Yesterday we saw a political show on the Senate floor, with Democrat after Democrat standing for hours, incensed not at ISIS, incensed not at radical Islamic terrorism, but incensed that Americans have a right to keep and bear arms. This is political distraction. This is political gamesmanship. I think the American people find it ridiculous that in response to an ISIS terror attack, the Democrats go on high dudgeon that we have to restrict the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. This is not a gun control issue. This is a terrorism issue. And it is nothing less than political gamesmanship for them to try to shift to their favorite hobbyhorse of taking away the Bill of Rights from law-abiding citizens.

I have spent years defending the Second Amendment—the right to keep and bear arms—the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights, and I, along with the Presiding Officer, along with a great many Members of this Chamber, am committed to defending the constitutional rights of every American. You don't defeat terrorism by taking away our guns; you defeat terrorism by using our guns. This body should not be engaged in a political circus trying to restrict the Second Amendment. Instead, we should be focusing on the problem at hand.

Why did we see yesterday's series of speeches? Because Senate Democrats have an election coming up in November, and they don't want to talk about the real issue. Let's talk about ISIS. Let's talk about radical Islamic terrorism. Let's talk about the failures of the last 7 years of this administration to keep this country safe.

In response to my criticism and that of many others, President Obama gave a press conference where he said, echoing the words of Hillary Clinton: What difference does it make if we call it radical Islamic terrorism? Well, Mr. President, it makes a world of difference because the failure to address the enemy impacts every action taken to fight that enemy.

I want to talk in particular about three areas where this administration and the Senate Democrats' refusal to confront radical Islamic terrorism has made America less safe and what we need to do about it. Let's start with prevention. Over and over again we have seen the Obama administration having ample information to stop a terrorist attack. Yet, because of the political correctness, because of the ideology of this administration that will not even say the word "jihad," will not even say the words "radical Islamic terrorism," they look the other way, and the attacks go forward.

In my home State of Texas, Fort Hood, Nidal Hasan—the Obama administration knew that Nidal Hasan had been in communication with the radical Islamic cleric Anwar al-Awlaki. The Obama administration knew that Nidal Hasan had asked al-Awlaki about the permissibility of waging jihad against his fellow soldiers. All of that was known beforehand, yet they did nothing. They did nothing. And on that fateful day, Nidal Hasan murdered 14 innocent souls, yelling "Allahu Akbar" as he pulled the trigger. Yet, just to underscore the blindness of this administration even after the terror attack, the administration insisted on characterizing that terror attack as "workplace violence." That is nothing short of delusion, and it is a delusion that cost 14 lives.

If we know of a U.S. servicemember who is communicating with a radical Islamic cleric and asking about waging jihad against his fellow soldiers, MPs should show up at that individual's door within minutes. And if we didn't have an administration that plunged

its head in the sand like an ostrich and refused to acknowledge radical Islamic terrorism, Nidal Hasan would have been stopped before he carried out that horrific act of terrorism.

Likewise, with the Boston bombing and the Tsarnaev brothers, Russia had informed the Obama administration they were connected with radical Islamic terrorism. We knew that. The FBI had gone and interviewed them. Yet, once again, they dropped the ball. They stopped monitoring them. They didn't even note when the elder Tsarnaev brother posted on YouTube a public call to jihad. Mind you, this did not require complicated surveillance. This was YouTube. Anyone with a computer who could type in "Google" could see this. Yet, because the administration will not acknowledge that we are fighting radical Islamic terrorism, they were not watching and monitoring the Tsarnaev brothers. So they called for public jihad and then carried out that public jihad with pressure cookers at the Boston Marathon—yet another example where we knew about the individual beforehand, and if we had focused prevention on the problem, we could have stopped it.

A third example was San Bernardino, that horrific terror attack. Once again, we had ample information about the individuals in question. The female terrorist who came to San Bernardino had given the administration a fake address in Pakistan. Yet the so-called vetting that this administration tells us they do had failed to discover that it was a fake address. She had made calls for jihad; yet the administration failed to discover that. In San Bernardino, we saw yet another horrific terror attack.

And how about Orlando? Let's talk about what the facts are in Orlando. Now, we are only 5 days in. The facts will develop further as they are more fully developed, but here is what has been publicly reported.

