S. 2737

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2737, a bill to ensure that transportation and infrastructure projects carried out using Federal financial assistance are constructed with steel, iron, and manufactured goods that are produced in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 2742

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2742, a bill to provide for public notice and input prior to the closure, consolidation, or public access limitation of field or hearing offices of the Social Security Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2757

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2757, a bill to invest in innovation through research and development, to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Warren Weinstein should be returned home to his family.

S. RES. 410

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 410, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

S. RES. 530

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 530, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq.

S. RES. 536

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mrs. HAGAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 536, a resolution designating September 2014 as ''National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2779. A bill to amend section 349 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to deem specified activities in support of terrorism as renunciation of United States nationality; read the first time.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise to address an issue of grave importance to the national security of the United States; that is, the threat from the radical Sunni terrorist organization known as the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria or simply as the Islamic State.

Now it claims to control territory in a grotesque parody of a nation state. ISIS is a study in oppression and brutality that is conducting ethnic cleansing against religious minorities in the region; that is, targeting and persecuting Christians and that is attempting to subject the local population to the strictest forms of Sharia law. ISIS has grotesquely murdered U.S. civilians and indeed journalists on the public stage. It should come as no surprise that the people of the United States are deeply concerned about this development. We are concerned about the inability of our government to anticipate this gathering threat. We are concerned about the brutal acts of oppression against the weak and the helpless.

We are concerned about ISIS's seizure of financial and military assets that have fueled their murderous rampage. Above all, we are concerned about the threat ISIS poses, not only to our close allies in the region but also to our citizens and even here in our homeland.

There has been a lot of talk in recent days about developing a strategy to combat ISIS. I would like to propose a couple of commonsense steps that we should take immediately to combat this scourge.

First, the time has come—it is beyond time—for us to secure our borders. Representing the State of Texas, which has a border nearly 2,000 miles long, I know firsthand how unsecure the border is right now. This week of all weeks, with the anniversary of the September 11 attacks upon us, we can have no illusions that terrorists will not try to make good on their specific threats to attack America. As long as our border is not secure, we are making it far too easy for the terrorists to carry through on those promises.

Rumored ISIS activities on the southern border should unite us all in the resolve to make border security a top priority rather than an afterthought or rather than something to be held hostage for political negotiations in the Congress. Second, we should take commonsense steps to make fighting for or supporting ISIS an affirmative renunciation of American citizenship. We know there are over 100 Americans who have joined ISIS who have taken up arms alongside the jihadists, along with thousands of others from the European Union.

We also know they are trying to return to their countries of origin to carry out terrorist attacks there. We know this because on May 24 an ISIS member returned to Belgium where he attacked innocent visitors at a Jewish museum, slaughtering four people. It was reported today he had been plotting an even larger attack on Paris on Bastille Day.

In addition, on August 11 of this year, an accused ISIS sympathizer, Donald Ray Morgan, was arrested at JFK Airport trying to reenter the United States. So we know this threat is real. That is why I have today filed legislation, the Expatriate Terrorist Act of 2014, which would amend the existing statutes governing renunciation of U.S. citizenship to designate fighting for a hostile foreign government or foreign terrorist organization as an affirmative renunciation of citizenship.

By fighting for ISIS, U.S. citizens have expressed their desire to become citizens of the Islamic state. That cannot and will not peacefully coexist with remaining American citizens, the desire to become a citizen of a terrorist organization that has expressed a desire to wage war on the American people, has demonstrated a brutal capacity to do so, murdering American civilians on the global stage and promising to bring that jihad home to America.

We should not be facilitating their efforts by allowing fighters fighting alongside ISIS to come back to America with American passports and walk freely in our cities to carry out unspeakable acts of terror. It is my hope the legislation I am introducing today will earn support on both sides of the aisle, that we will see this body come together and say: While there are many partisan issues that divide us, when it comes to protecting U.S. citizens from acts of terror, we are all as one. That is my fervent hope.

The third thing we should do is we should do everything possible to make ISIS understand there are serious ramifications for threatening to attack the United States, for murdering American citizens. While damaging ISIS's financial assets is certainly a part of this action, because of the very nature of ISIS, the response must be principally military.

All Americans are weary of the long and costly wars in the last decade. We

are tired of sending our sons and daughters potentially to die in distant lands. No one wants to see an extended engagement in Iraq, but at the same time I do not believe the American people are one bit reluctant to defend our national security, to defend the lives of fellow Americans. The American people can see the grim threat represented by ISIS and the need for decisive action.

