

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.  
The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. I will be back at 5 o'clock to speak on behalf of our nominee for TSA, Admiral Neffenger.

#### YOUTUBE KIDS APP

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I want to address something that I was absolutely shocked about when I saw it over the weekend. We hear the term "age appropriate," and when it comes to our children, that is necessarily something that parents should be concerned about because we parents—all of us who are parents—want our children to be able to take advantage of the Internet's vast resources to learn, to stay connected. But we as parents do not want our children, especially small children, to encounter inappropriate content.

Well, unfortunately, there is a lot of violence, profanity, and sexualized material on the Internet, and kids can too often access this material with the click of a mouse. We have all been dealing with that. That is nothing unusual. And what are we parents to do? We can monitor our kids' activities, but we can also depend on parental controls and filters in the marketplace. We have seen the development of many of these services for kids that promise a safe space for children. The problem is when companies do not completely deliver on that promise.

So I have read recent news reports and I watched Google's YouTube Kids mobile application for smart phones, and I see that it contains material that is not, in fact, appropriate for small children. According to the press accounts—and what I saw repeated—the app has apparently been found to include videos with explicit language; mature subject matter, such as child abuse, drug use, pedophilia; demonstrations of unsafe behaviors; and—get this—advertisements for alcohol.

I want to show you a picture. This is on Google's YouTube Kids app. Here is a lady hawking red wine. This is an advertisement for little kids? It is there, and I hope the offending parties will take heed to my remarks.

We all recognize what is shown in this picture—most appropriate for advertisements for the Super Bowl, but on a Google YouTube app for little children, preceded by the Clydesdales pulling the wagon with the Dalmatian—an icon in America. But for little children, an ad, the King of Beers?

And how about unsafe behaviors. Here is someone striking a match and taking this match down to a pile of unlit matches, and then, of course, you know what happens—it all goes up in flame.

Have we lost our common sense? When Google rolled out its YouTube Kids app, it said: "The app makes it

safer and easier for children to find videos on topics they want to explore . . ." That is a good thing. It went on to say: "Now, parents can rest a little easier knowing that videos in the YouTube Kids app are narrowed down to content appropriate for kids." Well, I certainly agree with Google on that statement. Parents should be able to trust these online venues for children, especially when they are designed and marketed as being safe. But is this safe for children? And, Madam President, is that safe for children? I do not think so.

If a company creates an online safe haven for kids, it must do everything it can to make sure children are not unnecessarily exposed to the very content parents want their children to avoid. Google certainly has the technical expertise to make sure that videos which are unsuitable for kids are screened or filtered out, especially when Google markets the app as being suitable for children. Indeed, section 5 of the FTC Act prohibits deceptive marketing practices.

I applaud Google for its efforts to create healthy online experiences for children, but in this case, their efforts fell short, and I would expect Google to change this right away.

Furthermore, YouTube Kids should also be sensitive to the fact that younger children often do not understand the difference between advertisements and noncommercial content. So kids' online services that have commercial advertising should make sure that advertising is clearly distinguished from the other content. Google should not take advantage of this well-known vulnerability among children. Video advertisements should be easily and clearly distinguishable from other videos the kids are watching.

I should not have to come here and the Senator from Utah be so gracious to give me the time. It ought to be common sense that we should not be doing this. But this Senator, who is the ranking member of the Senate Commerce Committee, is compelled to come here and speak of this kind of comment. We want companies to create online services and products that allow children safe access to age-appropriate content, and we understand that companies want to tap into the kids' market, but everyone knows just how much Internet content is out there that is completely unsuitable for children.

Madam President, need I say any more? It is very clear, and I hope there will be quick action for appropriate content.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise to speak today on a matter of critical importance to our Nation's security,

but first I wish to extend my most heartfelt condolences to our friends in Charleston, SC.

Last week, we witnessed an unspeakable tragedy with the shooting at the Emanuel AME Church. This heinous act has left families reeling and the Nation in disbelief. Words can little console nor can they heal the hearts of those who have lost. Still, I wish to say just a few words to the neighbors, families, and friends who have suffered most.

