S. 489

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to participant votes on the suspension of benefits under multiemployer plans in critical and declining status.

S. 505

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 505, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an energy equivalent of a gallon of diesel in the case of liquefied natural gas for purposes of the Inland Waterways Trust Fund financing rate.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to modernize the regulation of nuclear energy.

S. 518

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 518, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide for technical assistance for small treatment works.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

S.J. RES. 27

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 27, a joint resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to ''Clarification of Employer's Continuing Obligation to Make and Maintain an Accurate Record of Each Recordable Injury and Illness''.

S.J. RES. 28

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 28, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to accidental release prevention requirements of risk management programs under the Clean Air Act.

S. RES. 23

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 23, a resolution establishing the Select Committee on Cybersecurity.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 536. A bill to promote transparency in the oversight of cybersecurity risks at publicly traded companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Cybersecurity Disclosure Act of 2017 along with two members of the Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator Collins, and the ranking member, Senator Warner. In response to data breaches of various companies that exposed the personal information of millions of customers, our legislation asks each publicly traded company to include—in Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, disclosures to investors—information on whether any member of the board of directors is a cybersecurity expert, and if why having this expertise on the board of directors is not necessary because of other cyber security steps taken by the publicly traded company. To be clear, the legislation does not require companies to take any actions other than to provide this disclosure to its investors.

Many investors may be surprised to learn that board directors who participated in the National Association of Corporate Directors, NACD, roundtable discussions on cyber security late in 2013 admitted that ''the lack of adequate knowledge of information technology risk has made it challenging for them to 'effectively oversee management's cybersecurity activities.''' More recently, in Deloitte's 10th Global Risk Management Survey of Financial Services Institutions, published this month, 42 percent of respondents considered their institution to be less effective in managing cybersecurity. And according to the 2016–2017 NACD Public Company Governance Survey, ''fifty-nine percent of respondents reported that they find it challenging to oversee cyber risk, and only 19 percent of respondents said that their boards possess a high level of knowledge about cybersecurity.'' Indeed, Yahoo in its most recent annual report, which was filed with the SEC last week, disclosed that ''the Independent Committee found that failures in communication, management, inquiry and internal reporting contributed to the lack of proper comprehension and handling of the 2014 Security Incident. The Independent Committee also found that the Audit and Finance Committee and the full board were not adequately informed of the full severity, risks, and potential impacts of the 2014 Security Incident and related matters.'' The 2014 Security Incident here refers to the fact that ''a copy of certain user account information for approximately 500 million user accounts was stolen from Yahoo's network in late 2014.'' This is particularly troubling given that data breaches are on the rise. Indeed, 2016 was a recordbreaking year for data breaches, which increased 40 percent from the prior year to 1,093 breaches according to the Identity Theft Resource Center.

Investors and customers deserve a clear understanding of whether publicly traded companies are prioritizing cyber security and have the capacity to protect investors and customers from cyber-related attacks. Our legislation aims to provide a better understanding of these issues through improved SEC disclosure.

While this legislation is a matter for consideration by the Banking Committee, of which I am a member, this bill is also informed by my service on the Armed Services Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence. It is through this Banking-Armed Services-Intelligence perspective that I see that our economic security is indeed a matter of our national security, and this is particularly the case as our economy becomes increasingly reliant on technology and the Internet.

For example, when he was Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, appeared before the Armed Services Committee in 2015 and testified that ''cyber threats to the U.S. national and economic security are increasing in frequency, scale, sophistication and severity of impact.'' He further said that ''[b]ecause of our heavy dependence on the Internet, nearly all information communication technologies and I.T. networks and systems will be perpetually at risk.''

Indeed, retired Army GEN Keith Alexander, who is the former commander of the United States Cyber Command and former Director of the National Security Agency, appeared before the Armed Services Committee this month and stated that ''while the primary responsibility of government is to defend the nation, the private sector also shares responsibility in creating the partnership necessary to make the defense of our nation possible. Neither the government nor the private sector can capably protect their systems and networks without extensive and close cooperation.''