We should concentrate on a coordinated and overwhelming air campaign that has the clear military objective of destroying the capability of ISIS to carry out terror attacks on the United States. We must remain focused on this clear military objective if we hope to be successful. We cannot engage in photo op foreign policy or press release foreign policy of dropping a bomb here, shooting a missile there, and not have a strategy that is dictated by clear and direct military objectives in furtherance of U.S. national security interests.

We should be perfectly clear as well that any action we take against ISIS is in no way contingent on resolving the civil war in Syria. That conflict is a humanitarian tragedy, pitting a brutal dictator against radical Islamic terrorists. The sad reality is there are no good options for the United States in this fight. We may have had less radical options 3 years ago, but those are not currently available.

The Obama administration had proposed arming rebel forces that contained terrorist factions associated with ISIS. Previously, we were told the rebels fighting alongside ISIS were our friends and Assad and Iran were our enemies. Now, in the face of ISIS, we are hearing Assad may be our friend, Iran may be our friend, and ISIS is now our enemy. This makes no sense. Indeed, it is a dangerous cycle reminiscent of George Orwell's ''1984.'' Orwell wrote:

> At this moment, for example, in 1984. . . . Oceania was at war with Eurasia and in alliance with Eastasia. . . . Actually . . . it was only four years since Oceania had been at war with Eastasia and in alliance with Eurasia. But . . . [o]fficially the change of partners had never happened. Oceania was at war with Eurasia; therefore Oceania had always been at war with Eurasia. The enemy of the moment always represented absolute evil, and it followed that any past or future agreement with him was impossible. . . .

This administration seems to have no sense of past or future. All of those familiar with the terribly human carnage inflicted by the civil war in Syria pray for its end. But the goal of our action against ISIS should not be to end it by supporting Assad. The enemy of my enemy is not always my friend. Sometimes the goal is the destruction of the enemy who poses an imminent threat to our national security, not the enabler of yet another enemy of America.

It should also be clear that any action we take against ISIS should in no way be contingent on political reconciliation between Sunnis and Shiites in Baghdad. This administration has often become distracted by the hope to achieve this reconciliation, but the sad truth is the Sunnis and Shiites have been engaged in a sectarian civil war since 632 A.D. It is the height of hubris, it is the height of ignorance to suggest the American President can come and resolve a 1,500-year-old religious civil war and have both sides throw down their arms and embrace each other as brothers. That should not be our objective, although we of course always hope for reconciliation and peace. We should not be so naive as to make defending our national security contingent on resolving millennia-old sectarian religious civil wars. Doing so, seeking to promote a utopia, seeking to transform Iraq into Switzerland is nothing less than a fool's errand.

Likewise, it should be perfectly clear that any action we take to stop ISIS from attacking and murdering Americans is in no way contingent on consensus from the so-called international community. America is blessed to have many good friends and allies in the region and beyond who understand the threat of ISIS and are eager to do what they can to combat it. We welcome their support. But in order that this action be done right, it must be led by the United States, unfettered by other nations' rules of engagement that might impede our effective action.

Achieving some preordained number of countries in a coalition is not a strategy. For as has often been remarked: In the most effective efforts, the mission determines the coalition, not the other way around. It is heartening to hear the voices from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, raising the alarm of the threat posed by ISIS. President Obama has signaled his intention of addressing the issue later this week.

It is well past time for him to do so. His recent statements from his admission on August 28 that ''we don't have a strategy yet'' to his suggestion on September 3 that ''our best bet is to try to 'shrink' ISIS's sphere of influence until they are a manageable problem,'' those comments are not encouraging. The objective is not to make ISIS manageable. The objective is to protect the national security interests of the United States and to destroy terrorists who have declared jihad on our Nation.

Neither are the two things we already know that the President will propose in his new ''game plan''—namely, that he will not be requesting authorization from Congress for military action against ISIS and that his model is the counterterrorism policies pursued by his administration the past 5 years. Neither of these is encouraging. I ask the President to reconsider both of these points.

While ISIS is obviously part of the scourge of radical Islamic terrorism that has bedeviled the West for decades, it equally obviously represents a new and particularly virulent strain. The President is reportedly considering an action that could last as long as 3 years and may require a range of actions. If this is indeed the case, then it is incumbent on him to come to Congress and lay out his strategy so that we and the American people are clear on it.