Know that your Nation suffers with you—no question about it. You are in our prayers, our thoughts. May you feel peace and love. May you find healing in God. And may the shooter be swiftly brought to justice.

#### NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I now shift to a different threat we face.

Time and again—time and time again—the Islamic Republic of Iran has lied to the international community. The latest evidence emerged in the June 2 publication by the United Nations Security Council of a scathing report on Iranian noncompliance with the Joint Plan of Action. Written by a diverse panel of international experts, the report catalogs a growing list of Iran's violations of multiple U.N. mandates. It deserves to be read widely by all those who care deeply, as I do, about the ongoing P5+1 negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program.

The lesson to draw from the Security Council report is clear: If Iran continues to violate its current agreements with impunity, how can we expect that Tehran would adhere to a new deal to suspend its nuclear program? This is a matter of plain common sense.

The specifics of the report paint a profoundly troubling picture. Iranian arms transfer activities have continued uninterrupted, despite the sanctions imposed by the unified international community. These arms have found their way into a number of regional conflicts, fuelling instability in Syria, Iraq, Yemen, and elsewhere. Hezbollah and Hamas—Iran's perennial terrorist allies—continue to turn these weapons against Israel and our other allies in the region. Regional violence has been and continues to be Iran's export of choice.

According to this report, not only does Iran illegally export weapons and oil, it has also imported prohibited materials and technology, circumventing sanctions. The Iranians have long maintained a robust illicit procurement infrastructure. They have accomplished this through intermediaries controlled by Iranian and pro-Iranian interests, often involving false documentation, shell corporations, and foreign nationals.

For these and other reasons, our French allies have now declared that a rigorous inspection regime that includes military installations should be

a prerequisite to any agreement. This should have been our position from the start.

Additionally, the report describes violations of foreign travel restrictions of high-ranking Iranian Government officials. One particularly noteworthy violation is the case of Major General Qasem Soleimani, the commander of Iran's Special Forces Quds Force. Earlier this year, General Soleimani met with the Secretary General of Hezbollah in Lebanon. Just last month, photographs surfaced of General Soleimani surrounded by Shiite militia fighters in Iraq's embattled Anbar Province.

I am disappointed to hear some try to minimize these Iranian violations of Security Council resolutions because some Iranian arms and personnel are currently being used against the heinous Islamic State. We must not turn a blind eye to Iranian malfeasance. We must not fall into the trap of accepting Iran's transgressions simply because they are fighting a common foe. In this case, the enemy of our enemy is not our friend. Some of the armed Shia groups fighting the Islamic State are the same groups that were killing U.S. troops just a few short years ago. They might very well try to do so again.

A nuclear-armed Iran would be a disaster for the region and the wider world—not only for our Israel allies but also for our Saudi, Egyptian, Jordanian, Kuwaiti, Qatari, and Emirati allies as well. With the continuing turmoil in the region and the threat posed by the Islamic State, Al Qaeda, the Taliban, and other terrorist groups, the world cannot afford a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. Considering the hand-in-hand history between Iran and Hezbollah, one could easily translate a nuclear Iran into a nuclear Hezbollah.

It is therefore highly distressing that Iran has, to quote the Security Council, "continued certain nuclear activities, including uranium enrichment and some work at Arak." If Iran has failed to sufficiently address even the core cause of the sanctions against them, what confidence do we have in them in moving forward?

It is particularly telling that the U.N. expert panel assessed that a decline in reports by member states of Iranian violations results from one of two factors: either Iran has decreased its prohibitive activities significantly or member states have refrained from reporting noncompliance so as not to interrupt the negotiations process. In light of the revelations contained in this report, the latter appears far more likely.