What has been publicly reported is that Omar Mateen was interviewed not once, not twice, but three times by the FBI in 2013 and 2014. One of the reasons he was interviewed by the FBI was that he was talking in his place of employment, which, ironically and shockingly enough, was a contractor to the Department of Homeland Security, and he was talking about being connected to terrorist organizations, including the Boston bombers. To any rational person, that is a big red flag. Yet it has also been reported that his coworkers were so afraid to say anything because they didn't want to be labeled as somehow anti-Muslim by speaking out about someone claiming to be connected to radical Islamic terrorists.

We also know that when he was questioned by the FBI in 2004, according to public reports, it was because he was believed to have been connected to and knew Moner Mohammad Abusalha, who traveled to Syria to join the terrorist organization al-Nusra Front and who became the first known American suicide bomber in the Syrian conflict.

That is yet another big red flag. If you are palling around with al-Nusra suicide bombers, that ought to be a real flag. If the administration is focused on radical Islamic terrorism, this is an individual we ought to be watching.

We know that Mateen, as it has been reported, traveled to Mecca in Saudi Arabia for 10 days on March 2011 and for 8 days in March 2012. And we also have indications that the FBI may have been aware that he was a follower of the Islamist educational Web site run by radical Imams. Not only that, but his father has posted online videos expressing not only sympathy but arguably support for the Taliban. All of that is what the Obama administration knew. Yet by Sunday morning they were no longer watching Omar Mateen. They were no longer watching Omar Mateen. They were not monitoring him, and he was able to go in and commit a horrific act of murder.

The question that every Member of this body should be asking is, Why is the ball being dropped over and over and over again? It is not once. It is not twice. It is a pattern. It is a pattern of failing to connect the dots. I would suggest it is directly connected to President Obama and this administration's refusal to acknowledge what it is we are fighting. If you direct the prevention efforts to stopping radical Islamic terrorism—we had all the information we had on Mateen to keep a very close eye on him. Yet if that is not what you are fighting, then you close the investigation and yet another attack goes forward.

I would suggest that this willful blindness is one of the reasons we saw the circus yesterday on the Senate floor. Senate Democrats should be asking these questions, yet we don't hear them asking those questions. Instead, they want to shift this to gun control. They want to shift this to putting the Federal Government in charge of approving every firearms transaction between law-abiding citizens in America. Mind you, that would not have prevented this attack. Mind you, it was not directed at the evil of this attack. Mind you, it ignores the global jihad we are facing, but it is a convenient political dodge. We need serious leadership focused on keeping this country safe.

A second component of keeping this country safe is defeating ISIS—utterly and completely defeating ISIS.

In yesterday's circus, when calling for taking away your and my constitutional rights, how often did Senate Democrats say: Let's utterly destroy ISIS. Not with the pinprick attacks we are seeing, not with the photo-op foreign policy of this administration—a failed effort that leaves the terrorists laughing at us—but instead, using overwhelming airpower; instead, using the concerted power of the U.S. military, with rules of engagement that allow us to fight and win. Right now, sending our service men and women into combat with rules of engagement

tying their hands behind their backs is wrong, it is immoral, and it is not accomplishing the task.

Do you want a response to the Orlando attacks? President Obama and Vice President BIDEN are going down. They will no doubt give a self-righteous speech about gun control, trying to strip away the rights of law-abiding Americans. How about they stand up and have the President pledge that ISIS will be driven from the face of the Earth? Do you want to see a response to murdering innocent Americans? If you declare war on America, you are signing your death warrant. That is the response of a Commander in Chief. That is the seriousness we need.

A third component of focusing on the enemy is that we should focus on keeping us safe—in particular, passing two pieces of legislation, both of which I introduced, the first of which is the Expatriate Terrorist Act. This is legislation which provides that if any American citizen goes and takes up arms and joins ISIS, joins a radical Islamic terrorist group, that he or she forfeits their U.S. citizenship. So you do not have American citizens coming back to America with U.S. passports to wage jihad on America. We have seen Americans such as Jose Padilla, Anwar al-Awlaki, and Faisal Shahzad, just to name a few, who have abandoned their country and joined with the terrorists in waging war against us. Just this week, the CIA Director testified to the Senate that more are coming; ISIS intends to send individuals back here to wage jihad.

Rather than engaging in political showmanship, trying to gain partisan advantage in the November election, how about we come together and say: If you join ISIS, you are not using a U.S. passport to come back here and murder American citizens. That ought to be a unanimous agreement if we were focused on keeping this country safe.

