

Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Michael B. Enzi, John Barrasso, Shelley Moore Capito, John McCain, Bill Cassidy.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5117

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 34 with an amendment numbered 5117.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5118 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5117

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5118 to amendment No. 5117.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5119

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to refer the House message on H.R. 34 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith an amendment numbered 5119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 34 to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 5119.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following:

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5120

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5120 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 34.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5121 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5120

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 5121 to amendment No. 5120.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the motion to concur occur at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, December 5.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### IRAN SANCTIONS EXTENSION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6297, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6297) to reauthorize the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996.

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam President, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 155 Leg.]

YEAS—99

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McCaskill	Udall
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Sanders

The bill (H.R. 6297) was passed.

#### TSUNAMI WARNING, EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FILLING THE SUPREME COURT VACANCY

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the vacancy of the U.S. Supreme Court.

We have been on this issue and what needs to happen next year when our next President is sworn in. For months this year, I and other Members of this body held our ground in saying that the American people deserve a voice in this process. We talked about how the integrity of the advice and consent process, clearly outlined in article II, section 2 of the U.S. Constitution, was at stake. We outlined years of precedent against nominating and confirming a Supreme Court Justice during a Presidential election cycle.

The last time a vacancy arose and a nominee was confirmed in a Presidential election year was 1932, and 1888 was the last Presidential election year in which a Justice was nominated and confirmed by a divided government. Confirming a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court should never be distorted by political theater of a Presidential election cycle. This is a bipartisan position. Both parties have said at different times in the past decade or so what I and many colleagues on this floor have said just this year.

Since day one, I have consistently said that no Supreme Court nominee

should be considered for the Supreme Court or considered by the Senate before the next President is sworn in. That also meant no consideration during the lameduck, either, no matter the outcome of the election. You can't have it both ways. This was my position before the election. This is still my position today. It was and is about the principle, not the individual. As an outsider to the political process, this was a logical and an easy position to take from the very beginning. The process for nominating and confirming a Justice to the U.S. Supreme Court is enshrined in our Constitution.

The hyperpartisanship and politics of a Presidential election cycle should have absolutely no place in this process. Confirming any individual to a lifetime appointment to the U.S. Supreme Court must rise from that kind of political posturing. It must be above any political theater.

Furthermore, as I said previously, the American people deserved a voice in this process. Election day was not only about changing the direction of our country, but it was also a referendum on the ballots of the Supreme Court for generations to come.

Our decision to withhold consent on any Supreme Court nominee, until after a new President is sworn in, protected the integrity of the advice-and-consent process from political games in a heated Presidential campaign cycle. That decision was entirely within the rights and responsibilities of the Senate, as outlined in the Constitution.

We did our job, and next year we are going to continue to do that job of advice and consent as we consider the next nomination for the Supreme Court. With a new President sworn in, it will be time for the Senate to confirm a nominee to the U.S. Supreme Court. The election is over. The people have spoken. Americans have elected a new President. They chose a new direction.

I urge Members of this body to listen to them, and I urge this body to remember the integrity of the process. I also look forward to learning from whomever President-Elect Trump nominates to serve on the Supreme Court and having the opportunity to vote on his or her confirmation.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, since my arrival in the U.S. Senate a few years ago, I have been a proponent and advocate and have attempted to champion an issue many in the Senate care about; that is, the desire to increase America's investment in medical research, increase the likelihood of out-

comes that are desirable in improving every American's well-being, and end the pain and heartache that comes with diagnoses that often end in difficult lives and ultimately death. We have worked hard as a Senate on this issue.

I serve on the Appropriations Committee with the Presiding Officer. I serve on the appropriations subcommittee that funds the National Institutes of Health, and from my vantage point, it is clear to me that we have made a significant investment in increasing the amount of dollars that taxpayers pay to try to find those cures for cancer, eliminate the onset of Alzheimer's, help with diabetes and mental health issues.

Leadership has been busy for a number of months, and that hard work will culminate with a vote next week on the 21st Century Cures Act. It is an important component of this medical innovation I find so necessary for the benefit of Kansans, Americans, and for people who live around the globe.

This Cures Act invests in the future of our country by providing a significant increase in Federal support for lifesaving biomedical research that will simply impact the life of every American—certainly every American family. These important investments range from increasing the funding at the National Institutes of Health, advancing the precision medicine initiative, funding important cancer research through the cancer Moonshot, and supporting the BRAIN Initiative to improve our understanding of diseases like Alzheimer's.

There are also provisions that will accelerate the FDA approval and drug development process as well as fight opioid abuse and suicides.

The subcommittee the Presiding Officer and I serve on in the Appropriations Committee, or the subcommittee that deals with agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration, wants to give the FDA the tools necessary to accelerate the process by which lifesaving drugs and devices are available for Americans and citizens around the globe.