As the President continues to push for a permanent deal with Iran's leadership, this report is as alarming as it is timely. Past performance may not universally predict future behavior, but it certainly should be part of the consideration. Moreover, this report is far from the only sign of Iranian malfeasance. As recently as yesterday, the

Iranian Parliament voted to prohibit international inspections of military sites, casting into serious doubt its commitment to a workable nuclear deal.

Given these troubling moves, the President should explain to the American people what level of confidence he has negotiating with Iran given how it repeatedly violates the international community's mandates with impunity. The stakes are too high to act as if Iran were a trustworthy partner.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, the Senate is not in a quorum call; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, Senator.

#### KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak for a few minutes about the disaster that is known as ObamaCare and specifically the Supreme Court's upcoming decision in King v. Burwell, which we anticipate will be handed down later this week or perhaps as late as Monday. This case will decide whether the IRS can rewrite the law, and it actually challenges the legality of the subsidies to health care policies affecting people in up to 37 States.

If the Court rules against the IRS, that would be the third strike against ObamaCare in the Supreme Court. What more evidence would we possibly need of this administration's routine overreach of its authority under the Constitution?

Not surprisingly, the President once again has failed to accept responsibility for this flawed law that bears his name, and he has suggested that Congress could simply fix the problem with a one-sentence provision. In other words, even though President Obama and congressional Democrats jammed this partisan monstrosity through all by themselves in 2010, somehow, after three strikes in the U.S. Supreme Court, it is now our responsibility to clean up the mess.

But what is wrong with ObamaCare far exceeds the issue at hand in King v. Burwell. I hear of the disastrous effects of ObamaCare every day from folks back home in Texas. They know, as do I, that a one-sentence provision won't fix a 2,700-page legislative disaster, unless that sentence were to repeal ObamaCare in its entirety.

If somehow this administration and congressional Democrats could be sued for misleading consumers under the usual legal standards, the case brought by millions of Americans against ObamaCare would be a slam dunk. The President claimed his law would help everyone—miraculously decreasing costs, increasing access, and reducing the deficit—when, in fact, time after time after time, the opposite has been shown to be the case. What we have

seen instead has been great damage to the health care system in this country, leaving many Americans with their health care disrupted, their work hours cut, and higher costs for their health coverage.

Although proponents of the law, including the President and Democratic Members of Congress, claimed ObamaCare would reduce the financial burden of health care for American families, this has not been the case. In fact, one study found that ObamaCare actually increased individual market premiums by an average of almost 50 percent between 2013 and 2014. So rather than make health care more affordable, what ObamaCare did is to make it less affordable and more expensive by increasing individual market premiums by an average of almost 50 percent.

Recently, the administration released rate filings showing that insurers have requested double-digit premium increases for nearly 700 plans next year. So double-digit increases have been requested.

We can all remember the President's repeated promises that under ObamaCare those who wanted to keep their plans would be able to do so. In fact, the Associated Press has documented that more than 4.7 million Americans had insurance plans they liked that were canceled by ObamaCare.

And of course, just last week President Obama himself called the Web site platform for his trademark legislation—healthcare.gov—"a well-documented disaster."

The fact that this failed law has hurt patients is bad enough, but the truth is it is also hurting the economy and hurting jobs. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that ObamaCare is forcing employers to cut jobs and has projected that as many as 2 million jobs could be lost by 2017.

If the Court rules for King, the plaintiff in the lawsuit, millions more Americans could find their health care coverage temporarily disrupted—just one more painful consequence of this reckless piece of legislation.

Clearly, ObamaCare was not the silver bullet for our health care system or our economy. Instead, what we know today is that ObamaCare really just amounted to a trail of broken promises. But you will never find the President or those who foisted this flawed legislation upon the American people taking responsibility for it. Rather, as I said earlier, somehow they think it is for somebody else to clean up their mess.

I continue to believe the American people would be well served to see this entire law scrapped in favor of real patient-centered reforms that lower costs and increase access to care. I thought that was what health care reform was supposed to be about—lowering cost and improving access to care. But ObamaCare did the opposite.

I am here to say that while Republicans did not create this mess, we are