I would note that the Presiding Officer has been particularly vocal and clear defending the constitutional authority of Congress to declare war. I would note as well that it is beneficial for the effort for the President to come to Congress, because in doing so it will force the President to do what has been lacking for so long, which is lay out a specific and clear military objective: What is it we are trying to accomplish that is tethered directly to the U.S. national security interests of America?

The Constitution is clear. It is Congress and Congress only that has the constitutional authority to declare war. Any President, as Commander in Chief, has constitutional authority to respond to an imminent crisis, to respond to a clear and present danger. But in this instance, the President is not suggesting it. He is suggesting engaged military action, and it is, therefore, inconsistent with the Constitution for him to attempt to pursue that action without recognizing the constitutional authority of this body.

It is my hope that he will do so, and it is my hope we will have a substantive and meaningful debate about the military objective we should be united in achieving, which is, namely, destroying ISIS and preventing them from committing acts of terror and murdering innocent Americans.

Given the need to consider such action against a new actor such as ISIS, it also must be admitted that the Obama administration's counterterrorism policy has not been a success. They have labeled the 2009 attack on Fort Hood in my home State of Texas as an act of ''workplace violence'' even though the terrorist attacker Nidal Hasan recently asked to become a citizen of the Islamic State.

They also missed connecting the dots that would have uncovered the radicalization of the Tsarnaev brothers that resulted in the attack on the Boston Marathon. It should be noted that Tamerlan Tsarnaev, the elder brother, worshipped at the same Cambridge, MA, mosque where the ISIS head of propaganda worshipped. This jihad can reach back and directly take the lives of Americans citizens at home.

The administration has failed to respond effectively to the attack on our facilities in Benghazi on September 11, 2012, in which four Americans were murdered, including the first ambassador killed in the line of duty since 1979, an event that inaugurated Libya's spiral into terrorist anarchy that continues unchecked to this day. They completely missed the gathering threat of ISIS to the point that the President himself was under the misapprehension that the group was the terrorist equivalent of the junior varsity only a few months ago.

We cannot afford to return to these destructive policies, given the acute threat posed by ISIS. It is my hope that this body will stand together as one in bipartisan unity to secure the borders and to change our laws to pass the legislation I am introducing today to make clear that any American who takes up arms with ISIS has, in doing so, constructively renounced his or her American citizenship so that the Congress, with one voice, can protect Americans at home. This requires clear, decisive, unified action, and it is my hope that all of us will come together supporting such action and that the President will submit to the authority of Congress seeking authorization to protect America against ISIS and to engage in a concentrated, directed military campaign to take them out.

By Mr. NELSON:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have introduced today a Senate joint resolution. This is a resolution that will express the authorization for the use of the U.S. Armed Forces against the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. It is a resolution that has been necessitated by legal scholars.

Since the President has used his existing authorization for the use of military force in Iraq, most recently against ISIS—ISIL/ISIS; it is the same thing. The Levant is that area broadly from about Baghdad all the way to the Mediterranean. That is ISIL. ISIS, I-S-I-S, is the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria. Of course, we know that this organization that is calling itself an Islamic caliphate knows no jurisdictional boundaries. It has taken large swaths of territory in Syria as well as Iraq. When the President successfully employed the use of air power, both manned and unmanned, against ISIS targets as they were marching toward Erbil, the capital of Kurdistan, and then likewise as they were marching toward the Mosul dam, the President used his authority in Iraq and also his authority as Commander in Chief to protect Americans.

There are Americans in Erbil. There are Americans in Baghdad. There are Americans in other places in Iraq. The protection of the dam in Mosul was to protect those Americans downriver, because if the dam were blown, that would have flooded all downriver and it would have flooded Baghdad.

Legal scholars disagree with me that the President has the authority under the Constitution as Commander in Chief to go after ISIS in Syria. I describe ISIS as a snake. If the head of the snake is in Syria, which it is—a lot of their organization, a lot of their leadership is there—then we ought to go after the snake where the head is and decapitate the snake. In doing that, we are going to have to go into Syria.

I believe the President has the authority to do this under the Constitution anyway, but there are some who disagree. So rather than quibble about legalities, I have introduced this legislation. There is no pride of authorship. The Senate is obviously going to debate this. I believe if you are seeing the polls from today, where 90 percent of the people of this country are concerned about ISIS, and some huge number want us to go on and attack ISIS in other places than where we are attacking now, then I think it is obvious the United States is going to have to continue this attack on ISIS.

