

as a “Ghost Army” that conducted deception operations in Europe during World War II.

S. 1422

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1422, a bill to transfer revenues from the net investment income tax to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

S. 1438

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1438, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research.

S. 1448

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1448, a bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education.

S. 1459

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1459, a bill to control the export to the People’s Republic of China of certain technology and intellectual property important to the national interest of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1462

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1462, a bill to prevent a person who has been convicted of a misdemeanor hate crime, or received an enhanced sentence for a misdemeanor because of hate or bias in the commission, from obtaining a firearm.

S.J. RES. 11

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 11, a joint resolution to prohibit the unauthorized use of United States Armed Forces in hostilities with respect to Venezuela.

S. CON. RES. 10

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 10, a concurrent resolution recognizing that Chinese telecommunications companies such as Huawei and ZTE pose serious threats to the national security of the United States and its allies.

S. RES. 188

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 188, a resolution encouraging a swift transfer of power by the military

to a civilian-led political authority in the Republic of the Sudan, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE. 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. 1475

*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 “Charities Helping Americans Regularly Throughout the Year Act of 2019”.

#### SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.

(a) DETERMINATION OF STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR CHARITABLE CONTRIBUTIONS DEDUCTION.—Subsection (i) of section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(i) STANDARD MILEAGE RATE FOR USE OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE.—For purposes of computing the deduction under this section for use of a passenger automobile, the standard mileage rate shall be the rate determined by the Secretary, which rate shall not be less than the standard mileage rate used for purposes of section 213.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to miles traveled after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 3. MANDATORY E-FILING BY EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (n) as subsection (o) and by inserting after subsection (m) the following new subsection:

“(n) MANDATORY ELECTRONIC FILING.—Any organization required to file a return under this section shall file such return in electronic form.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (7) of section 527(j) of such Code is amended by striking “if the organization has” and all that follows through “such calendar year”.

(c) INSPECTION OF ELECTRONICALLY FILED ANNUAL RETURNS.—Subsection (b) of section 6104 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following: “Any annual return required to be filed electronically under section 6033(n) shall be made available by the Secretary to the public as soon as practicable in a machine readable format.”

#### (d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### (2) TRANSITIONAL RELIEF.—

##### (A) SMALL ORGANIZATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any small organizations, or any other organizations for which the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary’s delegate (hereafter referred to in this paragraph as the “Secretary”) deter-

mines the application of the amendments made by this section would cause undue burden without a delay, the Secretary may delay the application of such amendments, but such delay shall not apply to any taxable year beginning on or after the date 2 years after of the enactment of this Act.

(ii) SMALL ORGANIZATION.—For purposes of clause (i), the term “small organization” means any organization—

(I) the gross receipts of which for the taxable year are less than \$200,000; and

(II) the aggregate gross assets of which at the end of the taxable year are less than \$500,000.

(B) ORGANIZATIONS FILING FORM 990-T.—In the case of any organization described in section 511(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 which is subject to the tax imposed by section 511(a)(1) of such Code on its unrelated business taxable income, or any organization required to file a return under section 6033 of such Code and include information under subsection (e) thereof, the Secretary may delay the application of the amendments made by this section, but such delay shall not apply to any taxable year beginning on or after the date 2 years after of the enactment of this Act.

#### SEC. 4. MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO DONOR ADVISED FUNDS.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF TAX-FREE CHARITABLE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Clause (i) of section 408(d)(8)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “or any fund or account described in section 4966(d)(2)”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2018.

#### (b) RETURN DISCLOSURES.—

(1) DISTRIBUTIONS.—Subsection (k) of section 6033 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting a comma; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(4) list the total number of such funds which were in existence for the 36-month period ending at the close of such taxable year,

“(5) list the total number of funds described in paragraph (4) which made at least 1 grant during the period described in such paragraph, and

“(6) set forth—

“(A) whether such organization has a publicly available policy with respect to funds which are inactive, dormant, or do not make distributions during the period described in paragraph (4),

“(B) a description of the organization’s policy for responding to funds described in subparagraph (A) or a statement that no such policy is in effect, and

“(C) whether such organization regularly and consistently monitors and enforces compliance with the policy described in subparagraph (A) with respect to such funds.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

#### SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF THE TAX RATE FOR THE EXCISE TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “1 percent”.

