

(Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1603

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1603, a bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hezbollah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1668

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1789, a bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1933, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1972

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to require air carriers to modify certain policies with respect to the use of epinephrine for in-flight emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) 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. 1996

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2021. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to introduce the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2015 or the Fair Chance Act. This bipartisan bill has the support of Senators JOHNSON, BALDWIN, ERNST, and BROWN, and I thank them for their support. Today, a bipartisan House companion bill to the Fair Chance Act has also been introduced. I thank Congressmen CUMMINGS, ISSA, JACKSON LEE, BLUMENAUER, WATSON COLEMAN, RICHMOND, CONYERS, and SCOTT for their leadership on this issue.

Everyone deserves the dignity of work and the opportunity for a second chance to earn a living. But far too many Americans who return home from behind bars have to disclose convictions on their initial employment application or initial job interview that often serve as insurmountable barriers to employment. This legislation would ensure that people with convictions, who have paid their debt to society and want to turn their lives around, have a fair chance to work.

By encouraging Federal employers to focus on an individual's qualifications and merit, and not solely on past mistakes, the Fair Chance Act would remove burdensome and unnecessary obstacles that prevent formerly incarcerated people from reaching their full potential and contributing to society. It would also help reduce recidivism, combat poverty, and prevent violence

in our communities by helping people get back to work.

In the last 30 years, our prison population has exploded. Since 1980, the Federal prison population has grown by nearly 800 percent and our total prison population exceeds more than 2.2 million people. Taxpayers are wasting billions of dollars on overcrowded prisons that crush priceless human potential with lengthy prison terms that have failed to make our communities safer. Yet, more than 90 percent of those sentenced to prison eventually get out and return home. Indeed, over 600,000 people are released from prison each year.

Equally troubling, a high number of Americans living in our communities have criminal convictions. About 70 million people in the U.S. have been arrested or convicted of a crime. That means, almost one in three adults in the U.S. has a criminal record. In fact, in the Nation's capital alone an estimated 1 in 10 D.C. residents has a criminal record.

The American Bar Association has identified over 44,500 "collateral consequences"—or legal constraints—placed on what individuals with records can do once they have been released from prison. Of those, up to 70 percent are related to employment.

Without a job, it is impossible to provide for oneself and one's family. Yet, thousands of people with criminal convictions reenter society each year without employment. According to a recent New York Times/CBS News/Kaiser Family Foundation poll, men with criminal records account for about 34 percent of all nonworking men between the ages of 25 and 54. In addition, a landmark study by Professor Devah Pager, of Harvard University's Department of Sociology, found that a criminal record reduces the likelihood of a callback or a job offer by nearly 50 percent for men in general. African-American men with criminal records have been 60 percent less likely to receive a callback or job offer than those with criminal records. In the land of opportunity, a criminal conviction should not be a life sentence to unemployment.

Today, a criminal conviction is a modern day scarlet letter that—because of the so-called "War on Drugs"—has had a disproportionate impact on communities of color. For example, African-American men with a conviction are 40 percent less likely to receive an interview. And the likelihood that Latino men with a record will receive an interview or be offered a job is 18 percent smaller than the likelihood for white men.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens benefits public safety. With little hope of obtaining a decent paying job, returning citizens are often left with few options but to return to a life of crime. A 2011 study in the *Justice Quarterly* concluded that the lack of employment was the single most negative determinant of recidivism. A report by the Bureau of

Justice Statistics found that of the over 400,000 state prisoners released in 2005, 67.8 percent of them were re-arrested within 3 years of their release. And 76.6 percent were re-arrested within 5 years of their release.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens also strengthens our economy. Poor job prospects for people with records reduced our nation's gross domestic product in 2008 between \$57 billion and \$65 billion. With an integrated global economy that is becoming more and more competitive, it is imperative that we encourage sound policy that promotes the gainful employment of Americans.

A formerly incarcerated person—and later President—named Nelson Mandela once said, "For to be free is not merely to cast off one's chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others." The American criminal justice system is predicated on this ideal, the belief that an individual who has committed a crime can, and should be, reformed into a productive member of society over their time of imprisonment. The ideal that, once released from prison, that individual should have the opportunity to enrich himself and his community upon his reentry into society.