I want to compliment the President. Often, as I have talked about this issue, people have come—or members of the press—and said: Well, the President has dillydallied and so forth. I do not think he has at all. I think the President indeed has employed a very successful strategy of going after ISIS in Iraq—in fact, stopped their march on Erbil, in fact, stopped their march on the Mosul dam, and is going after them in other locations in coordination with the Peshmerga of the Kurds, as well as the Iraqi Army.

Indeed, the President started on August 25 the surveillance flights over Syria so that we can collect the intelligence that is necessary to prepare to go after them in Syria. But the President has done something more. He has started to put together a coalition, realizing that the American people have no appetite for American boots on the ground in Syria—to put together a coalition so that maybe the Free Syrian Army, maybe other members of the Arab League, maybe some other members of NATO would participate.

But the way we drew this resolution, it talks about there would not be a recurring military presence and the employing of an American army on the ground. It leaves the flexibility that clearly there will be American boots on the ground, just as there already have been when we sent our special operations forces in there to try to rescue the two American journalists who subsequently met such a brutal and uncivil end in their beheading. So American boots have been there. We might need special operations kinds of missions in the future. We might need forward air observers actually on the ground to direct air strikes. So there is flexibility in this resolution.

I want to say if there is anybody with any doubt about the intent of ISIS, they have made it so clear, not only taking the lives of these journalists, the second one of which was from my State of Florida, but in their statements of what they intend to do, setting up an Islamic caliphate. The leader, al-Baghdadi, even calls himself the caliph or religious leader.

But they have also said they will not stop until the black flag of ISIS is hanging and flying over the White House. Their intent is pretty clear. We are going to have to deal with them, not only in Iraq as we are now, but elsewhere. It is going to be sooner or later. It is not going to be a 1-day or 2-day operation. As the President has already indicated, this is going to be a long-term kind of operation. The fact is, the United States is the one that has to lead the coalition.

To get this right out front and center of what we need to do, I have introduced, and it is printed as a part of the RECORD, this resolution to give the legal authorization from the Congress for the President to strike ISIS in Syria and to do as the President has said, to bring to a successful conclusion, to stop this horrendous uncivil, extraordinary kind of inhumane behavior that is being illustrated by these folks.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S.J. Res. 43. A joint resolution to authorize the use of force against the organization called the Islamic State in order to defend the American people and assist the Iraqi Government in expelling the Islamic State from their territory; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, when you look at what is happening with ISIS, we have gone through all kinds of terrorist activities. We all know we are in a crisis right now. I am inclined to agree—and I don't always agree—with Secretary Hagel, but on the day when he said that ''ISIS is an imminent threat to every interest we have, whether it is in Iraq or anywhere else,'' this is a big deal.

As America sat back and looked and observed and saw the beheading of two Americans, a lot of people said that was an act of war. I found out recently that as of yesterday—and it will be announced in the next few days that there is a poll that has been conducted, that if we take all the problems that are out there that people have been talking about for a long period of time, including the borders and all the other issues, nothing is even close to ISIS.

I think it was very interesting that on August 28, just a few days ago, the President made the statement, ''We don't have a strategy yet'' to deal with ISIS in Syria. If there is not a strategy now, there has to be a strategy.

I am introducing an AUMF resolution for action against ISIS. An AUMF is Authorization for Use of Military Force. This is something that perhaps the President has anyway—we don't know that—but we have to take away the doubt that is out there. Something has to be done. I know the President is going to make a speech—I guess it is on Wednesday—and he may come out with a specific strategy. If he doesn't, he has had all the time in the world he needs to do it, and he hasn't done it. My AUMF is specific to ISIS. There are other AUMF's dealing with Al Qaeda and other things, but to me that just confuses the issue. This has now become the No. 1 issue in America, and

there is no tolerance to continue doing nothing, as we have been doing. We need to make sure the President has the authority, and this requires the President, within 15 days and then with 90-day updates, to submit in writing to Congress a comprehensive strategy to defeat the global threat posed by ISIS.

Keep in mind, it seems as if this President is inclined, anytime there is a problem out there, let's drop a bomb here and let's do something over there. That is not a strategy. I stated 1 year ago, on this same day, that the President cannot continue to operate without a clear-cut strategy.