Under the 21st Century Cures Act, the National Institutes of Health will receive a significant dollar investment increase over the next 10 years. We know that will drive research forward to develop a greater understanding of rare diseases. We often think about NIH as dealing with those major afflictions—cancer and Alzheimer's and diabetes—but many Americans unfortunately suffer from rare diseases, and we want to help find the treatments that are patient-centric that treat rare diseases as well.

This funding will send a message that we acknowledge the benefits of NIH research in a strong bipartisan way. This funding will also work in tandem with those increases that we have provided at NIH through the normal annual appropriations process.

We have always given NIH the ability to prioritize their research that could

result in the biggest bang for the buck, the most lifesaving opportunities, but obviously the more resources NIH has, the more opportunities they have to find those cures and advancements in treatments.

This effort also supports the best and brightest among us—those researchers and scientists. I want young Kansans to have a future, if they are interested in science and mathematics and engineering and research, and an opportunity to pursue those careers, hopefully in our State, but certainly in this country. We want the United States to continue to be at the forefront of medical research and within the realm of science and engineering as well. This is an economic engine for our Nation. It can be and is an economic engine for my State. The Cures Act accelerates those opportunities for young people and others across the country who want to devote their lives toward a noble cause of making life longer, greater longevity, but also with fewer challenges and afflictions that come to many people who encounter disease.

The burdens of diseases like Alzheimer's, cancer, stroke, and mental illness can be lessened through research. A long time ago, well before the Affordable Care Act and ObamaCare, I sat down and put my thoughts on paper as to what we should do to try to reduce the cost of health care in this country. What can we do to reduce the price people have to pay to be insured? That list is long. In my view, the way to do this is incremental, but one of those increments is to invest in medical research. The amount of money that we can save if we can find the cure for cancer, if we can find the delay for the onset of Alzheimer's, is certainly in the billions of dollars, and the investment in medical research helps us to save health care dollars, therefore helping us to make health insurance more affordable for all Americans. It certainly is an investment in economics, it is an investment in the ability to save money, as well as what we know about saving lives and making treatments available to people who otherwise would have less life enjoyment as a result of disease.

New scientific findings are what yields breakthroughs that enable us to confront the staggering challenges of disease and illness, and we can do that through the Cures Act and the efforts we have made over the last several years to make certain that NIH has additional resources.

When it comes to cancer, half of all men and a third of all women in the United States will develop cancer in their lifetime. This bill includes the Cancer Moonshot provision for \$1.8 billion of funding. It seeks to combat those statistics to reduce the chances that somebody encounters cancer in their lives and to reduce the costs associated with it. This research will focus on accelerating cancer research and make more therapies more available to

more people, to a wider range of patients, and improve our ability to detect cancers at earlier stages of its development and, hopefully, prevent that disease altogether.

So cancer is front and center with the Moonshot and the Cures Act.

For the Food and Drug Administration, an agency that I have learned more about in the last couple of years and have taken a greater interest in, we need to have reforms that are included in the Cures Act that target speeding up the FDA's approval of new medicines and medical equipment.

Pharmaceuticals have become a significant portion of how we treat disease. It used to be in the early days of my life, and certainly in my parents' lives, that you went to the doctor and you were examined and you may be admitted to the hospital. So often today you are examined, and you are given a prescription. It is a way now that we treat patients. We have today a wider variety of opportunities that pharmaceuticals provide, and we need to make certain that the FDA has the resources, has the right mentality, the mindset—is not a bureaucratic organization—that can advance the production of new drugs available to treat Americans with a wide array of options. This legislation brings a patient-focused view to drug development that will be so relevant in the process of bringing forward the things we need to cure and treat Americans.

Opioids have been a topic of conversation of this Senate for a number of months—for the last several years, in fact—and, unfortunately, millions across the country struggle with an addiction to opioids. It is a heartbreaking reality. The Presiding Officer and I come from rural States. We wish we could say that our States are immune, that it is a problem for folks in the cities or suburbs or someplace else. But, unfortunately, opioids and other drug addictions are a significant component of the challenges we face at home. We include in the Cures bill additional dollars to address the addiction issue, including prevention and treatment, prescription drug monitoring programs, and efforts to reform our current system.

It is important that this legislation pass as a followup to the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, which I voted for earlier this year, to try to stop the spread of opioid abuse in communities across the country.