The Fair Chance Act would help fix unemployment barriers for formerly incarcerated people and bring America closer to truly being a land of opportunity for all. It would ban the Federal Government—including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—from requesting criminal history information from applicants until they reach the conditional offer stage. This bill strikes the right balance. It would allow qualified people with criminal records to get their foot in the door and be judged on their own merit. At the same time, the legislation would allow employers to know an individual's criminal history before the job applicant is hired.

This bill would also prohibit Federal contractors from requesting criminal history information from candidates for positions within the scope of Federal contracts until the conditional offer stage. Companies that do business with the Federal Government and receive Federal funds should espouse good hiring practices. The Fair Chance Act would permit Federal contractors to inquire about criminal history earlier in the application process if a candidate would have access to classified information.

The legislation includes important exceptions for sensitive positions where criminal history inquiries are necessary earlier in the application process. Exceptions are included for positions involving classified information, sensitive national security duties, armed forces, and law enforcement jobs, and for when criminal history information for a job is legally required prior to a conditional offer.

Finally, this bill would require the Department of Labor, U.S. Census Bu-

reau, and Bureau of Justice Statistics to issue a report on the employment statistics of formerly incarcerated individuals. Currently, no comprehensive tracking of data on the employment histories of people with convictions exists. This provision would change that and allow us to better understand the scope of the problem people with convictions face when trying to find a job.

Many of the reforms in this bill have been urged for years. In 2011, then-Attorney General Eric Holder called for making the Federal Government a model employer. And the White House's My Brother Keeper's Initiative has endorsed fair chance reforms. Earlier this year, I was proud to join 26 other Senators in a letter to the President urging an executive order that would ban Federal contractors from asking job applicants about their criminal histories. But more must be done.

States and localities have led the way on providing people with convictions meaningful job opportunities, and the Federal Government must catch up. So far 18 States, including Georgia and Nebraska, and over 100 cities and counties have taken steps to prohibit government agencies from asking job applicants about criminal convictions until later in the process.

Some of the Nation's largest companies already have fair chance policies. Companies such as Wal-Mart, Target, Starbucks, Koch Industries, Home Depot, and Bed, Bath and Beyond, have reserved the criminal history inquiry until later in the hiring process. These companies know that creating economic opportunity for people with criminal history is not just good policy, it's good business.

This bipartisan legislation has the support of numerous groups, including the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Employment Law Project, the Center for Urban Families, Bend the Arc Jewish Action, and the National Black Prosecutors Association.

We are a nation built on liberty and justice for all. Once a person's sentence has ended, they should not continue to be forever shackled by their past. That turns the concept of justice upside down. It is contrary to who we are and what we stand for.

President George W. Bush once said that "America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life." But far too often the road back into the community is paved with poverty, hopelessness, and unemployment. When President Obama commuted the offenses of 46 drug offenders earlier this year, he also affirmed that "we have to ensure that as [formerly incarcerated people] do their time and pay back their debt to society, that we are increasing the possibility that they can turn their lives around."

The ideal that America is a place that values second chances is bipartisan and rooted deeply in our country's history, and the opportunity to turn one's life around is a fundamental principle of justice. With the introduction of this important criminal justice reform legislation, we aim to fulfill the promise of our great democracy and make access to the American Dream real for thousands of Americans who have paid their debts to society.

The Fair Chance Act would give so many Americans a fair chance to obtain Federal jobs or work with Federal contractors. It would improve public safety, boost our economy, and adhere to our shared values of liberty and justice for all. I urge my fellow Senators to join me in supporting this important criminal justice reform bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PROVISION OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015 DOES NOT APPLY TO THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT FAILED TO TRANSMIT THE ENTIRE AGREEMENT AS REQUIRED BY SUCH ACT, AND THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION WOULD ONLY PREEMPT EXISTING IRAN SANCTIONS LAWS AS “THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND” IF RATIFIED BY THE SENATE AS A TREATY WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF TWO THIRDS OF THE SENATORS PRESENT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE CONSTITUTION OR IF CONGRESS WERE TO ENACT NEW IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION THAT SUPERSEDES THE MANDATORY STATUTORY SANCTIONS THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, PURPORTS TO SUPERSEDE

