

rollovers between 529 programs and ABLE accounts.

S. 2704

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2704, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 2707

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 2707, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to nullify the proposed rule regarding defining and delimiting the exemptions for executive, administrative, professional, outside sales, and computer employees, to require the Secretary of Labor to conduct a full and complete economic analysis with improved economic data on small businesses, nonprofit employers, Medicare or Medicaid dependent health care providers, and small governmental jurisdictions, and all other employers, and minimize the impact on such employers, before promulgating any substantially similar rule, and to provide a rule of construction regarding the salary threshold exemption under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and for other purposes.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to improve access to durable medical equipment for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2760

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2760, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to address certain issues related to the extension of consumer credit, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2790, a bill to provide requirements for the appropriate Federal banking agencies when requesting or ordering a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, to provide for additional requirements related to subpoenas issued under the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, and for other purposes.

S. 2796

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2796, a bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Min-

nesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2843, a bill to provide emergency supplemental appropriations to address the Zika crisis.

S. 2845

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2845, a bill to extend the termination of sanctions with respect to Venezuela under the Venezuela Defense of Human Rights and Civil Society Act of 2014.

S. RES. 432

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 432, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

AMENDMENT NO. 3857

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3857 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3877

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3877 intended to be proposed to H.R. 2028, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2856. A bill to streamline certain feasibility studies and avoid duplication of effort; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2856

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Corps’ Obligation to Assist in Safeguarding Texas Act” or the “COAST Act”.

#### SEC. 2. COASTAL TEXAS PROTECTION AND RESTORATION STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study—

(1) the Secretary of the Army shall take into consideration studies, data, or information developed by the Gulf Coast Community Protection and Recovery District to expedite completion of the Study; and

(2) any studies, data, or information used in the development of the final recommenda-

tions of the Chief of Engineers shall be credited against the non-Federal share of study costs.

(b) EXPEDITED COMPLETION.—The Secretary shall expedite completion of the reports for the Coastal Texas Protection and Restoration Study and, if the Secretary determines that a project described in the completed report is justified, proceed directly to project preconstruction, engineering, and design.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2857. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to obtain membership status for India in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2857

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. PARTICIPATION OF INDIA IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC ECONOMIC COOPERATION REGIONAL ECONOMIC FORUM.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Republic of India is the world’s ninth largest economy in nominal terms and the third largest economy based on purchasing-power parity.

(2) The United States-India partnership is vital to United States strategic interests in the Asia-Pacific region and across the globe, and is an integral aspect to the Administration’s Rebalance to Asia.

(3) United States-India bilateral trade and investment continue to expand, supporting thousands of United States jobs.

(4) The Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) regional economic forum is the premier Asia-Pacific economic forum with a goal to support sustainable economic growth and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

(5) APEC works to champion free, open trade and investment, to promote and accelerate regional economic integration, to encourage economic and technical cooperation, to enhance human security, and to facilitate a favorable and sustainable business environment.

(6) APEC held a moratorium on new membership from 1997 to 2010, which has since been lifted.

(7) India has pursued membership in APEC for over 20 years, and became an APEC observer in November 2011 at the invitation of the United States, when the forum met in Hawaii.

(8) India enjoys a location within the Asia-Pacific region which provides an avenue for continued trade and investment partnerships with APEC member states.

(9) India has been or is pursuing bilateral or multilateral trade agreements with the majority of APEC member states.

(10) India’s “Look East, Act East” strategy to expand economic engagement with East and Southeast Asia demonstrates its effort to pursue external oriented, market-driven economic policies.

(b) ACTIONS.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) develop a strategy to obtain membership status for India in APEC, including participation in related meetings, working groups, activities, and mechanisms; and

(2) actively urge APEC member states to support such membership status for India.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to Congress a report, in unclassified form, describing the United States strategy to obtain membership status for India in APEC. Such report shall be updated and submitted annually until such time as India obtains membership in APEC. Each such report shall include the following:

(1) A description of the efforts the Secretary has made to encourage APEC member states to promote India's bid to obtain membership status.

(2) The further steps the Secretary will take to assist India in obtaining membership status for APEC.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2862. A bill to amend section 3606 of title 18, United States Code, to grant probation officers authority to arrest hostile third parties who obstruct or impede a probation officer in the performance of official duties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Probation Officer Protection Act, which I introduced today with Senator FEINSTEIN. I would like to begin by thanking Senator FEINSTEIN for cosponsoring this bill and also thank Representatives REICHERT and PASCRELL for introducing companion legislation in the House.

Under current law, a Federal probation officer may arrest a probationer or individual on supervised release if the officer has probable cause to believe that the offender has violated a condition of his or her probation or release. The officer may make the arrest with or without a warrant.

In practice, formal arrests by probation officers are rare. Rather, probation officers use this authority to lawfully engage in less restrictive uses of force, such as ordering an offender to stand aside during a search; instructing an offender not to interfere with the officer's movements; or, in rare cases, temporarily restraining an offender who poses a physical danger.

