

bring those voices together back in Rhode Island and find the kind of agreement that has enabled these successes, so I am very grateful to them as well.

With that comment, I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 19, H.R. 22.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, H.R. 22, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 19, H.R. 22, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Shelley Moore Capito, Rob Portman, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Deb Fischer, Richard Burr.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

#### ADOPTIVE FAMILY RELIEF ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 145, S. 1300.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1300) to amend the section 221 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide relief for adoptive families from immigrant visa fees in certain situations.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 1300) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:  
S. 1300

*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 "Adoptive Family Relief Act".

#### SEC. 2. WAIVER OF FEES FOR RENEWAL OF IMMIGRANT VISA FOR ADOPTED CHILD IN CERTAIN SITUATIONS.

Section 221(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) PERIOD OF VALIDITY; RENEWAL OR REPLACEMENT.—

"(1) IMMIGRANT VISAS.—An immigrant visa shall be valid for such period, not exceeding six months, as shall be by regulations prescribed, except that any visa issued to a child lawfully adopted by a United States citizen and spouse while such citizen is serving abroad in the United States Armed Forces, or is employed abroad by the United States Government, or is temporarily abroad on business, shall be valid until such time, for a period not to exceed three years, as the adoptive citizen parent returns to the United States in due course of his service, employment, or business.

"(2) NONIMMIGRANT VISAS.—A non-immigrant visa shall be valid for such periods as shall be by regulations prescribed. In prescribing the period of validity of a non-immigrant visa in the case of nationals of any foreign country who are eligible for such visas, the Secretary of State shall, insofar as practicable, accord to such nationals the same treatment upon a reciprocal basis as such foreign country accords to nationals of the United States who are within a similar class; except that in the case of aliens who are nationals of a foreign country and who either are granted refugee status and firmly resettled in another foreign country or are granted permanent residence and residing in another foreign country, the Secretary of State may prescribe the period of validity of such a visa based upon the treatment granted by that other foreign country to alien refugees and permanent residents, respectively, in the United States.

"(3) VISA REPLACEMENT.—An immigrant visa may be replaced under the original number during the fiscal year in which the original visa was issued for an immigrant who establishes to the satisfaction of the consular officer that the immigrant—

"(A) was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity because of reasons beyond his control and for which he was not responsible;

"(B) is found by a consular officer to be eligible for an immigrant visa; and

"(C) pays again the statutory fees for an application and an immigrant visa.

"(4) FEE WAIVER.—If an immigrant visa was issued, on or after March 27, 2013, for a child who has been lawfully adopted, or who is coming to the United States to be adopted,

by a United States citizen, any statutory immigrant visa fees relating to a renewal or replacement of such visa may be waived or, if already paid, may be refunded upon request, subject to such criteria as the Secretary of State may prescribe, if—

"(A) the immigrant child was unable to use the original immigrant visa during the period of its validity as a direct result of extraordinary circumstances, including the denial of an exit permit; and

"(B) if such inability was attributable to factors beyond the control of the adopting parent or parents and of the immigrant."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I just want to briefly say a few words about today's Senate passage of S. 1300, the Adoptive Family Relief Act. The issue this bill addresses is of particular importance to me, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation.

More than 400 American families—approximately 20 of them from Kentucky—have successfully adopted children from the Democratic Republic of the Congo or the DRC. However, due to the DRC Government's suspension of exit permits—which has been in place for close to 2 years now—many of these families have been unable to bring their adoptive children home to the United States.

For example, although I was pleased to be able to help the Brock family from Owensboro, KY, with the return of one of their adopted sons last Christmas, their other son still remains in the DRC. To make matters worse, many of these families have been financially burdened by the cost of continually renewing their children's visas while they wait for the day the DRC decides to lift the suspension.

In an attempt to help these families, the Adoptive Family Relief Act will provide meaningful financial relief by granting the State Department the authority to waive the fees for multiple visa renewals in this and other extraordinary adoption circumstances.

The bill builds on Congress's bipartisan efforts on this adoption issue, including a provision in this year's congressional budget resolution to encourage a solution to the stalemate in the DRC.

I strongly urge the DRC Government to resolve this matter. I truly hope there is a solution to it soon, but until then I urge the House and President Obama to help us enact the Adoptive Family Relief Act. The passage of this bill through the Senate today will help bring needed assistance to so many loving families across our country who want nothing more than to open their homes to a child in need.

I wish to thank the bill's sponsors, Senators FEINSTEIN and JOHNSON, the 17 other bipartisan cosponsors, and the Judiciary Committee for their hard work and truly bipartisan commitment to solving this heartbreaking issue.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I am sorry. I withhold.

EVERY CHILD ACHIEVES ACT OF  
2015—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader.

I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

5TH ANNIVERSARY OF DODD-FRANK WALL  
STREET REFORM ACT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, next Tuesday, July 21, is my wife's birthday, and it is also the 5-year anniversary of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform Act becoming law.

Nearly two decades before that, Barings, an international bank, was destroyed by fraud committed by a single one of their traders. In reality, there were no profits, unbeknownst to many at the time, just big losses that this trader managed to conceal until the firm collapsed.

When writing about his actions later in his memoir, the trader said:

Luckily for my fraud, there were too many chiefs who would chat about it at arm's length but never go further. And they never dared to ask me any basic questions, since they were afraid of looking stupid about not understanding futures and options.