I have started paying more attention to mental health issues at home as well, visiting our community mental health centers, visiting our State and mental health hospitals. We need to make certain that in our efforts to focus on health care, we have an appropriate prioritization of mental health as well. The 21st Century Cures Act takes steps forward in that regard in providing solutions for more than 11.5 million American adults who live with mental illness that is considered disabling. Important sections of the Help-

ing Families in Mental Health Crisis Act, which represents some of the most significant reforms to the mental health system in more than a decade, are included in the Cures Act. These efforts are aided by establishing a new Assistant Secretary for Mental Health and Substance Abuse at the Department of Health and Human Services, and we are hopeful that this person will help us coordinate direct funding and remove the regulatory barriers that hold back our abilities to find treatment and cures and care for people who suffer from mental illness.

Suicides are a significant problem. The Presiding Officer and I serve on the Veterans' Committee together, where suicides by veterans are an ever-present problem. Twenty-two veterans a day commit suicide. Our efforts at focusing research and treatment in regard to mental health can help save the lives of those who sacrificed so much for us and comfort their families and avoid disasters and tragedies that occur way too often.

There are a couple of provisions that were included in this legislation as it works its way through the Senate. I am supportive of many of those related to rural health care. For my time in Congress, I have been an active member of the rural health care caucus. I represent a State that has 127 hospitals in communities across our State. Those hospitals provide health care and jobs for people in rural America. Rural Kansans have paid into FICA and Social Security taxes and deserve to have the attention they need for treating individuals who choose to live in rural America, in keeping those hospital doors open, keeping physicians in our communities, and keeping the pharmacy open on Main Street. Those are things that matter greatly to me.

Unfortunately, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, a component of the Department of Health and Human Services, often creates rules and regulations that make no sense in the places that the Presiding Officer and I come from. So I am supporting a couple of things in particular that are included in this bill. We had a regulation that came from CMS—the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—generally called physician supervision. Its enforcement is delayed 1 year in the Cures Act. I am the sponsor of legislation to rid us of that regulation permanently, but it is a benefit for us to have it out of the system for another year as we work to find that permanent solution. But the idea that there must be a physician present in certain circumstances—it is difficult for us to have a physician on site in a room with a patient in every circumstance, and our mid-levels and others are important to us in rural communities in particular. That delay is something we have worked hard on, and I am pleased to see that we were successful in getting it included in this legislation.

Many of those hospitals that I mentioned in Kansas—127 hospitals in our

State, 80-plus—90 or so—are what are called critical access hospitals, which is a special designation that allows them a so-called cost-based reimbursement. When I was in the House of Representatives, I authored legislation that created an opportunity to expand the critical access hospital designation to hospitals that are slightly larger and that wouldn't otherwise meet the criteria, which is 25 beds or less. There is a demonstration project, a pilot program that has been operating in the country for the last 5 years, trying to determine what cost-based reimbursement would mean for hospitals that are slightly larger than 25 beds. That demonstration project is expiring. Fortunately, language in the Cures Act extends that community health demonstration project—something, again, we have worked hard to make certain happens. I am pleased that the lead sponsors of this legislation were amenable to our request to include these provisions.

I would conclude by saying the United States has a responsibility to continue our leadership in providing medical breakthroughs that will help change the world, and certainly change people's lives, to develop those cures and treat diseases, and we must commit ourselves to significant support for research that is supported in legislation just like the 21st Century Cures Act. This legislation has the capacity to benefit millions of Americans suffering from chronic diseases. It can help our grandparents, our children, our lifelong best friends, and we can avoid the tragedy that comes with a diagnosis that often ends in death. People's lives depend upon the decisions we make, and this is a decision we can make that will benefit many Americans and their families.

Our researchers must be able to rely on consistent, sustainable funding support from Congress; otherwise we will lose the best and brightest, and we will lose men and women who think maybe they want to be a researcher and find a cure for a disease, but because of their uncertainty as to whether or not their research might get funded or whether the funding is going to be there next year—they get it, but they are uncertain as to whether it will continue. We don't want to lose those bright minds and noble colleagues, people across our country who might enter into the profession of medical research to help find ways to meet the needs of Americans and their health care.

NIH-supported research has raised life expectancy, improved the quality of life, and lowered overall health care costs. This legislation strengthens that circumstance and allows us to better remain globally competitive in the arena of medical research. The 21st Century Cures Act is a powerful statement by Congress, but, more important than being a statement, it is something that will actually make a difference in the future of the people that we care about.

I commend the efforts by many Senators and Members of the House to make certain that this legislation arrives here in the Senate before there is a recess for the holidays. It will be a strong statement, but, more importantly, we expect significant results and the improvement of people's lives across the Nation and around the globe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2016

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 10, introduced earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 10) to provide for the consideration of a definition of anti-Semitism for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities.

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

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today, along with my colleague from South Carolina, to talk about a bill we have introduced entitled the "Anti-Semitism Awareness Act of 2016."