Likewise, let's talk about the problem of refugees. What are the consequences of the willful blindness of this administration that President Obama, in the face of this terror attack, says that he will admit some 10,000 Syrian Muslim refugees, despite the fact that the FBI Director has told Congress he cannot possibly vet them to determine if they are terrorists?

Here is what FBI Director Comey said:

We can only query against that which we have collected. And so if someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing to show up because we have no record of them.

This is an FBI Director who was appointed by President Obama who is telling the administration they cannot vet these refugees. Yet what does the administration say? What does Hillary Clinton say? What do the Senate Democrats say? Let the refugees in, even though ISIS is telling us they are

going to use those refugees to send terrorists here to come and murder us. This transcends mere partisan disagreement; this is lunacy.

We know the Paris attack was carried out in part by people who came in using the refugee program, taking advantage of the refugee program. Indeed, earlier this year, on January 6, 2016, Omar Faraj Saeed Al Hardan, a Palestinian born in Iraq who entered the United States as a refugee in 2009, was charged with attempting to provide support to ISIS. He wanted to set off bombs using cell phone detonators at two malls in my hometown of Houston, TX. This is a refugee who came from Iraq. Yet, do you hear the administration saying: This is a dangerous world. Jihadists are attempting to kill us. We have to keep us safe. They don't say that.

The legislation I have introduced, which I would urge this body to take up, would impose a 3-year moratorium on refugees coming from any nation where ISIS or Al Qaeda or radical Islamic terrorists control a substantial portion of the territory. We can help with humanitarian efforts. We can help resettling refugees in majority Muslim countries in the Middle East. America is a compassionate country that has given more than 10 times as much money as any country on Earth to caring for refugees. But being compassionate doesn't mean we are suicidal. It doesn't mean we invite to America, we invite to our homes people who the FBI cannot tell us if they are terrorists or not.

What should this Senate be doing? We shouldn't be engaging in a sideshow of gun control. By the way, I will say on behalf of a lot of American citizens, in the wake of this terror attack, it is offensive. I sat in that chair and presided yesterday over some of the show. It was offensive to see Democrat after Democrat prattling on about the NRA. It wasn't the NRA that murdered 49 people in Orlando. It wasn't the NRA that set up pressure cookers in the Boston bombing. It wasn't the NRA that murdered 14 innocent souls at Fort Hood. It is offensive to play political games with the constitutional rights of American citizens instead of getting serious about keeping this country safe.

I would urge this body to take up both pieces of legislation—the Expatriate Terrorist Act to prevent terrorists from using U.S. passports to come back to America and TRIPA to prevent refugees from countries with majority control, major control from ISIS or Al Qaeda from coming in, ISIS terrorists as refugees. Those would be common-sense steps. The overwhelming majority of Americans would agree. Yet, in this politicized environment, that is not what our friends on the other side of the aisle want to talk about. Until we get serious about defeating radical Islamic terrorists, we will continue to lose innocents.

I would note one aspect of the attack on Sunday morning. It was widely re-

ported that it was at a gay bar. There are a great many Democrats who are fond of calling themselves champions of the LGBT community. I would suggest there is no more important issue to champion in that regard than protecting Americans from murder by a vicious ideology that systematically murders homosexuals, that throws them off buildings, that buries them under rocks. The regime in Iran, now supported by billions of dollars of American taxpayer dollars at the behest of President Obama, murders homosexuals regularly.

I will confess, some in the press pool were a little bit puzzled: Well, how can a Republican be speaking out against this? Let me be very clear. I am against murder. I am against murder of any American. Nobody has a right to murder anybody because they differ in faith, because they differ in sexual orientation, because they differ in any respect. We are a nation founded on protecting the rights of everyone to live according to their conscience, according to their faith. This murder in Orlando was not random; it was part of a global jihad, an ideology, an Islamist ideology that commands its adherents to murder or forcibly convert the infidel, by whom they mean every one of us.

This body should not be engaged in political games. We should be focused on the threat and keeping America safe and defeating radical Islamic terrorists.

As we remember the victims of this latest terror attack, the greatest memorial we can give to them is to redouble ourselves to a seriousness of purpose to prevent the next terror attack from taking innocent American lives. I hope that is what this body does. I hope we do so in a bipartisan manner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I am a proud cosponsor of the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, and I am glad that this important bill is now going to be moving to conference. I am glad that as the senior Democrat on the Judiciary Committee, I will be a conferee.

