

country pursuant to chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.; relating to the Economic Support Fund); and

(8) a formal request to the foreign country concerned to extradite an individual who is engaged in abduction and who has been formally accused of, charged with, or convicted of an extraditable offense.

(e) **COMMENSURATE ACTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (f), the Secretary of State may substitute any other action authorized by law for any action described in subsection (d) if the Secretary determines that such action—

(A) is commensurate in effect to the action substituted; and

(B) would substantially further the purposes of this Act.

(2) **NOTIFICATION.**—If commensurate action is taken pursuant to this subsection, the Secretary shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that—

(A) describes such action;

(B) explains the reasons for taking such action; and

(C) specifically describes the basis for the Secretary's determination under paragraph (1) that such action—

(i) is commensurate with the action substituted; and

(ii) substantially furthers the purposes of this Act.

(f) **RESOLUTION.**—The Secretary of State shall seek to take all appropriate actions authorized by law to resolve the unresolved case or to obtain the cessation of such pattern of noncompliance, as applicable.

(g) **HUMANITARIAN EXCEPTION.**—Any action taken pursuant to subsection (d) or (e) may not prohibit or restrict the provision of medicine, medical equipment or supplies, food, or other life-saving humanitarian assistance.

#### **SEC. 203. CONSULTATIONS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.**

As soon as practicable after the Secretary of State makes a determination under section 201 in response to a failure to resolve unresolved abduction cases or the Secretary takes an action under subsection (d) or (e) of section 202, based on a pattern of noncompliance, the Secretary shall request consultations with the government of such country regarding the situation giving rise to such determination.

#### **SEC. 204. WAIVER BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of State may waive the application of any of the actions described in subsections (d) and (e) of section 202 with respect to a country if the Secretary determines and notifies the appropriate congressional committees that—

(1) the government of such country—

(A) has satisfactorily resolved the abduction cases giving rise to the application of any of such actions; or

(B) has ended such country's pattern of noncompliance; or

(2) the national security interest of the United States requires the exercise of such waiver authority.

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.**—Not later than the date on which the Secretary of State exercises the waiver authority under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) notify the appropriate congressional committees of such waiver; and

(2) provide such committees with a detailed justification for such waiver, including an explanation of the steps the noncompliant government has taken—

(A) to resolve abductions cases; or

(B) to end its pattern of noncompliance.

(c) **PUBLICATION IN FEDERAL REGISTER.**—Subject to subsection (d), the Secretary of State shall ensure that each waiver determination under this section—

(1) is published in the Federal Register; or

(2) is posted on the Department of State website.

(d) **LIMITED DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION.**—The Secretary of State may limit the publication of information under subsection (c) in the same manner and to the same extent as the President may limit the publication of findings and determinations described in section 654(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2414(c)), if the Secretary determines that the publication of such information would be harmful to the national security of the United States and would not further the purposes of this Act.

#### **SEC. 205. TERMINATION OF ACTIONS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE.**

Any specific action taken under this Act or any amendment made by this Act with respect to a foreign country shall terminate on the date on which the Secretary of State submits a written certification to Congress that the government of such country—

(1) has resolved any unresolved abduction case that gave rise to such specific action; or

(2) has taken substantial and verifiable steps to correct such country's persistent pattern of noncompliance that gave rise to such specific action, as applicable.

### **TITLE III—PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION**

#### **SEC. 301. PREVENTING CHILDREN FROM LEAVING THE UNITED STATES IN VIOLATION OF A COURT ORDER.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title IV of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 231 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### **“SEC. 433. PREVENTION OF INTERNATIONAL CHILD ABDUCTION.**

“(a) **PROGRAM ESTABLISHED.**—The Secretary, through the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection (referred to in this section as ‘CBP’), in coordination with the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall establish a program that—

“(1) seeks to prevent a child (as defined in section 1204(b)(1) of title 18, United States Code) from departing from the territory of the United States if a parent or legal guardian of such child presents a court order from a court of competent jurisdiction prohibiting the removal of such child from the United States to a CBP Officer in sufficient time to prevent such departure for the duration of such court order; and

“(2) leverages other existing authorities and processes to address the wrongful removal and return of a child.

“(b) **INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall convene and chair an interagency working group to prevent international parental child abduction. The group shall be composed of presidentially appointed, Senate confirmed officials from—

“(A) the Department of State;

“(B) the Department of Homeland Security, including U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; and

“(C) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

“(2) **DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.**—The Secretary of Defense shall designate an official within the Department of Defense—

“(A) to coordinate with the Department of State on international child abduction issues; and

“(B) to oversee activities designed to prevent or resolve international child abduction cases relating to active duty military service members.”.

(b) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of contents of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by adding after the item relating to section 432 the following:

“Sec. 433. Prevention of international child abduction.”.

#### **SEC. 302. AUTHORIZATION FOR JUDICIAL TRAINING ON INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State, subject to the availability of appropriations, shall seek to provide training, directly or through another government agency or nongovernmental organizations, on the effective handling of parental abduction cases to the judicial and administrative authorities in countries—

(1) in which a significant number of unresolved abduction cases are pending; or

(2) that have been designated as having a pattern of noncompliance under section 202(b).

(b) **STRATEGY REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit a strategy to carry out the activities described in subsection (a) to—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(3) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(4) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(c) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State \$1,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 2015 and 2016 to carry out subsection (a).