With mounting cyber threats and concerns over the capabilities of corporate directors, we all need to be more proactive in ensuring our Nation's cyber security before there are additional serious breaches. This legislation seeks to take one step toward that

goal by encouraging publicly traded companies to be more transparent to their investors and customers on whether and how their boards of directors are prioritizing cyber security.

I thank Harvard Law School professor John Coates, MIT professor Simon Johnson, Columbia Law School professor John Coffee, and the Consumer Federation of America for their support, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator Collins, Senator Warner, and me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 550. A bill to restore statutory rights to the people of the United States from forced arbitration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, I have reintroduced legislation to protect Americans from being stripped of their legal rights by little known clauses that are now hidden in an alarming number of contracts. When we enter into agreements to obtain cell phone service, rent an apartment, or accept a new job, most are not made aware of the forced arbitration clauses that are tucked away in the legal fine print. But these dangerous provision force us to abandon our constitutional right to protect ourselves in court and instead send hard-working Americans to face wealthy corporations behind closed doors in private arbitration. This must change.

When Congress passed the Federal Arbitration Act in 1925, it was intended to help businesses resolve legal disputes with each other. But over the past two decades, private arbitration has been abused by large companies to push Americans out of court. In doing so, these companies have effectively opted out of critical labor, consumer, and civil rights laws that give Americans the ability to assert their claims before our independent judiciary.

Forced arbitration clauses now appear in nearly every contract we sign. Unfortunately, examples of the injustice caused by these clauses are equally ubiquitous and can be found all across the country. They affect consumers, workers, seniors, veterans, and families in Vermont and every other State, and the cases are heart-wrenching.

Just last week, the Washington Post reported that hundreds of current and former employees of Sterling Jewelers—a company that earns $6 billion in annual revenue—have for years alleged that the company is engaged in pervasive gender discrimination and has fostered a culture that condones sexual harassment. The stories now being reported are shocking and date back to the early 1990s. Yet, despite the fact that women at the company have been alleging misconduct for decades, no one knew about it. That is because their claims were hidden behind closed doors because of private arbitration. To this day, we still do not know the full details.

The press has helped to bring attention to other instances of forced arbitration in recent years. In 2015, the Los Angeles Times revealed that Wells Fargo used arbitration clauses to deny customers whose names were used to open fraudulent accounts an opportunity to seek justice in court. In fact, Wells Fargo asked a Federal court in Utah to move a number of sham account allegations to arbitration. The New York Times dedicated a three-part investigative series to highlighting the impact on consumers and workers of forced arbitration clauses. And becoming the story herself, television journalist Gretchen Carlson was barred from speaking publicly about her allegations of sexual harassment against former FOX News chairman Roger Ailes.

I have long raised concerns about the practice of forced arbitration, and as chairman led hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 2007, 2008, 2011, and 2013. This should not be a partisan issue. Both Republican and Democratic attorneys general have repeatedly spoken out against the Federal Arbitration Act's intrusion on State sovereignty and a State's compelling interest in protecting the health and welfare of its citizens. In Vermont, lawmakers enacted commonsense legislation to limit the abuse of forced arbitration clauses and raise consumer awareness, but but this law was invalidated because it conflicted with Federal law. Companies have effectively created a ''get out of jail free'' card that guts our laws and shields bad actors from any type of public accountability. This is an unconscionable situation, and Congress must act.

The Restoring Statutory Rights Act that I am reintroducing today/will protect Americans' right to seek justice in our courts. It will ensure that our Federal laws will actually be effective by ensuring that Americans cannot be stripped of their ability to enforce their rights before our independent court system. This bill also ensures that when States act to address forced arbitration, as my home State of Vermont has, they are not preempted by an overbroad reading of our Federal arbitration laws.

This effort is supported by the Leadership Conference for Civil and Human Rights, the National Employment Lawyers' Association, and consumer groups such as National Association of Consumer Advocates, Consumers Union, Public Citizen, the National Consumer Law Center, and Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety. For years, these groups and many others have worked tirelessly to highlight the injustice of forced arbitration and the full scope of the number of people it affects.

All Senators should care about ensuring that corporations cannot unilaterally circumvent the statutes that this body writes, debates, and enacts into law. Senators should also care about the ability of the States to protect consumers from unconscionable contracts. I urge Members to support this bill.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 553. A bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education, and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pursue claims against certain institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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. 553

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 ''Court Legal Access and Student Support (CLASS) Act of 2017''.