(b) ELIMINATION OF REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4940 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PERDUE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BLUNT, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1480. A bill to protect law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about Police Week and some legislation we have introduced to honor and support our men and women in blue called, not surprisingly, the Back the Blue Act. With regard to the comments of my friend from Illinois, who was bemoaning the fact that there didn't seem to be bipartisan legislation that could come to the floor of the Senate, be debated, voted on, and passed with concurrence of the House of Representatives and the President's signature, I note that, actually, there is a lot we could be doing together.

I have been on the floor a number of times describing the humanitarian and security crisis at our southern border. That is something we could work together to address. I have introduced bipartisan and bicameral legislation with my friend and colleague HENRY CUELLAR at the House of Representatives that would address that humanitarian crisis and, I believe, take big steps toward stopping it. That is something we could do together.

I know the Democratic whip from Illinois doesn't particularly like the idea that President Trump is nominating highly qualified people for the judiciary and for executive branch nominations—the types of people we are voting on today and will vote on tomorrow. Obviously, that is not high on his agenda, but I submit that there are a lot of other things we could do besides fixing this humanitarian crisis.

We could work on roads and bridges together. I know that Chairman BARRASSO of the Environment and Public Works Committee is soliciting the views of a number of Senators and is going to come to the floor, hopefully, in the next couple of months with some ideas on what that infrastructure package should look like. I actually think that is the best way to handle that.

Again, these are nonpartisan issues. Infrastructure is not a partisan issue, but figuring out how to pay for it is the biggest challenge.

I note that Ms. PELOSI, Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader, and the President met and talked about a \$2 trillion pricetag. Well, it seems to me that is backward. We ought to be talking about what sort of plan makes sense and where we can get the votes to build consensus on that plan rather than saying that we want to spend this much money on a plan to come.

That is why I think the committee work that is being done in the Senate, in the Environment and Public Works Committee, and, hopefully, in the House is so important. Once the Environment and Public Works Committee makes a proposal and votes that out of the committee on a bipartisan basis, then, the Senate Finance Committee will be asked to come up with a way to pay for it. That is always the part that people want to talk about the least, but it is important.

It is important we not continue to spend money we don't have and increase our deficits and debt. Rather, we need to come up with a user-fee model, which is what the gas tax is designed to do, and find a way not to pay for that infrastructure and deal with the congestion and traffic by just borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, literally just increasing the money we borrow and giving that tab to our children and grandchildren to pay back. There are a lot of really good ideas out there and ones on which I think we ought to work together.

I don't share the dystopian views of the Senator from Illinois in terms of the Senate. The Senate is not broken. It is just a matter of political will to try to work together to get beyond the petty disagreements that seem to come up every day and to just do our work. Sometimes you don't necessarily appear on TV or have your name appear in lights when you are doing that sort of hard work, but it is essential to get the Senate's work done and, indeed, to get the work of the American people done. Those are some things we could work on together if there is a political will to do so.

Mr. President, this week, tens of thousands of Americans will make their way to Washington for National Police Week, our annual opportunity to honor the brave men and women in blue who have lost their lives while protecting our communities.

Of course, this includes many officers from Texas. I am particularly proud of the Fort Worth Police Pipes and Drums Band and the Texas Department of Public Safety Pipes and Drums Corps that performed on the National Mall yesterday.

Law enforcement is a calling answered by a select few. These brave men and women have chosen a difficult and sometimes dangerous life, dedicated to upholding the law, defending or civil liberties, and protecting our cities and our neighborhoods. They wake up each morning and put on a uniform, never knowing what the day may hold. It requires a lot of courage and sacrifice—both from the officers and their families—and I am grateful for those who selflessly serve our communities each day.

Each year for Police Week, we honor the law enforcement community to remember those who have made the ultimate sacrifice. One of the most emblematic reminders of that sacrifice is the National Law Enforcement Officers

Memorial, which is here in Washington, DC. It is a beautiful tribute to the Federal, State, and local law enforcement officials who have died in the line of duty and features marble walls filled with more than 21,000 names. Each of those names represents an American hero. Sadly, this year, we add the names of 13 Texans to that memorial. These officers gave their lives in service to their communities and to our country, and we thank them and their families for their sacrifices, and we remember and honor their names.

Each year for Police Week, we pay tribute to those who go to work and never come home. We honor the lives of those we have lost. We share in the grief of their families, and we promise never to forget the stories of heroism they left behind.

While we remember the fallen this week, I hope we will also take time to consider how we can do more to support and serve those who have taken the oath to defend us.