Beyond the idea of being a conferee, it is urgent that we find comprehensive and real solutions to the epidemic of heroin and prescription opioid abuse. I am in Vermont many times a month. I hear from people I know and from some I do not know. They are in the grocery stores, on the street, even coming out of church on Sunday. They are telling me of their concerns either within their own family or in their own neighborhood with the problems of opioid abuse. Communities throughout the Nation are grappling with this issue, whether they are in urban areas or rural areas or a State such as the Presiding Officer and I represent that has a mixture of both urban and rural.

I think the Federal Government has to do its part to provide the support

necessary to sustain those efforts. It means real money. For rural communities, which are predominantly the communities in my home State of Vermont, it means better access to the opioid antidote Naloxone, which saves lives. I have held hearings throughout Vermont, and I have heard from not only the police but physicians, the faith community, parents, teachers, and others that Naloxone can save lives.

It is really not a question of whether there is a heroin-opioid epidemic; the question is how quickly we can respond. We have to act now. The American people expect us to, and that is an expectation they are justified to have. So let us fulfill the expectation.

I support the efforts by my neighbor from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN, and I support her motion to instruct conferees to provide funding for State and local efforts to combat the opioid epidemic.

I also support my fellow New Englander, Senator WHITEHOUSE, in his motion to instruct conferees to address the needs of rural communities. I come from a State of 625,000 people—625,000 very special people. It is very rural. We need the help. I support Senator WHITEHOUSE in this.

I see other Senators on the floor, so I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today to be a voice for the 3½ million citizens living on the island of Puerto Rico. I rise so their concerns for themselves, their families, and their livelihoods will be heard—to ask that we improve House-passed legislation known as PROMESA. The word “promesa” in English would mean “promise,” but the only thing the House bill promises the people of Puerto Rico is years of subjugation at the hands of an anti-democratic control board.

All of us in this Senate will soon be faced with an immediate and serious choice, one which will have profound consequences on the people of Puerto Rico for a generation. I have said from the beginning, in terms of the challenge Puerto Rico has—a \$70 billion debt; pays one-third of every dollar it receives toward paying interest, which is unsustainable for them and unsustainable for any governmental entity that would face that challenge; made tough, horrible decisions—closed schools, closed hospitals, reduced public safety—and still cannot meet the challenge. They need a clear path to restructuring. That is not a bailout. A bailout is when somebody has a debt, you bring them the money and say, OK, we are going take care of your debt, but that is not the case. Restructuring is about taking the debt you have and giving the wherewithal for that debt to be restructured in a way that is both sustainable and can take care of the obligations therein.

It needs an oversight board that represents the people, the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico, their needs and their concerns, and acknowledges and respects their Democratic rights as Americans, but, sadly, the legislation passed by the House last week falls far short of what we need on several fronts. Instead of offering a clear path to restructuring, it creates more obstacles. It creates a supermajority 5-to-2 vote by an unelected control board to get to the possibility of restructuring that could derail the island’s attempts to achieve sustainable debt payments. Without any authority to restructure its debt, all this legislation will do is take away the Democratic rights of 3½ million Americans and leave the future to wishful thinking and a prayer that the crisis will somehow be resolved. Even if the board did allow restructuring after a series of hurdles, it will come at a steep price, and that price is the right of self-governance.

In return for being able to rework its debts, the people of Puerto Rico will be forced to relinquish their fundamental right to govern themselves and make their own decisions, the very same rights we fought to secure in a revolution 240 years ago.

What I am saying shouldn’t come as a surprise to anyone who read the House Natural Resources Committee report, which was unequivocal when describing the vast powers this control board will exercise, which we will be voting on.

In an analysis by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, it states: “The board would have broad sovereign powers to effectively overrule decisions by Puerto Rico’s legislature, governor and other public authorities.”

Let me repeat that. They will have broad sovereign powers. Words have consequences and meaning in legislation and in law. They will have broad sovereign powers to effectively overrule decisions made by the elected government of the 3½ million U.S. citizens who call Puerto Rico their home.