SEC. 2. INAPPLICABILITY OF CHAPTER 1 OF TITLE 9, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ENROLLMENT AGREEMENTS MADE BETWEEN STUDENTS AND CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code (relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements) shall not apply to an enrollment agreement made between a student and an institution of higher education.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002).

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON LIMITATIONS ON ABILITY OF STUDENTS TO PURSUE CLAIMS AGAINST CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(30) The institution will not require any student to agree to, and will not enforce, any limitation or restriction (including a limitation or restriction on any available choice of applicable law, a jury trial, or venue) on the ability of a student to pursue a claim, individually or with others, against an institution in court.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill for the private relief of Shirley Constantino Tan. Ms. Tan is a Filipina national living in Pacifica, CA. She is the proud

mother of 20-year-old U.S. citizen twin boys, Joriene and Jashley, and the spouse of Jay Mercado, a naturalized U.S. citizen.

I believe Ms. Tan merits Congress's special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief because her removal from the United States would cause undue hardship for her and her family. She faces deportation to the Philippines, which would separate her from her family and jeopardize her safety.

Ms. Tan experienced horrific violence in the Philippines before she left to come to the United States. When she was only 14 years old, her cousin murdered her mother and her sister and shot Shirley in the head. While the cousin who committed the murders was eventually prosecuted, he received a short jail sentence. Fearing for her safety, Ms. Tan fled the Philippines just before her cousin was due to be released from jail. She entered the United States legally on a visitor's visa in 1989.

Ms. Tan's current deportation order is the result of negligent counsel. She applied for asylum in 1995. While her case appeal was pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals, her attorney failed to submit a brief to support her case. As a result, the case was dismissed, and the Board of Immigration Appeals granted Shirley voluntary departure from the United States.

Ms. Tan never received notice that the Board of Immigration Appeals granted her voluntary departure. Her attorney moved offices, did not receive the order, and ultimately never informed her of the order. As a result, Ms. Tan did not depart the United States and the grant of voluntary departure automatically led to a removal order. She learned about the deportation order for the first time on January 28, 2009, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents took her into immigration custody.

Because of her attorney's negligent actions, Ms. Tan was denied the opportunity to present her case in immigration proceedings. She later filed a complaint with the State Bar of California against her former attorney. She is not the first person to file such a complaint against this attorney.

On February 4, 2015, Ms. Tan's spouse, Jay, a U.S. citizen, filed an approved spousal petition on her behalf. On August 20, 2015, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services denied her application due to the fact that she still had a final order of removal. Ms. Tan must go back to the immigration court and ask for the court to terminate her case and then reapply for her green card. Ms. Tan is now again facing the threat of deportation while she seeks to close her case before an immigration court.

In addition to the hardship that Ms. Tan would endure if she is deported, her deportation would cause serious hardship to her two U.S. citizen children, Joriene and Jashley.

Joriene is a junior at Stanford University and is premed, majoring in human biology. In addition to his studies, Joriene is involved in Stanford's Pilipino-American Student Union.

Jashley is a junior at Chapman University, majoring in business administration. Ms. Tan no longer runs her in-home daycare and is a homemaker.

If Ms. Tan were forced to leave the United States, her family has expressed that they would go with her to the Philippines or try to find a third country where the entire family could relocate. This would mean that Joriene and Jashley would have to leave behind their education and the only home they know in the United States.

I do not believe it is in our Nation's best interest to force this family, with two U.S. citizen children, to make the choice between being separated and relocating to a country where they may face safety concerns or other serious hardships.

Ms. Tan and her family are involved in their community in Pacifica and own their own home. The family attends Good Shepherd Catholic Church, volunteering at the church and the Mother Teresa of Calcutta's Daughters of Charity. Ms. Tan has the support of dozens of members of her community who have shared with me the family's spirit of commitment to their community.