Let me say first that I wish we were living in a time where we would not have to introduce legislation like this, but unfortunately what we have seen over a long period of time—and I think a problem that is getting worse—is the rising tide of anti-Semitism in substantial sectors of our society. We have, in fact, a rise in the incidence of religious discrimination and religiously motivated hate crimes. To say that is unacceptable, even un-American, is an understatement.

We have to take action at long last to do what we can in the U.S. Senate, and I hope in the House as well, to not just speak out against anti-Semitism but to take action which will lead to a better strategy to deal with it. What do I mean by that? Well, it is simple. It is about definitions, and it is about making sure that Federal agencies, such as the Department of Education, do their job when it comes to combating anti-Semitism. We know that one piece of legislation is not somehow going to magically eradicate anti-Semitism. We don't have that naive hope. But what we do believe is that if we don't take action, this problem is only going to get worse.

Some of the problem, frankly, is on our college campuses, and I know that

is true, unfortunately and regrettably, in my home State of Pennsylvania. We don't have time to list every incident, every action, every terrible example of this, but I will just provide one for the record.

In September, students at Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania—one of our great institutions of higher education not only in Pennsylvania but across the country—Swarthmore is a great school, but here is what they found. They found swastikas spray-painted in a bathroom in the library. The college leadership did the right thing in swiftly condemning these actions and removing the graffiti, and I am glad they did that.

I can only try to imagine—and I can literally only try to understand because I have never been the victim of this kind of hate—the horror that was experienced by those students and their families. A person comes to a college or a university as a place where they are going to learn and grow and live in a community, and then there are people—for whatever reason, and I will never understand the reason anyone would do that—painting those images and using language and taking other actions that discriminate against people because of who they are. We have to be not just concerned about this, as I said, but we have to figure out a way to take action.

This particular piece of legislation is aimed at a terrible manifestation of this problem. When anti-Semitic views lead to discrimination against students of Jewish faith or Jewish ancestry, that is the result, and they are the victims of this. The intent here is simple and narrowly circumscribed to make sure we are getting at the problem as best we can to define anti-Semitism at long last—this hasn't been done before—to define anti-Semitism so that the Department of Education can effectively investigate allegations of discrimination motivated by anti-Semitism under the Civil Rights Act. The bill does not infringe on the First Amendment. It does not infringe on those rights of free speech. It is intended to help protect students from discrimination on the basis of their faith.

We all agree that religious discrimination has no place on campuses, has no place in our society, and we have to do more than just speak out against it. That is fundamental, but we can do more than just speak out; we can define it and thereby give in this case one Federal Government agency one tool it needs to deal with this issue. This is a bill which is timely not only because of what is happening on college campuses but unfortunately what has happened in too many parts of our society. We want to make sure the Department of Education has at least one of those tools to deal with this problem.

Because of the nature of this problem, we have people on both sides of the aisle here who are very concerned about it. I am particularly grateful

that I am joined by my colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, who is joining with me. We are a Democrat and a Republican from different parts of the country and a different point of view on a lot of issues. On this issue we are unified, and we have a solidarity about not just the problem, but there is a solidarity and a consensus about one of the things we can do to take action on this issue.

I am grateful to be joined by my colleague from South Carolina.

I yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I thank Senator CASEY for joining me on the floor.

There is no question that much of our country yearns for a day when Republicans and Democrats come together on issues that impact who we are as a nation. I am thankful that Senator CASEY has joined me in this objective of making sure hate is pushed out of this Nation every single day.

Today I come to speak about an alarming issue—the issue of hate. It truly tears at the very fabric of our great Nation and should inspire all of us to stand up and be counted on the side of justice, on the side of common sense, and on the side of making sure this great American family remains one Nation.

Over the past several years, there has been a sharp rise in religiously motivated hate crimes, particularly on our college and university campuses all over America. According to the FBI, close to 60 percent of these crimes were due to anti-Jewish sentiments. From 2014 to 2015, we saw the number of reported incidents double. Let me say that one more time. In a year, we saw a doubling of the incidence of religious discrimination on college campuses, and the vast majority of those issues and situations focused on the Jewish community. There were 90 anti-Jewish incidents reported at 60 schools last year, compared with 47 incidents on 43 campuses just the year before. These numbers are staggering.

Senator CASEY noted that there have been college campuses and buildings on college campuses where we have seen swastikas. We have heard protests that call for Zionists to leave the school, and we have heard references being made to burning in Auschwitz. I am stunned and saddened by the careless and hateful reminders of such an incredibly dark and daunting time in our world's history, but I also feel empowered and committed to taking a stand against hate. No one, not a single person should ever have to experience being singled out because of who they are or attacked based on the religion they choose to follow. There is simply no place in our country for this kind of intolerance, especially not in our country, the greatest country on Earth.

As citizens of this great Nation, it falls on us to stand up and do more to protect our students from being targeted by any form of hate and bigotry.