Throughout my career in public office, I have had the pleasure of interacting with law enforcement officials from across my State and, certainly, here at the Federal level, including our incredible Capitol Police officers. I am continually impressed and inspired by their professionalism, their conviction, and their unwavering commitment to enforcing the law, and I want to ensure that they have what they need when they put on that uniform with confidence every morning.

Last Congress we made a lot of progress, and two bills that I introduced then are now law. The first is the Justice Served Act, which I introduced with my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR, another example of bipartisan legislation. This bill provides grants to State and local governments to prosecute cold cases by making sure the newly tested DNA evidence is used to investigate and prosecute unsolved cases. The Justice Served Act helps to ensure that violent criminals are taken off the streets and brought to justice.

We also passed legislation I introduced with Senator PETERS from Michigan to authorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods program at the Department of Justice. This is a nationwide partnership among Federal, State, and local law enforcement and prosecutors who use data-driven, evidence-based, and trauma-informed practices to reduce violent crime. It is inspired by a successful program that was initiated at the State level in Texas, when I was attorney general, but the truth is it started in the Eastern District. I believe it was in Virginia. Of course, it was designed to focus on reducing gun crime and gun violence by targeting those who repetitively used firearms in the commission of violent crimes.

We were glad to use the examples in Virginia and in Texas to bring the model to the Nation and to promote this proactive and collaborative approach to prevent violence in our neighborhoods.

I am appreciative of the fact that our colleagues have seen fit to work together to pass both of these bills and of President Trump for signing those, but I know there is a lot more that we can and should do.

Today I am introducing another piece of legislation called the Back the Blue Act, which I am introducing along with our colleagues Senator CRUZ from Texas and Senator TILLIS from North Carolina. This legislation sends a strong message to the more than 900,000 law enforcement officers serving in our country that we support them and that we will not tolerate any act of violence against them, period.

In recent years, we have seen brutal and inexcusable attacks on law enforcement officers across the United States, including one in Texas that rocked our entire State.

In 2016, a man killed five police officers and injured nine others in Dallas. It was a sobering reminder of the danger these officers face every day and a call for us to take action to do more to support them.

This bill makes clear our support for these public servants who dedicate their lives to protecting and serving us. The Back the Blue Act would add stiff mandatory penalties and make it a Federal crime to kill or attempt to kill a law enforcement officer, a Federal judge, or a federally funded public safety officer. It would also make it a Federal crime to assault a law enforcement officer.

There is zero justification for attacking a police officer—none. We need to show that we value their lives, and we need to make it absolutely clear that we will hold those who carry out crimes against them accountable. The Back the Blue Act sends that message loud and clear.

I think it is important to point out that this legislation would also help make our communities stronger by allowing grant funds to be used for efforts that help foster more trust between the police and the communities they protect. This bill would better serve the men and women who work tirelessly in our communities each day.

There is no doubt in my mind that our Nation is better and safer because of the hard work and dedication of our law enforcement officials. Here in the Senate we should do all we can to help them do their job as effectively and as safely as possible. The Back the Blue Act would be a great start.

I hope my colleagues will consider this legislation and decide to support it and, more importantly, show our law enforcement across the country that we stand shoulder to shoulder with them.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1483. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sex-

ual assault prevention and response; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President. Sexual assault is a major issue on our Nation's college campuses. In 2016, the Department of Justice found that one in four college women are sexually assaulted while in school. Alarmingly, the majority of these crimes will go unreported. The consequences of these crimes are often damaging to a student's mental, physical, and emotional well-being and the aftermath can drive many survivors to drop out of school.

Sexual assault survivors deserve access to a safe and supportive educational environment. I have met with students in Virginia, most recently at the University of Virginia and Virginia Tech, who have expressed the need for someone on campus to turn to for unbiased advice, guidance, and support following an assault. Given the prevalence of this issue, it is clear that our federal higher education policy must do more to prevent sexual assaults and ensure that survivors have access to and can navigate through a plethora of resources.

This is why I am pleased to reintroduce today the Survivor Outreach and Support Campus Act of 2019 or SOS Campus Act. The SOS Campus Act requires every institution of higher education that receives federal funding to designate an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response. The advocate will help students access all of the resources available to them, both on and off campus, in the wake of a sexual assault and will guide them through the process of reporting their assault if they choose to do so, acting always in the interests of the victim, not the university.