Enactment of the legislation I am introducing on behalf of Ms. Tan today will enable this entire family to continue their lives in California and make positive contributions to their community.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 556. A bill for the relief of Joseph Gabra and Sharon Kamel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing private relief legislation on behalf of Joseph Gabra and Sharon Kamel, a couple living with their four U.S. citizen children in Camarillo, CA.

Joseph and Sharon are nationals of Egypt who fled their home country over 19 years ago after being targeted for their religious membership in the Christian Coptic Church in Egypt. They became involved with this church during the 1990s, Joseph as an accountant and project coordinator helping to build community facilities and Sharon as the church's training director in human resources.

Unfortunately, Joseph and Sharon were also subjected to threats and abuse. Joseph was jailed repeatedly because of his involvement with the church. Sharon's family members were violently targeted, including her cousin who was murdered and her brother whose business was firebombed. When Sharon became pregnant with her first child, she was threatened by a member of a different religious organization for raising her child in a non-Muslim faith.

Joseph and Sharon came to the United States legally on visitor visas in November 1998. Due to their fears of persecution in Egypt based on their religious beliefs, they filed for asylum in the United States in May 1999.

However, Joseph, who has a speech impediment, had difficulty communicating why he was afraid to return to Egypt, and 1 year later their asylum application was denied. Considering that Sharon's brother, who also applied for asylum for similar reasons, was granted asylum in the United States, Joseph and Sharon appealed the denial of their asylum applications, to no avail.

While Sharon's brother, who is now a U.S. citizen, has filed a family-based immigrant petition on Sharon's behalf, it will be at least 4 years until she will even be eligible for a visa number due to visa backlogs.

If Sharon and Joseph are deported before then, they will not only be separated from their family but will be forced to return to a country where persecution of Coptic Christians continues.

Due to their fear of returning to Egypt, Joseph and Sharon have therefore tried to build a life for themselves here in the United States, working hard while building their beautiful family. With the protection of past private bills I filed on their behalf, Joseph was able to get his certified public accountant license and opened his own accounting firm, where Sharon works by his side.

Joseph and Sharon make sure that their four U.S. citizen children—Jessica, age 18, Rebecca, age 17, Rafael, age 16, and Veronica, age 11—all attend school in California and maintain good grades.

Joseph and Sharon carry strong support from friends, members of their local church, and other Californians who attest to their good character and community contributions.

I am concerned that the entire family would face serious and unwarranted hardships if Joseph and Sharon were forced to return to Egypt. For Jessica, Rebecca, Rafael, and Veronica, the only home they know is in the United States. Separation of this family would be devastating and the alternative—relocating the family to Egypt—could be dire, as it is quite possible that these four American children would face discrimination or worse on account of their religion, as was the experience of many of their family members.

Joseph and Sharon have made a compelling plea to remain in the United States. These parents emphasize their commitment to supporting their children and creating a healthy and productive place for them to grow up in California. I believe this family deserves that opportunity.

I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this private relief bill on behalf of Joseph Gabra and Sharon Kamel.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 557. A bill for the relief of Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela

Lopez Martinez, and Adilene Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Jose Alberto Martinez Moreno, Micaela Lopez Martinez, and their daughter, Adilene Martinez. This family is originally from Mexico but has been living in California for over 20 years. I believe they merit Congress's special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief.

When Jose came to the United States from Mexico, he began working as a busboy in restaurants in San Francisco, CA. In 1990, he started working as a cook at Palio D'Asti, an award-winning Italian restaurant in San Francisco.

Jose worked his way through the ranks, eventuall becoming Palio's sous chef. His colleagues describe him as a reliable and cool-headed coworker and as ''an exemplary employee'' who not only is ''good at his job but is also a great boss to his subordinates.''

He and his wife Micaela call San Francisco home. Micaela is a homemaker and part-time housekeeper. They have three daughters, two of whom are U.S. citizens. Their oldest daughter, Adilene, age 28, is undocumented. She currently works fulltime at a cinema and hopes to continue pursuing her studies in the future.

The Martinez's second daughter, Jazmin, age 24, is a U.S. citizen. She graduated from Leadership High School and is now studying at California State University, San Francisco. Jazmin has been diagnosed with asthma, which requires constant treatment. According to her doctor, if Jazmin were to return to Mexico with her family, the high altitude and air pollution in Mexico City could be fatal to her. The Martinez's other U.S. citizen daughter, Karla, is 19 years old and attends San Francisco City College.