The Congressional Budget Office went on to say that the Board can “effectively nullify”—cancel, goodbye, hasta la vista—“any new laws or policies adopted by Puerto Rico that did not conform to requirements specified in the bill.” So not only can the control board set budgets and fiscal policy, it also has the power to veto other laws. Essentially, this means that the Board combines—think of this—the legislative powers of Congress with the veto powers of the Executive to form an omnipotent entity, the powers which are virtually unprecedented. We talk about checks and balances in our government as one of the creations by the Founders which was essential to a modern democracy. Well, we obliterate the checks and balances and the rights of the people of Puerto Rico by having an omnipotent entity, the powers of which are virtually unprecedented.

As the bill’s own author noted in the markup memo, and I quote, “[T]he

Oversight Board may impose mandatory cuts on Puerto Rico’s government and instrumentalities—a power far beyond that exercised by the Control Board established for the District of Columbia, when there was a control board, when the District of Columbia found itself in Fiscal Challenge.”

The fact that the Puerto Rican people will have absolutely no say over who is appointed or what action this Board decides is blatant neocolonialism. Instead, their fate will be determined by seven unelected, unaccountable members of a so-called oversight board that will act as a virtual oligarchy and impose their unchecked will on the island. If the Board uses the superpowers in this bill to close schools, shutter more hospitals, cut senior citizens’ pensions to the bone, if it decides to hold a fire sale and put Puerto Rico’s natural wonders on the auction block to the highest bidder, if it puts balanced budgets ahead of the health, safety, and well-being of children and families similar to the control board travesty that unfolded in Flint, there will be nothing the people of Puerto Rico or their elected representatives can do to stop them.

Of course the bill doesn’t stop there. It also provides an exception to the Federal minimum wage for younger workers, and it exempts the island from recently finalized overtime protections. At a time when we are working to increase workers’ wages, the people in the country have said through this election process: My wages are stagnant, and I feel I can’t meet the challenges of myself and my family, PROMESA goes in the opposite direction, and it actually cuts workers’ wages. It amazes me that the solution to get Puerto Rico’s economy growing again is to ensure that workers make even less money. The island consists of 3½ million U.S. citizens, 40 percent of which are below the Federal poverty level, and now we are going to cut their wages. Lowering people’s wages is not a pro-growth strategy. What it is, is a pro-migration strategy. All it will do is intensify outmigration to the mainland, where people who are U.S. citizens and happen to live in Puerto Rico are eligible for a higher minimum wage here, where they would have common-sense overtime protections, are eligible for full Medicare, Medicaid reimbursement, are eligible for the child tax credit as they try to raise their child and realize their hopes and dreams and aspirations, are eligible for the earned-income tax credit—all they have to do is take one flight to the United States. Yet we somehow think that a policy that subjugates these 3½ million citizens and takes away essential rights they have as American citizens is going to be a good fiscal policy for us as well.

Every time I talk about my brothers and sisters in Puerto Rico, I like to remind my colleagues in this Chamber and in the other that they have fought on behalf of America since World War

I. They have fought in World War II, the Korean war, Vietnam, Desert Storm, Desert Shield, Iraq, Afghanistan, and the War on Terror. As a matter of fact, if you go and visit the Vietnam Memorial as it commemorates its 50th anniversary, you will find a disproportionately high number of Puerto Rican names etched in that solemn black stone as compared to the rest of the American population.

I remember being in the Visitor Center when the Speaker of the House had a celebration of the 65th Infantry Division, an all-Puerto Rican division, one of the most highly decorated in U.S. history, known as the Borinqueneers. They received the Congressional Gold Medal, the highest honor Congress gives any citizen.

We talked about their enormous contributions, their sacrifices on behalf of the Nation. These men and women—many of whom gave their lives—still serve so we can remain the land of the free. They will go back home to where their freedom and their right to self-governance will be stripped. These heroes deserve the same rights and respect as U.S. citizens in New Jersey, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Florida, Utah, or any other State in the Nation, but what this bill tells the people of Puerto Rico is this: Though you may be good enough to wear the uniform of your country, you may be good enough to fight and die to defend the United States, you are not good enough to make your own decisions, govern yourself, and have a voice in your own future.

I am not advocating to completely remove all oversight powers—to the contrary. I support helping Puerto Rico make informed, prudent decisions that put it on the path to economic growth and solvency. Despite its name, the oversight board envisioned by this bill doesn't simply oversee, it directs and commands. It doesn't assist. It absolutely controls potentially every significant public policy decision that affects those 3½ million U.S. citizens.