The SOS Campus Act requires that the confidential advocate is responsible for ensuring that survivors, regardless of whether they decide to report the crime, have access to emergency and follow-up medical care, guidance on reporting assaults to law enforcement, medical forensic or evidentiary exams, crisis intervention, and information on their legal rights. The advocate will also conduct a public information campaign on campus to inform students of their services, and train other university staff to provide information to students about the advocate.

I am proud to reintroduce this legislation with Senators BALDWIN, HIRONO and FEINSTEIN, which would ensure all college students across our country have access to a supportive advocate for sexual assault survivors. It is our responsibility as public servants to advocate relentlessly for reforms to prevent sexual assault and protections for survivors. I strongly encourage my colleagues in the Senate to consider this legislation when we consider reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1486. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain

pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Prioritizing Our Workers Act, which will make changes to the current bankruptcy code, requiring companies going through bankruptcy proceedings to pay unpaid vested benefits, like workers' pensions, before they pay out other claims against them.

I firmly believe that no one should be denied their pension because their employer goes bankrupt. Hard-working men and women across the country go to work every day for years, paying into these pension plans each paycheck with the expectation that one day they can retire and provide for their families.

Companies offering pension plans made promises to their workers and need to live up to those promises, no matter what else happens to that company financially.

In West Virginia, we are far too familiar with coal and steel companies leaving their workers out to dry in this way. This is absolutely unacceptable. That is why I am introducing this bill, and I look forward to my fellow Senators joining me to support and protect pensions across this country.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1488. A bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horse-racing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. UDALL. 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. 1488

*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 "Racehorse Doping Ban Act of 2019".

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) INTERSTATE OFF-TRACK WAGER; HORSEMEN'S GROUP; HOST RACING ASSOCIATION; OFF-TRACK BETTING SYSTEM.—The terms "interstate off-track wager", "horsemen's group", "host racing association", and "off-track betting system" have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 (15 U.S.C. 3002).

(2) VETERINARIAN-CLIENT-PATIENT RELATIONSHIP.—The term "veterinarian-client-patient relationship" has the meaning of that term as used in the Principles of Veterinary Medical Ethics of the American Veterinary Medical Association (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act).

**SEC. 3. INDEPENDENT ANTI-DOPING ORGANIZATION FOR INTERSTATE HORSE-RACING.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be an independent anti-doping organization with responsibility for ensuring the integrity and safety of horseraces that are the subject of interstate off-track wagers.

(b) DUTIES.—The duties of the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) with respect to horseraces described in that subsection are the following:

(1) Developing, publishing, and maintaining rules with respect to—

(A) substances, methods, and treatments that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace;

(B) substances, methods, and treatments that may be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace in the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship; and

(C) the use of substances, methods, and treatments permitted under subparagraph (B), including rules with respect to the period before a horserace (which may not be less than 24 hours before a horserace) during which a horse may no longer receive such substances, methods, and treatments.

(2) Implementing programs relating to anti-doping education, research, testing, and adjudication to prevent any horse participating in a horserace described in subsection (a) from racing under the effect of any substance, method, or treatment that could affect the performance of the horse (other than a substance, method, or treatment described in subparagraph (B) of paragraph (1) administered during a time period that is permitted under subparagraph (C) of that paragraph).

(3) Excluding from participating in any horserace described in subsection (a) any person that the independent anti-doping organization or a State racing commission determines—

(A) has violated a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment that may not be administered to a horse participating in such a horserace under subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1);

(B) has violated 3 or more times a rule with respect to a substance, method, or treatment permitted under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of that paragraph that has the ability to affect the performance of a horse; or

(C) is subject to a suspension from horse-racing activities by any State racing commission.

(c) DEADLINE.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall publish the rules required by subsection (b) not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) SUSPENSION OF EXCLUSION PERIOD.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may—

(1) suspend a period of exclusion from participating in a horserace imposed on a person pursuant to subsection (b)(3) if the person provides substantial assistance to the organization or other persons that results in the discovery of—

(A) a violation of a rule published under subsection (b) by another person; or

(B) a violation of Federal or State law by another person; and

(2) reinstate all or part of a period of exclusion imposed on a person and suspended under paragraph (1) if the person fails to provide substantial assistance described in that paragraph.

(e) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing, publishing, and maintaining rules under subsection (b)(1), the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) may consult with State racing commissions, host racing associations, horsemen's groups, and other interested persons.