The Martinez family attempted to legalize their status through several channels.

In 2001, Jose's sister, who has legal status, petitioned for Jose to get a green card. However, the current green card backlog for siblings from Mexico is very long, and it will be many years before Jose will be eligible to legalize his status though his sister.

In 2002, the Martinez family applied for political asylum. Their application was denied. An immigration judge denied their subsequent application for cancellation of removal.

Finally, Daniel Scherotter, the executive chef and owner of Palio D'Asti, petitioned for an employment-based green card for Jose based upon his unique skills as a chef. Jose's petition was approved by U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. However, before he will be eligible for a green card, he must apply for a hardship waiver, which cannot be guaranteed.

The Martinez family has become an integral part of their community in California. They are active in their faith community. They volunteer with community-based organizations and are, in turn, supported by their community. When I first introduced this bill, I received dozens of letters of support from their fellow parishioners, teachers, and members of their community.

The Martinez family truly exemplifies the American dream. Jose worked his way through the restaurant industry to become a chef and an indispensable employee at a renowned restaurant. With great dedication, Micaela has worked hard to raise three daughters who are advancing their education and look forward to continuing the pursuit of their goals.

I believe the Martinez family's continued presence in the United States would allow them to continue making significant contributions to their community in California.

I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 558. A bill for the relief of Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I offer private immigration relief legislation to provide lawful permanent resident status to Esidronio Arreola-Saucedo, Maria Elena Cobian Arreola, Nayely Arreola Carlos, and Cindy Jael Arreola. The Arreolas are Mexican nationals living in the Fresno area of California.

Esidronio and Maria Elena have lived in the United States for over 20 years. Two of their five children—Nayely, age 30, and Cindy, age 28—also stand to benefit from this legislation. The other three Arreola children—Robert, age 25, Daniel, age 22, and Saray, age 20—are U.S. citizens. The story of the Arreola family is compelling, and I believe they merit Congress's special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Arreolas are facing deportation in part because of grievous errors committed by their previous counsel, who has since been disbarred. In fact, the attorney's conduct was so egregious that it compelled an immigration judge to write to the Executive Office of Immigration Review seeking the attorney's disbarment for his actions in his clients' immigration cases.

Esidronio came to the United States in 1986 and was an agricultural migrant worker in the fields of California for several years. As a migrant worker at that time, he would have been eligible for permanent residence through the Seasonal Agricultural Workers, SWA, Program, had he known about it.

Maria Elena was living in the United States at the time she became pregnant with her daughter Cindy. She returned to Mexico to give birth because she wanted to avoid any immigration issues.

Because of the length of time that the Arreolas were in the United States, it is likely that they would have qualified for suspension of deportation, which would have allowed them to remain in the United States legally. However, the poor legal representation they received foreclosed this opportunity.

One of the most compelling reasons for my introduction of this private bill is the devastating impact the deportation of Esidronio and Maria Elena would have on their children—three of whom are American citizens—and the other two who have lived in the United States since they were toddlers. America is the only country the Arreola children have ever known.

Nayely, the oldest, was the first in her family to graduate from high school and the first to graduate college. She recently received her Masters in Business Administration from Fresno Pacific University, a regionally ranked university, and now works in the admissions office. Nayely is married and has a young son named Elijah Ace Carlos.

At a young age, Nayely demonstrated a strong commitment to the ideals of citizenship in her adopted country. She worked hard to achieve her full potential both through her academic endeavors and community service. As the Associate Dean of Enrollment Services at Fresno Pacific University states in a letter of support, ''[T]he leaders of Fresno Pacific University saw in Nayely, a young person who will become exemplary of all that is good in the American dream.''

In high school, Nayely was a member of the Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID) college preparatory program in which students commit to determining their own futures through attaining a college degree. Nayely was also President of the Key Club, a community service organization. Perhaps the greatest hardship to Nayely's U.S. citizen husband and child, if she were forced to return to Mexico, would be her lost opportunity to realize her dreams and contribute further to her community and to this country.