The Senate has an opportunity to change that situation. We have a chance to improve this bill and strike the right balance. I want the opportunity to offer a number of targeted, commonsense amendments to restore a proper balance and ensure the people of Puerto Rico have a say in their future and to temper the powers of the control board and give the people of Puerto Rico more of a say as to who is on the Board that is going to determine their future for quite some time.

I know, as all of us do, that success is never guaranteed, but at the very least, the people of Puerto Rico deserve a thorough and thoughtful debate on the Senate floor.

I do not take lightly, nor should my colleagues, a decision to infringe upon the Democratic rights of the 3½ million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico. Those 3½ million American citizens living in Puerto Rico and their 5 million family members living in our States and our

districts deserve more than the Senate holding its nose to improve an inferior solution.

I am pleased to say that this sentiment has some bipartisan support. I sent a letter, with Senator WICKER, to Senate leadership asking for a full and thorough debate. I hope we do not get jammed at the final moment as an attempt to push an undemocratic bill through the Senate by waiting until the very end of this session as a tactical maneuver to avoid a thoughtful debate and an opportunity for amendments.

I took Majority Leader MCCONNELL at his word when he said: "We need to open up the legislative process in a way that allows more amendments from both sides." I am hopeful he will honor that commitment.

Like some of my colleagues, I was once a Member of the House of Representatives, and I have enormous respect for that Chamber, but I didn't get elected to the Senate to abdicate my responsibility and simply rubberstamp whatever bills come over from the House of Representatives. I would hope we would immediately call up this bill for debate and do what we were elected to do—fix problems and make the lives of the American people better.

Just because these 3½ million citizens are Puerto Rican, they are no less a citizen than you or the Presiding Officer or my colleagues who are on the floor or those who get to serve in this institution. They deserve better. They deserve better than to be jammed with an undemocratic process that will affect their lives in ways far beyond anybody in this Chamber would be willing to accept.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following and notwithstanding the adoption of the compound motion to go to conference on S. 524, that Senator SHAHEEN and Senator WHITEHOUSE or their designees be recognized to each offer a motion to instruct conferees and that there be 2 minutes of debate equally divided on the motions, and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motions to instruct conferees with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I understand that prior to the cloture vote, the Democratic side still had some time. I yield back that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

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 disagree to the House amendments, agree to the request from the House for a conference, and the Presiding Officer appoint the following conferees: Senators Grassley, Alexander, Hatch, Sessions, Leahy, Murray, and Wyden with respect to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, and to provide for the establishment of an inter-agency task force to review, modify, and update best practices for pain management and prescribing pain medication, and for other purposes.

John McCain, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Joni Ernst, David Vitter, James M. Inhofe, Dean Heller, Pat Roberts, Lamar Alexander, Ron Johnson, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Mitch McConnell.

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 disagree to the House amendments, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and to appoint conferees with respect to S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Blunt	Capito
Ayotte	Booker	Cardin
Baldwin	Boozman	Carper
Barrasso	Brown	Casey
Bennet	Burr	Cassidy
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Coats

Cochran	Hoeven	Reed
Collins	Inhofe	Reid
Coons	Isakson	Risch
Corker	Johnson	Roberts
Cornyn	Kaine	Rounds
Cotton	King	Sasse
Crapo	Kirk	Schatz
Cruz	Klobuchar	Schumer
Daines	Lankford	Scott
Donnelly	Leahy	Sessions
Durbin	Manchin	Shaheen
Enzi	Markey	Shelby
Ernst	McCain	Stabenow
Feinstein	McCaskill	Sullivan
Fischer	McConnell	Tester
Flake	Menendez	Thune
Franken	Merkley	Tillis
Gardner	Mikulski	Toomey
Gillibrand	Moran	Udall
Graham	Murkowski	Vitter
Grassley	Murphy	Warner
Hatch	Murray	Warren
Heinrich	Paul	Whitehouse
Heitkamp	Perdue	Wicker
Heller	Peters	Wyden
Hirono	Portman	

NAYS—1

Lee

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Rubio
Nelson	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 1.