This helps illustrate how we got to that financial crisis.

Wall Street so often speaks its own language—one most Americans can't understand and one that prevented consumers and taxpayers and sometimes even participants from asking questions and from challenging Wall Street.

September 2008 was preceded by a decade of deregulation, after furious lobbying by the financial industry—lobbying buttressed by obfuscation and deceit, always underscored by greed. Risky behavior was rewarded with gargantuan profits for the firms and multimillion-dollar bonuses for the traders and the executives. Questions were not asked. People often looked the other way. So many were confused and tricked, if you will.

Regulators didn't do their jobs. Congress was too—putting it mildly—bought and sold by Wall Street, and look what happened to the American public. Most Americans didn't fully appreciate the connection between Wall Street and our lives until 2008. That is when the biggest banks' recklessness led to the loss of 9 million jobs. The unemployment rate reached 10 percent, 5 million Americans lost their homes, and \$13 trillion, with a "T"—that is 13,000 billion; that is what a trillion is, 13,000 billion dollars—in household wealth was erased.

My wife and I for 2 years have lived in the city of Cleveland in ZIP Code 44105. I mention the ZIP Code because that ZIP Code in 2007, I believe—it was around that time—that ZIP Code had the highest rate of foreclosures of any ZIP Code in the United States of America. It wasn't because people in Slavic

Village, Cleveland, OH, in my neighborhood were trying to game the system. It was not because there were all kinds of con men and women in the neighborhood. It was mostly because of job loss due to the decline in manufacturing. It was also because firms that were rewarded by turning over homes and fees came into those communities offering something more than people could really think they would get, and so foreclosure after foreclosure after foreclosure happened.

The financial crisis created 9 million people who wanted to work for a living, contribute to society, and support their families but could not. And behind the millions of foreclosures were 5 million painful conversations.

Think about this. We in this body talk about numbers, we talk about statistics, we talk about foreclosures, we talk about derivatives, we talk about banks, we talk about fees, we talk about all of this, but think about what a foreclosure means. We don't dress the way we do, making good salaries and benefits, hanging out more with people of means rather than people without much means; we don't think a lot about what a foreclosure might mean to a family. Think about this: A mother and father both have sort of middle-income jobs, working-class jobs. They have a daughter who is 12 and a son who is 13. The mother comes home one day and says: I lost my job. The family scrapes things together, figures they can keep going. Six months later the father comes home and says he lost his job. The kids and the father have a conversation.

It is pretty clear they are going to have to move out of their house because they are going to be foreclosed on. They sit down with the son and daughter and they try to explain what this is going to mean.

The daughter says: What school are we going to go to?

The parents say: I don't know. We are going to have to move out of this house and leave our school district.

The son says: What happens to our friends?

And the parents say: We don't know because we are going to move.

Then they have another painful conversation.

What happens to our dog?

We don't have the money to feed the dog, and in that new apartment we are not going to be allowed to have a pet.

Think about that. They lose their home and their neighborhood and their friends. They even have to give away their family pets. They are cutting back.

These are the stories that aren't really told around here—what actually happens to these families when they are foreclosed on. Those conversations happened—I don't know how many conversations, but I know there were 5 million homes foreclosed on where conversations took place such as that night after night after night, as parents explained to their children what

was happening to their way of life. Parents were sometimes telling their children, We are going to have to share a house with relatives. Families leaving neighborhoods, leaving schools, leaving friends behind, parents trying to find a new home for the family dog that the child had grown up with since the child was 3 or 4 years old, that is why we passed Wall Street reform.

Despite doomsday predictions from the Republicans—almost all of whom opposed Dodd-Frank reform, almost all of whom opposed Dodd-Frank because Wall Street opposed Dodd-Frank reform—despite those predictions, it has been a huge success.

In 2011, as the law was beginning to be implemented, we heard Republicans running for President, people such as Newt Gingrich, a historical figure who has, by and large, been forgotten now, who used to be the Speaker of the House down the hall, who used to be one of the most powerful people in Washington, who stood toe-to-toe with President Clinton and shut down the government in the 1990s. He said Dodd-Frank will kill small banks, kill small business, kill the housing industry. He was wrong.

Since Dodd-Frank has been implemented over the past 5 years, the private sector has created 13 million new jobs, household wealth has grown by \$13 trillion, exceeding precrisis levels, and business lending has climbed 30 percent. Wall Street reform didn't ruin the economy, Wall Street reform stabilized and strengthened it.

Polling that Americans for Financial Reform released last week shows that Americans agree with this assessment. They overwhelmingly support strong financial regulations and they overwhelmingly support the goals of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

But this month—and for the rest of the year—we have seen Republicans try to undermine Wall Street reform, try to do the bidding of Wall Street itself, and try to do all they can to weaken the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. We have seen it in the Budget Committee and in the Agriculture Committee and in the Banking Committee and in the appropriations process.

Last week, in the Senate Banking Committee, Republicans held another hearing with representatives from the financial industry advocating for legislation to undermine parts of Dodd-Frank. Week after week, it seems, we hear from people who come in front of the Banking Committee—people who seem oblivious to the fact that Wall Street caused this damage to our society, people doing the bidding for Wall Street banks, people who have excused the greed and the overreach of Wall Street and what Wall Street has done to the men and women, done to children, done to families, done to neighborhoods in our society.

My ZIP Code is doing better than it was, but we can still see the ruin and