Nayely's sister, Cindy, is also married and has a 7-year-old daughter and a 5-year-old son. Neither Nayely nor Cindy is eligible to automatically adjust their status based on their marriages because of their initial unlawful entry.

The Arreolas also have other family who are U.S. citizens or lawful permanent residents of this country. Maria Elena has three brothers who are American citizens, and Esidronio has a sister who is an American citizen. They have no immediate family in Mexico.

According to immigration authorities, this family has never had any problems with law enforcement. I am told that they have filed their taxes every year from 1990 to the present. They have always worked hard to support themselves.

As I mentioned, Esidronio was previously employed as a farm worker but now has his own business in California repairing electronics. His business has been successful enough to enable him to purchase a home for his family. He and his wife are active in their church community and in their children's education.

It is clear to me that this family has embraced the American dream. Enactment of the legislation I have reintroduced today will enable the Arreolas to continue to make significant contributions to their community as well as the United States.

I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 559. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Plascencia Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to offer legislation to provide lawful permanent residence status to Alfredo Plascencia Lopez, a Mexican national who lives in the San Bruno area of California.

I offer legislation on his behalf because I believe that, without it, this hard-working man, wife who is a lawful permanent resident, and children would face extreme hardship. His children would either face separation from their father or be forced to leave the only country they know and give up the education they are pursuing in the United States.

Alfredo and his wife Maria have been in the United States for over 20 years. They worked for years to adjust their status through appropriate legal channels, but poor legal representation ruined their opportunities.

The Plascencias' lawyer refused to return their calls or otherwise communicate with them in any way. He also failed to forward crucial immigration documents. Because of the poor representation they received, Alfredo only became aware that they had been ordered to leave the United States 15 days prior to his scheduled deportation.

Alfredo was shocked to learn of his attorney's malfeasance, but he acted quickly to secure legitimate counsel and filed the appropriate paperwork to delay his deportation and determine if any other legal action could be taken.

Together, Alfredo and Maria have used their professional successes, with the assistance of private bills, to realize many of the goals dreamed of by all Americans. They have worked hard and saved up to buy their home.

They have good health care benefits, and they each have begun saving for retirement. They are sending their children Christina, Erika, and Danny, to college and plan to send the rest of their children to college, as well.

Their oldest child, Christina, is 26 years old, and takes classes at Heald College to become a paralegal. Erika, age 22, graduated from high school and is currently taking classes at Skyline College. Her teachers have praised her abilities and have referred to her as a ''bright spot'' in the classroom. Danny, age 20, currently attends the University of California and volunteers at his local homeless shelter in the soup kitchen. Daisy, age 15, and Juan Pablo, age 10, are in school and plan on attending college.

Allowing Alfredo to remain in the United States is necessary to enable his family to continue thriving in the United States. His children are dedicated to pursuing their education and being productive members of their community.

I do not believe that Alfredo should be separated from his family. I am reintroducing this legislation to protect the best interest of Alfredo's U.S. citizen children and his wife, who is a lawful permanent resident. I believe that Alfredo will continue to make positive contributions to his community in California and this country. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 560. A bill for the relief of Jorge Rojas Gutierrez and Oliva Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a private relief bill on behalf of Jorge Rojas Gutierrez and his wife, Oliva Gonzalez. The Rojas family, originally from Mexico, is living in the San Jose area of California.

The story of the Rojas family is compelling, and I believe they merit Congress's special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

Jorge and Oliva originally came to the United States in 1990 when their son Jorge Rojas, Jr., was just 2 years old. In 1995, they left the country to attend a funeral and then reentered the United States on visitors' visas.

The family has grown to include three U.S. citizen children: Alexis, now 24 years old, Tanya, 22 years old, and Matias, now 7 years old. Jorge and Oliva are also the grandparents of Meena Rojas.

The Rojas family first attempted to legalize their status in the United States when an unscrupulous immigration consultant, who was not an attorney, advised them to apply for asylum. Unfortunately, without proper legal guidance, the family did not realize at the time that they lacked a valid basis for asylum. Their asylum claim was denied in 2008, leaving the Rojas family with no further options to legalize their status.