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 251

Whereas the United States Government has enacted and enforced multiple statutes and regulations that impose comprehensive sanctions on Iran and on companies and individuals doing business with Iran;

Whereas Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the President “shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur”;

Whereas Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all

Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land”;

Whereas, on April 28, 2015, 39 Senators voted for Senate Amendment 1150, the purpose of which was “To declare that any agreement reached by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed a treaty that is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate”;

Whereas, according to subsection (a)(1) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law as Public Law 114-17 on May 22, 2015, “[n]ot later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes”;

Whereas subsection (h)(1) of such section 135 defines the “agreement” that the President “shall” transmit to Congress not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran to include all “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 the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future”;

Whereas such section 135 further provides that a 60-day congressional review period will commence upon the President’s transmittal of the agreement, including all 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 the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future;

Whereas, on July 14, 2015, the Secretary of State announced a multilateral agreement with Iran and six other nations, labeled the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), in Annex II of which the United States purports to agree that “[t]he United States commits to cease the application, and to seek such legislative action as may be appropriate to terminate, or modify to effectuate the termination of, all nuclear-related sanctions as specified in Sections 4.1-4.9 below,” and Sections 4.1-4.9 specifies the following United States statutes: “the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (ISA), as amended by Section 102 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (CISADA) and Sections 201-207 and 311 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (TRA); CISADA, as amended by Sections 214-216, 222, 224, 311-312, 402-403, and 605 of TRA and Section 1249 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA); the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (NDAA), as amended by Sections 503-504 of TRA and Section 1250 of IFCA”;

Whereas the United States statutes specified in sections 4.1 through 4.9 of Annex II, of which the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action purports to provide for United States agreement to “cease the application,” may only be superseded by a Senate-ratified treaty or by new legislation;

Whereas the United States statutes and regulations concerning Iran sanctions include section 2 of CISADA, in which Congress made comprehensive findings of fact concerning Iran, which remain true and accurate today, including that “[t]he illicit nuclear activities of the Government of Iran, combined with its development of unconventional weapons and ballistic missiles and its

support for international terrorism, represent a threat to the security of the United States, its strong ally Israel, and other allies of the United States around the world”;

Whereas Congress also found in section 2(10) of CISADA that “[e]conomic sanctions imposed pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other authorities available to the United States to impose economic sanctions to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, are necessary to protect the essential security interests of the United States”;

Whereas, based on the above and other similar statutory findings since 1979, the United States enacted ISA, CISADA, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), the IFCA, and the TRA, as well as various preceding statutes that each of the named laws amended over time, and, taken as a whole, those Acts of Congress directed and authorized the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, and Energy, and other Federal agencies, to promulgate and enforce implementing regulations, which they have done under the guidance of multiple executive orders and under close congressional oversight;

Whereas the Department of Justice has prosecuted, or entered into non-prosecution agreements with, corporations and individuals for Iran sanctions violations under this body of law;

Whereas existing legislation includes mandatory sanctions that may only be repealed or amended by law, including CISADA section 104, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit or restrict correspondent accounts for foreign financial institutions that knowingly engage in a prohibited activity, and TRA section 202, which provides that the President shall impose statutorily prescribed sanctions with respect to persons that own, operate, control, or insure vessels used to transport crude oil from Iran to another country;

Whereas the President’s authority to waive statutorily prescribed sanctions is limited, conditional, and circumscribed by law;

Whereas the period of five days for the President to transmit to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran,” as defined in section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, began to run on July 14, 2015, and by July 19, 2015, the President had transmitted to Congress only part of the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” reached five days earlier;

Whereas the Administration publicly acknowledged on July 22, 2015, that at least two side agreements existed that had not yet been provided to Congress, specifically between the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Iran, but has steadfastly refused to provide those agreements;

Whereas such section 135 provides that the President “shall” transmit to Congress any agreement with Iran, “including all related materials and annexes,” defined under such section to include “side agreements”—with no statutory exceptions for either secret or unavailable (to the United States) side agreements—within five days of reaching such an agreement; and

Whereas, as a result, the President has never fully transmitted to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” as defined by such section 135, and specifically did not transmit the full agreement within the timeline mandated by law: Now, therefore, be it