Current law does not, however, address a probation officer's arrest authority in situations where a third party attempts to physically obstruct the officer or cause the officer physical harm. Although obstructing a probation officer in the performance of his or her official duties is illegal, when a probation officer encounters an uncooperative or violent third party, the officer may be forced to retreat because he or she lacks authority to restrain the third party. This lack of authority and resulting need to retreat exposes probation officers to greater risk of harm and allows the third party—along with any evidence or individual the third party is attempting to shield—to elude capture. As a result, evidence that an offender has violated a condition of his or her probation or supervised release, or evidence of other criminal activity, may be lost.

In some circumstances, a probation officer may be able to enlist the assistance of local police in responding to a

hostile third party. But this is not, in and of itself, an adequate solution. First, unless the probation officer knows in advance that he or she is likely to encounter a hostile third party and can find an available police officer to accompany him or her, the probation officer must wait for police backup to arrive. This is often not a viable option. Second, even if a local police officer is available to accompany the probation officer, because the probation officer lacks arrest authority, he or she cannot lawfully assist the police officer if the police officer is accosted. Third, requiring federal probation officers to rely on local law enforcement in responding to uncooperative or violent third parties burdens local police departments and diverts police resources from other uses.

My bill addresses these problems by authorizing Federal probation officers to arrest a third party if there is probable cause to believe the third party has forcibly assaulted, resisted, opposed, impeded, intimidated, or interfered with the officer, or a fellow probation officer, while the officer was engaged in the performance of official duties. This language parallels 18 U.S.C. §111, which makes it a crime to forcibly assault, resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with an officer or employee of the United States while the officer or employee is engaged in the performance of official duties.

The bill additionally provides that this arrest authority shall be exercised in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

It is important to note, that this legislation does not give probation officers general arrest authority. Rather, it merely authorizes arrest in the narrow circumstance where a third party forcibly interferes with a probation officer in the course of the officer's performance of his or her official duties. This limited arrest authority will protect officers, offenders, and third parties alike by preventing obstruction from escalating to actual violence, consistent with the rehabilitative mission of the Federal probation system. State probation officers in many jurisdictions have similar third-party arrest authority.

This legislation has the strong support of the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, and numerous other law enforcement groups. It will make a meaningful difference in the lives of our Federal probation officers and local police officers and in the homes and communities they serve.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 442—CONDEMNING THE TERRORIST ATTACKS IN BRUSSELS AND HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE UNITED STATES CITIZENS MURDERED IN THOSE ATTACKS, AND OFFERING THOUGHTS AND PRAYERS FOR ALL THE VICTIMS, CONDOLENCES TO THEIR FAMILIES, RESOLVE TO SUPPORT THE BELGIAN PEOPLE, AND THE PLEDGE TO DEFEND DEMOCRACY AND STAND IN SOLIDARITY WITH THE COUNTRY OF BELGIUM AND ALL OUR ALLIES IN THE FACE OF CONTINUING TERRORIST ATTACKS ON FREEDOM AND LIBERTY

Mr. CORKER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 442

Whereas, on March 22, 2016, three suicide bombers and their accomplices conducted three coordinated terrorist attacks across the city of Brussels, Belgium, killing at least 32 civilians and wounding over 340 innocent men, women, and children;

Whereas these terrorist attacks were conducted in order to maximize casualties, the 7:58 a.m. explosions targeted the Brussels-Zaventem Airport morning rush and the 9:10 a.m. metro attack targeted those commuting to and from the Maelbeek metro station, which is near the United States Embassy and the European Union headquarters buildings;

Whereas evidence suggests that these attacks explicitly targeted United States interests by placing explosive devices in front of the American Airlines, Delta, and United Airlines check-in counters;

Whereas the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS) has claimed responsibility for these attacks, which marks the second time in just over four months that ISIS has used suicide bombers to attack innocent civilians in a Western European capital;

Whereas the world still grieves for those innocent lives lost and injured in Paris, the 129 murdered civilians and the 350 injured men, women, and children;

Whereas Charles Michel, the Prime Minister of Belgium, has responded to these horrors by calling for solidarity: “[W]hat we feared has happened. Our country and citizens have been hit by a terrorist attack, in a violent and cowardly way . . . To those who have chosen to be the barbaric enemies of liberty, of democracy, of fundamental values, I want to say with the greatest strength that we will remain assembled and united.”;

Whereas President Barack Obama has called these attacks “yet another reminder that the world must unite; we must be together, regardless of nationality or race or faith, in fighting against the scourge of terrorism”;

Whereas Justin and Stephanie Shults, an American married couple, were murdered at the airport, where they had just taken Stephanie's mother for her flight back to the United States after visiting the Shults' home in Belgium;

Whereas Justin and Stephanie Shults met at Vanderbilt University in Nashville, Tennessee, close to both where Justin grew up in Gatlinburg, Tennessee and Stephanie grew up in Lexington, Kentucky;

Whereas Justin and Stephanie lived in Brussels and worked for CLARCOR and Mars,