Since their arrival in the United States more than 20 years ago, the Rojas family has demonstrated a robust work ethic and a strong commitment to their community in California. They have paid their taxes and worked hard to contribute to this country.

Jorge is a hard-working individual who has been employed by BrightView Landscaping Services, formerly known as Valley Crest Landscape Maintenance, in San Jose, CA, for the past 20 years. Currently, he works on commercial landscaping projects. Jorge is well-respected by his supervisor and his peers.

In addition to supporting his family, Jorge has volunteered his time to provide modern green landscaping and building projects at his children's school in California. He is active in his neighborhood association, through which he worked with his neighbors to open a library and community center in their community.

Oliva, in addition to raising her three children, has also been very active in the local community. She volunteers with the People Acting in Community Together, PACT, organization, where she works to prevent crime, gangs, and drug dealing in San Jose neighborhoods and schools.

Jorge Rojas, Jr., who entered the United States as an infant with his parents, is now the father of 6-year-old Meena. He is 28 years old and working at a job that allows him to support his daughter. Jorge graduated from Del Mar High School in 2007. He has obtained temporary protection from deportation through the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, Program.

Alexis, age 24, graduated from West Valley College in Saratoga, CA, and is interested in continuing his linguistics studies at San Jose State University. Tanya, age 22, is now in her second semester at San Jose State University. Their teachers have described them as ''fantastic, wonderful and gifted'' students.

Perhaps one of the most compelling reasons for permitting the Rojas family to remain in the United States is the impact that their deportation would have on their four children. Three of the Rojas children—Alexis, Tanya, and Matias—American citizens. Additionally, Jorge Rojas, Jr., has lived in the United States since he was a toddler. America is the only country these children have called home. It seems so clear to me that this family has embraced the American dream, and their continued presence in our country would do so much to promote the values we hold dear,

When I first introduced this bill, I received dozens of letters from the community in Northern California in support of this family. Enactment of the legislation I have reintroduced today will keep this great family together and enable each of them to continue making significant contributions to their community as well as the United States.

I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 561. A bill for the relief of Alicia Aranda De Buendia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am reintroducing a private relief bill

on behalf of Alicia Buendia, a woman who has lived in the Fresno area of California for more than 20 years. I believe her situation merits Congress's special consideration.

She is married to Jose Buendia, and together they have raised two outstanding children, Ana Laura, age 28, and Alex, age 26, a U.S. citizen. Both children have excelled in school. Ana Laura graduated from University of California, Irvine, and Alex is currently attending the University of California, Merced.

I previously introduced bills for Alicia, her husband, and Ana Laura. Thankfully, Jose has successfully secured lawful permanent residency for himself through cancellation of removal. This followed 7 unfortunate years of delay in the immigration courts to determine his eligibility under the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 for permanent residence. Ana Laura has obtained temporary protection from deportation through the 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, DACA, Program.

However, Alicia, who is eligible to adjust status, is still awaiting a determination on a family-based immigration petition filed by her U.S. citizen son. Additionally, she would be required to file a waiver application, which could result in separation from her family

Alicia warrants private relief and a chance to start fresh in America. She goes to work season after season in California's labor-intensive agriculture industry in Reedley, CA, where she currently works for a fruit packing company.

In the more than 20 years of living in California, Alicia has dedicated herself to her family and community. She and Jose have worked hard to honestly feed their family and have raised two exceptional children who have both pursued and excelled in higher education.

Alicia has a strong connection to her local community, serving as an active member of her church. She and Jose pay their taxes every year, have successfully paid off their mortgage, and remain free of debt. They have shown that they are responsible, maintaining health insurance, savings accounts, and retirement accounts. Without this private bill, Alicia would be separated from her lawful permanent resident husband, two children who rely on her for love, support, and guidance.

I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 562. A bill for the relief of Ruben Mkoian, Asmik Karapetian, and Arthur Mkoian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I am reintroducing private relief legislation in the 115th Congress on behalf of Ruben Mkoian, Asmik Karapetian, and their son, Arthur Mkoian. The Mkoian family has been living in Fresno, CA, for over 20 years. I continue to believe this family deserves Congress's special consideration for such an extraordinary form of relief as a private bill.