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

The question occurs on agreeing to the compound motion to go to conference on S. 524.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct the conferees at the desk, which I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mrs. SHAHEEN] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on S. 524 (the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016) be instructed to insist that the final conference report include funding for prevention, treatment, and recovery associated with state and local efforts needed to combat the national heroin and opioid epidemic.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be 2 minutes equally divided for debate.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, the opioid crisis is a national public health emergency, and it is long past time that Congress treat it like one. It is shattering families and communities, especially in New Hampshire but also all across this country. In New Hampshire, we are losing a person a day to drug overdoses.

The CARA bill is a good bill. I co-sponsored it. I think it is important. But without real dollars, it is the equivalent of offering a life preserver with no air in it.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this motion to instruct and support real funding in this bill.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the next vote, the Whitehouse vote, can go by a voice vote—sorry about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there debate in opposition to the Senator's motion?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Franken	Murphy
Ayotte	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Paul
Bennet	Grassley	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Portman
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Brown	Hirono	Reid
Burr	Hoeven	Roberts
Cantwell	Isakson	Rounds
Capito	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	King	Schumer
Carper	Kirk	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Coats	Markey	Thune
Cochran	McCain	Toomey
Collins	McCaskill	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warren
Donnelly	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Flake	Risch
Boozman	Gardner	Sasse
Corker	Hatch	Scott
Cornyn	Heller	Sessions
Cotton	Inhofe	Shelby
Crapo	Johnson	Sullivan
Daines	Lankford	Tillis
Enzi	Lee	Vitter
Ernst	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—5

Boxer	Nelson	Sanders
Leahy	Rubio	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have a motion to instruct conferees at

the desk, which I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WHITEHOUSE] moves that the managers on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendments to the bill S. 524 (the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act of 2016) be instructed—

(1) to reject proposals that would replace the individual prevention, treatment, law enforcement, and recovery programs authorized in S. 524, including the incentive grant program authorized in section 601, with a single grant program with multiple allowable uses;

(2) to insist that the final conference report include authorizations explicitly designated for grants to States, and in the case of States that do not have prescription drug monitoring programs, units of local government that do have such programs, to strengthen the use of and make improvements to prescription drug monitoring programs;

(3) to insist that the final conference report address the unique needs of rural communities, which are among the hardest hit by opioid abuse in the United States and are often in the most dire need of improved emergency services and more accessible treatment infrastructure;

(4) to insist that the final conference report authorize those provisions of S. 1641 that were approved by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(5) to insist that the final conference report include the provisions of S. 1455 as reported by the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Colleagues, this motion to instruct has bipartisan support from the authors of CARA. It reflects the bipartisan work that was done on CARA, and we hope that this motion to instruct will get a strong bipartisan vote.

This motion supports the bipartisan Senate work on the CARA bill that passed this body 94 to 1. It supports the bipartisan language worked out between Senator BLUNT and Senator MCCASKILL on the Missouri county prescription drug management program issue. It supports a focus on the rural communities for which opioid has been a plague, which is a bipartisan concern. It supports the passed bipartisan version of the veterans opioids measure from the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. And it supports the Senate HELP Committee's passed bipartisan version of the bipartisan TREAT Act.

If we can pull together as a Senate, we can have a really great bill. Please send the conferees a strong bipartisan vote.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I concur in the comments of my colleague. This is the CARA legislation which passed here on a 94-to-1 vote. This is simply a motion saying we support what we have already passed. I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murphy
Ayotte	Graham	Murray
Baldwin	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Peters
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Portman
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boozman	Hoeven	Rounds
Brown	Isakson	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Capito	King	Stabenow
Cardin	Kirk	Sullivan
Carper	Klobuchar	Tester
Casey	Manchin	Thune
Cassidy	Markey	Tillis
Collins	McCain	Udall
Coons	McCaskill	Vitter
Cruz	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Mikulski	Wyden
Fischer	Moran	
Franken	Murkowski	

NAYS—24

Barrasso	Enzi	Risch
Coats	Ernst	Roberts
Cochran	Flake	Sasse
Corker	Gardner	Scott
Cornyn	Heller	Sessions
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Daines	Perdue	Wicker

NOT VOTING—6

Boxer	Leahy	Rubio
Inhofe	Nelson	Sanders

The motion was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of debate only for the next 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE MOTHER EMANUEL AME CHURCH MASS SHOOTING

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, when I started preparing to

give this speech, I must admit I was overwhelmed with emotion. One year ago tomorrow, a brutal attack, fueled by hate, led to the deaths of nine parishioners at Mother Emanuel AME Church in my hometown of Charleston, SC.