So the congressional authorization for the President is to use all necessary and appropriate force to protect Americans in defending national security in the United States against a threat posed by ISIS and any successor terrorist organization. It allows the President to use all tools available and necessary to defeat ISIS, with flexibility to adjust efforts as the terrorist organization evolves. So this is not just limited to any boundaries. As you know, there are no boundaries with ISIS. It is not just Syria, it is not just Iraq. This is something that is spread all over. It is huge, and it is a threat unlike anything we have seen in our country before.

So I am asking my good friends—I have already talked to several friends on the Democratic side and the Republican side—to join me, and I think hopefully we will be able to do it.

It is estimated that 12,000 foreign fighters have joined ISIS, about 2,500 of which hold Western passports to give them easy access. What is going to happen is they will come back and be trained terrorists. I think that is a major issue that I want to at least have announced.

I have introduced this resolution. It is out there right now and we are going to be asking for support.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3783. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3784. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3785. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 3786. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3783. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas Iraq is currently embroiled in a surge of violence arising from an ISIL-led offensive that began in Anbar province and has spread to key locations such as Mosul, Tikrit, and Samarra and continues to engulf the region in violence and instability;

Whereas, on June 29, 2014, ISIL leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi renamed the group the Islamic State and pronounced himself Caliph of a new Islamic caliphate encompassing the areas under his control, and Mr. al-Baghdadi has a stated mission of spreading the Islamic State and caliphate across the region through violence against Shiites, non-Muslims, and unsupportive Sunnis;

Whereas Iraq's population is approximately 31,300,000 people, with 97 percent identifying themselves as Muslim and the approximately 3 percent of religious minorities groups comprising of Christians, Yezidis, Sabean-Mandaeans, Bahais, Shabaks, Kakais, and Jews;

Whereas the Iraqi Christian population is estimated to be between 400,000 and 850,000, with two-thirds being Chaldean, one-fifth Assyrian, and the remainder consisting of Syriacs, Protestants, Armenians, and Anglicans;

Whereas the Iraqi constitution provides for religious freedom by stating that ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the principles of democracy,'' ''no law may be enacted that contradicts the rights and basic freedoms stipulated in this Constitution,'' and ''[this Constitution] guarantees the full religious rights to freedom of religious belief and practice of all individuals such as Christians, Yazidis, and Mandean Sabeans'';

Whereas the fall of Mosul in particular has sparked enough anxiety among the Christian population that, for the first time in 1,600 years, there was no Mass in that city;

Whereas over 50 percent of Iraq's Christian population has fled since the fall of Saddam Hussein, and the government under Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki did not uphold its commitment to protect the rights of religious minorities;

Whereas the United States Government has provided over $73,000,000 of cumulative assistance to Iraq's minority populations since 2003 through economic development, humanitarian services, and capacity development;

Whereas 84,902 Iraqis have resettled to the United States between 2007 and 2013 and over 300,000 Chaldean and Assyrians currently reside throughout the country, particularly in Michigan, California, Arizona, Illinois, and Ohio; and

Whereas President Barack Obama recently declared on Religious Freedom Day, ''Foremost among the rights Americans hold sacred is the freedom to worship as we choose . . . we also remember that religious liberty is not just an American right; it is a universal human right to be protected here at home and across the globe. This freedom is an essential part of human dignity, and without it our world cannot know lasting peace.'': Now, therefore, be it

SA 3784. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms its commitment to promoting and to protecting religious freedom around the world;

(2) calls on the Department of State to work with the Government of Iraq, the Kurdistan Regional Government, neighboring countries, the diaspora community in the United States, and other key stakeholders to address the urgent plight of those Iraqi minority groups seeking safety and protection from persecution in Iraq;

(3) respectfully requests the Government of Iraq to prioritize the issue of protecting religious minorities and take concrete action to enact and enforce laws protecting religious freedom; and

(4) urges the President to ensure the timely processing of visas for Iraq's minority groups fleeing religious persecution, in accordance with existing United States immigration law and national security screening procedures.

SA 3785. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the resolution S. Res. 530, expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the Sunni Islamist insurgent and terrorist group the Islamic State, formerly known as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), as it expands its control over areas in northwestern Iraq; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: ''A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the current situation in Iraq and the urgent need to protect religious minorities from persecution from the terrorist group the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).''.

SA 3786. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 19, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the ''No Exemption for Washington from Obamacare Act''.