The Mkoian family is originally from Armenia. They decided to leave Armenia for the United States in the early 1990s, following several incidents in which the family experienced harassment, vandalism and threats to their well-being.

In Armenia, Ruben worked as a police sergeant on vehicle licensing. At one point, he was offered a bribe to register stolen vehicles, which he refused and reported to his superior, the police chief. He later learned that a coworker had registered the vehicles at the request of the same chief.

After Ruben reported the bribe offer to illegally register vehicles and said he would call the police, his family store was vandalized and he received threatening phone calls telling him to keep quiet. A bottle of gasoline was thrown into his family's residence, burning it to the ground. In April 1992, several men entered the family store and assaulted Ruben, hospitalizing him for 22 days.

Ruben, Asmik, and their son Arthur, who was 3 years old at the time, left Armenia and entered the United States on visitor visas. They applied for political asylum that same year on the grounds that they would be subject to physical attacks if returned to Armenia. It took 16 years for their case to be finalized, with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals denying their asylum case in January 2008.

At this time, Ruben, Asmik, and Arthur have exhausted every option to obtain immigration relief in the United States. While Ruben and Asmik's other son, Arsen, is a U.S. citizen, he is too young to file a green card petition on their behalf.

It would be a terrible shame to remove this family from the United States and to separate them from Arsen, who is 20 years old and a U.S. citizen. The Mkoians have worked hard to build a place for their family in California and are an integral part of their community.

The family attends St. Paul Armenian Apostolic Church in Fresno. They do charity work to send medical equipment to Armenia.

Ruben works as a driver for Uber. He previously worked as a manager at a car wash in Fresno and as a truck-driver for a California trucking company that described him as ''trustworthy,'' ''knowledgeable,'' and an asset to the company. Asmik has worked as a medical assistant the past 6 years at the Fresno Shields Medical Center.

Arthur has proven to be a hard-working, smart young man who applies himself. He was recognized nationally for his scholastic achievement, having maintained a 4.0 grade point average in high school and serving as his class valedictorian. After graduating on the Dean's Merit List from the University of California, Davis with a major in Chemistry, he is now a full-time analyst at a water testing company. He also teaches Armenian School on Saturdays at the church.

Arthur's brother, Arsen currently attends Fresno State University, is majoring in Computer Science, and maintains a 3.8 GPA. These two young men have already accomplished so much and clearly aspire to do great things here in the United States.

Reflecting their contributions to their community, Representatives George Radanovich and JIM COSTA strongly supported this family's ability to remain in the United States. When I first introduced a private bill for the Mkoian family, I received more than 200 letters of support and dozens of calls of support from friends and community members, attesting to the positive impact that this family has had in Fresno, California.

I believe that this case warrants our compassion. I respectfully ask my colleagues to support this private legislation on behalf of the Mkoian family.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 82—CONGRATULATING THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY APPLIED PHYSICS LABORATORY ON THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE LABORATORY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 82

Whereas, on March 10, 2017, the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory (in this preamble referred to as ''APL''), located in Laurel, Maryland, celebrates the 75th anniversary of the founding of APL on March 10, 1942;

Whereas, less than 4 months after the attack on the United States Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, APL was established to perfect and help field the radio proximity fuze, one of the most closely guarded wartime secrets of the United States;

Whereas historians have ranked the development of the radio proximity fuze as one of the 3 most important technological developments of World War II, along with the development of radar and the atomic bomb;

Whereas, during and after World War II, APL developed the first generation of Navy surface-to-air missiles and associated propulsion, guidance, control, and targeting technologies;

Whereas APL developed the initial ''phased array'' radar system, called AMFAR, for the Navy that provided the scanning, tracking, and targeting necessary to defend the ships of the United States against simultaneous aircraft and missile raids;

Whereas APL created the first satellite-based global navigation system, called Transit, the forerunner of modern GPS, to serve the ballistic missile submarine force of the United States and provide essential capabilities to the Navy from 1964 until the 1990s;

Whereas APL developed prototypes, experiments, ocean physics research, and engineering models that unlocked the potential of towed sonar arrays, groundbreaking developments that revolutionized anti-submarine