(2) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts appropriated for the activities set forth in subsection (a) shall be used pursuant to the authorization and requirements under this section.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't believe there is further debate on this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 3212), as amended, was passed.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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.

#### **VETERINARY MEDICINE MOBILITY ACT OF 2014**

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 458, H.R. 1528.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1528) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to allow a veterinarian to transport and dispense controlled substances

in the usual course of veterinary practice outside of the registered location.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate, and any statements be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1528) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

#### NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 503, submitted earlier today.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 503) designating September 2014 as “National Childhood Awareness Month” to promote awareness of charities benefiting children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

#### AUTHORIZING SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL

Mr. REID. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to S. Res. 504.

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

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) to direct the Senate Legal Counsel to appear as amicus curiae in the name of the Senate in *Menachem Binyamin Zivotofsky, By His Parents and Guardians, Ari Z. and Naomi Siegman Zivotofsky v. John Kerry, Secretary of State*.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, next term the Supreme Court will take up a case presenting the question whether a provision of the Foreign Relations Author-

ization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, which affects the official identification documents of some American citizens born abroad, is constitutional. In 2002, Congress enacted a law permitting U.S. citizens who are born in Jerusalem to have the Secretary of State specify “Israel” as their birthplace on their passports and other consular documents. Under existing State Department policy, passports and other documents of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem may only record “Jerusalem” as their place of birth, not “Israel,” regardless of the wishes of the child or the parents.

Although the President signed the Foreign Relations Authorization Act for fiscal year 2003 into law, in his signing statement he stated that, if the section of the law that included that provision, section 214, were interpreted as mandatory, it would “interfere with the President’s constitutional authority to formulate the position of the United States, speak for the Nation in international affairs, and determine the terms on which recognition is given to foreign states.” Emphasizing that “U.S. policy regarding Jerusalem has not changed,” the Executive has continued to record solely “Jerusalem” as the birthplace on passports of all U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem, regardless of their preference and notwithstanding the statute.

In accordance with the Executive’s policy, the State Department declined a request to place “Israel” on the official documents of a young Jerusalem-born U.S. citizen despite the statutory directive. The boy’s parents then sued the Secretary of State on his behalf and sought an order to have “Israel” recorded as their son’s place of birth. Their suit has been before the D.C. Circuit three times and is now in the Supreme Court for the second time.

Both the district court and the court of appeals initially ordered the suit dismissed. The D.C. Circuit held that the parents’ claim under the statute “presents a nonjusticiable political question because it trenches upon the President’s constitutionally committed recognition power,” which the court said, includes “a decision made by the President regarding which government is sovereign over a particular place.” Siding with the Executive, the court explained, “[E]very president since 1948 has, as a matter of official policy, purposefully avoided taking a position on the issue whether Israel’s sovereignty extends to the city of Jerusalem. . . . The State Department’s refusal to record ‘Israel’ in passports and Consular Reports of Birth of U.S. citizens born in Jerusalem implements this longstanding policy of the Executive.”

The parents sought Supreme Court review, and in 2011 the Attorney General advised Congress that the Department of Justice would defend the court of appeals’ judgment that the case was nonjusticiable, but that it would also argue that, if the claim was found to be

justiciable, section 214(d) of the Act unconstitutionally infringes on the President’s exclusive authority to recognize foreign states. A number of Senators and Members of the House appeared as amici curiae, or friends of the court, in support of the statute.

The Supreme Court granted certiorari and vacated the court of appeals’ holding that the constitutional issue was a political question. The Court found that the case called for nothing more than performing the “familiar judicial exercise” of “deciding whether the statute impermissibly intrudes upon Presidential powers under the Constitution.”

On remand, Members of both Houses again submitted amicus curiae briefs in defense of section 214(d). One judge on the appellate panel found that the plaintiff’s argument was “powerfully” buttressed by briefs submitted by Members of Congress, among other amici. However, the panel majority observed, “While an amicus brief has been submitted on behalf of six senators and fifty-seven representatives, they of course do not speak for the Congress qua the Congress.”

Based on its review of constitutional text and structure, precedent, and history, the D.C. Circuit concluded, this time on the merits, that the President “exclusively holds the power to determine whether to recognize a foreign sovereign” and that the statute “plainly intended to force the State Department to deviate from its decades-long position of neutrality on what nation or government, if any, is sovereign over Jerusalem.” The court found conclusive the Executive’s view that, in so doing, “section 214(d) would cause adverse foreign policy consequences.” Accordingly, the court found that the law “impermissibly intrudes on the President’s recognition power and is therefore unconstitutional.”

In April of this year, the Supreme Court again granted review in the case, this time focused on the single question: “Whether a federal statute that directs the Secretary of State, on request, to record the birthplace of an American citizen born in Jerusalem as born in ‘Israel’ on a Consular Report of Birth Abroad and on a United States passport is unconstitutional on the ground that the statute ‘impermissibly infringes on the President’s exercise of the recognition power reposing exclusively in him.’”

This case, accordingly, now presents the Supreme Court with very important questions about the constitutional allocation of power between the branches over foreign affairs. The issues likely to be addressed include the claims of the Executive that the Constitution gives the President exclusive authority over recognition of foreign governments, that this law implicates such authority, and that the statute infringes impermissibly on the President’s recognition power.

Contrary to the Executive’s claim and the reasoning of the D.C. Circuit,