(f) TRANSITION RULE WITH RESPECT TO FUROSEMIDE.—During the 2-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a) shall permit the use of furosemide in a horse partici-

pating in a horserace described in subsection (a) if—

(1) the horse is 3 years old or older; and

(2) the use of furosemide—

(A) complies with the requirements of the document entitled “ARCI-011-020 Medications and Prohibited Substances” published by the Association of Racing Commissioners International, Inc.; and

(B) is within the context of a veterinarian-client-patient relationship.

(g) DESIGNATION OF ORGANIZATION.—The independent anti-doping organization designated pursuant to section 701 of the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 (21 U.S.C. 2001) shall serve as the independent anti-doping organization referred to in subsection (a).

**SEC. 4. CONSENT REQUIRED FOR ACCEPTANCE OF INTERSTATE OFF-TRACK WAGERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, a host racing association may conduct a horserace that is the subject of an interstate off-track wager, and an interstate off-track wager may be accepted by an off-track betting system, only if consent is obtained from the independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a).

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR AGREEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A host racing association shall obtain the consent required by subsection (a) of the independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a) pursuant to an agreement entered into between the association and the organization that specifies the terms and conditions relating to such consent, including—

(A) compliance with the rules published under section 3(b); and

(B) payments to the organization to defray the costs of carrying out the duties of the organization under this Act.

(2) DEFRAYAL OF COSTS.—The independent anti-doping organization referred to in section 3(a) shall ensure that all of the costs incurred by the organization in carrying out the duties of the organization under this Act are defrayed pursuant to agreements entered into under paragraph (1).

**SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS**

**SENATE RESOLUTION 211—RECOGNIZING THE AVIATION CADET MUSEUM IN EUREKA SPRINGS, ARKANSAS, AS “AMERICA’S NATIONAL AVIATION CADET MUSEUM”**

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

**S. RES. 211**

Whereas, in 1994, former Aviation Cadet and United States Air Force First Lieutenant Errol Severe founded the Aviation Cadet Museum;

Whereas the flying cadet and succeeding aviation cadet programs served as the primary production source of nearly 500,000 United States Air Force pilots, navigators, and bombardiers from 1917 to 1961;

Whereas the bravery, courage, dedication, and heroism of United States aviators from across the Air Corps and Army Air Forces were critical factors in defeating the enemies of the United States during World War I and World War II;

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, exists to exclu-

sively preserve and promote an understanding of the role of aviation cadets in the 20th century; and

Whereas the Aviation Cadet Museum is dedicated to celebrating the spirit of the United States and recognizing the teamwork, collaboration, patriotism, and courage of the individuals who trained and fought and the individuals on the homefront who mobilized and supported the national aviation effort: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate recognizes the Aviation Cadet Museum in Eureka Springs, Arkansas, as “America’s National Aviation Cadet Museum”.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 16—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE TREATY ON THE NON-PROLIFERATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS (NPT) CONTINUES TO MAKE AN INVALUABLE CONTRIBUTION TO UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND NOTING FORMER SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR’S INDISPENSABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND REDUCING NUCLEAR WEAPONS-RELATED RISKS**

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**S. CON. RES. 16**

Whereas the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) opened for signature 50 years ago on July 1, 1968;

Whereas the United States and the former Soviet Union averted a catastrophic nuclear exchange during the October 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, which led to a series of bilateral and multilateral agreements to lessen the chance of nuclear war, including the NPT;

Whereas President John F. Kennedy predicted in 1963 that as many as 25 countries would acquire nuclear weapons by 1970 absent a treaty to control nuclear weapons;

Whereas the United States Senate provided its advice and consent to the NPT on March 13, 1969, with a vote on ratification of 83 to 15;

Whereas the NPT has grown to include 191 State Parties, making an irreplaceable contribution to international security by preventing the spread of nuclear weapons;

Whereas former Senator Richard G. Lugar made indispensable contributions to reducing nuclear weapon risks, most notably through his leadership in standing up the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (commonly referred to as the “Nunn-Lugar Program”), which eliminated 7,600 nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union;

Whereas Senator Lugar successfully secured the advice and consent of the Senate to the Treaty between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, signed at Prague April 8, 2010, and entered into force February 5, 2011 (commonly known as the “New START Treaty”);

Whereas Article III of the NPT obligates each nonnuclear weapon state to the NPT to conclude a Safeguards Agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify treaty compliance, 174 of which are