A year later, the idea that someone's heart could be filled with so much anger and venom is still jarring.

Then, over the weekend, we saw it again. In Orlando, FL, a brutal attack, fueled by hate, led to the deaths of 49 people at the Pulse nightclub. This was an assault against the people of Orlando, the State of Florida, and the United States as a whole.

We can, and we will, have a much longer discussion on ISIS, Islamic terror, and the steps that must be taken in those areas. But today, as Orlando mourns and Charleston remembers, I want to return to 365 days ago and show how, with the world watching, love overcame hate.

On the night of June 17, 2015, I was here in Washington. Much like this week, we were debating the NDAA and our military priorities. But in Charleston, there was a Bible study. Cynthia Hurd, Susie Jackson, Ethel Lee Lance, Depayne Middleton-Doctor, Tywanza Sanders, Daniel Simmons, Sharonda Coleman-Singleton, Myra Thompson, Felicia Sanders and her 5-year-old granddaughter, Polly Sheppard, and my friend, the Reverend Clementa Pinckney, had gathered together for a Bible study at Mother Emanuel.

Among them was a young man who was new to Emanuel—a young man they welcomed into their presence with God's love. While they did not and could not possibly see the darkness in his heart, they showed him the loving nature of their own hearts—so much so that he later told police that he almost, almost did not go through with this vicious, vile attack because everyone was so nice to him. But, tragically, almost was not enough.

In an instant, the horrors unleashed by this young man changed South Carolina forever. I remember getting a phone call about 9 o'clock p.m. on that Wednesday night from one of my friends at the Sheriff's office about the shooting at Mother Emanuel. Reports continued to come in, and so I texted my friend, Clementa Pinckney, hoping that he would respond and tell me what was going on at the church.

I am looking at my texts from June 17, 2015, at 10:31 p.m. I asked him: Are you and your parishioners OK? It was met with silence—silence that is still deafening, silence that I will never forget.

He should have been able to text back. He should have been able to go home and see his family, raise his daughters. He should have been able to have gone on and finished his work as a State senator in the statehouse and to continue spreading God's love. As we people of faith know, sometimes things simply don't go as they are planned. But as the families of the Emanuel nine showed you, God had a plan.

Within 48 hours, these men and women set the tone for my grieving city, my grieving State, and my grieving Nation. On Friday morning, about 36 hours later, looking into the killer's eyes, they said to the killer of their family members: "I forgive you."

Family member after family member, nine consecutive times, to the shock and the amazement of the world that was watching, said: "I forgive you." Your life can be better in God's hands.

Those of us here today cannot even imagine how hard that must have been—how in their immense grief, these families chose to take this unique path. But they did. We as a nation, as a State, and certainly as a city are forever thankful.

I am fortunate enough to have had the opportunity to talk to many and all of the families at some point. I continue to be amazed at their grace, their dignity, and their righteousness. They have truly been the rock on which we all stand. In the days and weeks after the shooting, Charleston and South Carolina came together like never before. As the clergy and parishioners at Mother Emanuel said after the attack: "Wrong church, wrong people, wrong day."

It was the wrong place to try and sow the seeds of discord. It was the wrong people to try and break their faith and the wrong day to try and bring down the people of South Carolina.

Last summer, we saw chapters of history close and new ones open. While the debate over the Confederate flag may be the most widespread symbol of Emanuel's aftermath, the actions and words of folks across Charleston and South Carolina are the most enduring.

Looking ahead, we have come so far, but we certainly still face many challenges. It is going to take a lot of effort and strength to stand together in times of division. It is going to be hard sometimes in a world that is too often so full of hate to know that we are still taking steps forward, and it is going to require a continuing conversation on issues that are uncomfortable for some but necessary for all.

So where are we headed from here? Three words show where I believe that we, as a nation, are headed. These three words show where I believe we, as a nation, must head. They are simple words—words found in 1 Corinthians 13: faith, hope, and love. We saw these in abundance throughout South Carolina over the past year, and they remain our final goal.

As I head back to Charleston tonight, I will be thinking about the events honoring the Emanuel nine tomorrow. I am certain there will be tears—lots of tears. There will be moments, as there have been in the last few minutes, when it will be hard to speak, to truly show what all of this means to all of us, but the world will also see this from Charleston, SC: They will see that you cannot destroy love with hate and that you cannot kill the spirit. We