

more advanced warning of space weather disturbances (as defined in section 3 of the Space Weather Research and Forecasting Act).

“(2) TECHNOLOGY AND INSTRUMENTATION DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall support the development of technologies and instrumentation to improve space weather forecasting lead-time and accuracy to meet the needs identified by the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

“§60704. Space weather data

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Director of the National Science Foundation shall—

“(1) make space weather related data obtained for scientific research purposes available to space weather forecasters and operations centers; and

“(2) support model development and model applications to space weather forecasting.

“(b) RESEARCH.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall make space weather related data obtained from operational forecasting available for scientific research.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) REPEAL OF SECTION 809.—Section 809 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18388) and the item relating to that section in the table of contents under section 1(b) of that Act (124 Stat. 2806) are repealed.

(2) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters of title 51, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to chapter 605 the following:

“607. Space weather ..... 60701”.

**SEC. 3. SPACE WEATHER METRICS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SPACE WEATHER DISTURBANCE.—The term “space weather disturbance” includes geo-electric fields, ionizing radiation, ionospheric disturbances, solar radio bursts, and upper atmospheric expansion.

(2) SPACE WEATHER BENCHMARK.—The term “space weather benchmark” means the physical characteristics and conditions describing the nature, frequency, and intensity of space weather disturbances.

(b) BENCHMARKS.—

(1) PRELIMINARY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Space Weather Interagency Working Group, established under section 60701 of title 51, United States Code, in consultation with academic and commercial experts, shall—

(A) assess existing data, the historical record, models, and peer-reviewed studies on space weather; and

(B) develop preliminary benchmarks, based on current scientific understanding and the historical record, for measuring solar disturbances.

(2) FINAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date the preliminary benchmarks are developed under paragraph (1), the Space Weather Interagency Working Group shall publish final benchmarks.

(3) REVIEW.—The Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall contract with the National Academy of Sciences to review the benchmarks established under paragraph (2).

(4) REVISIONS.—The Space Weather Interagency Working Group shall update and revise the final benchmarks under paragraph (2), as necessary, based on—

(A) the results of the review under paragraph (3);

(B) any significant new data or advances in scientific understanding that become available; or

(C) the evolving needs of entities impacted by solar disturbances.

**SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall provide information about space weather hazards to the Secretary of Homeland Security for purposes of this section.

(b) CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with sector-specific agencies, the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the heads of other relevant agencies, shall—

(1) include, in meeting national critical infrastructure reporting requirements, an assessment of the vulnerability of critical infrastructure to space weather events, as described by the space weather benchmarks under section 3; and

(2) support critical infrastructure providers in managing the risks and impacts associated with space weather.

(c) PROHIBITION ON NEW REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in subsection (b) may be construed to grant the Secretary of Homeland Security any authority to promulgate regulations that was not in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) DEFINITION OF SECTOR-SPECIFIC AGENCY.—In this section, the term “sector-specific agency” has the meaning given the term in Presidential Policy Directive–21 of February 12, 2013 (Critical Infrastructure Security and Resilience), or any successor.

**SEC. 5. PROTECTION OF NATIONAL SECURITY ASSETS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Security Council, in consultation with the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Defense, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall—

(1) assess the vulnerability of the national security community to space weather events, as described by the space weather benchmarks under section 3; and

(2) develop national security mechanisms to protect national security assets from space weather threats.

(b) COOPERATION.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall provide information about space weather hazards to the National Security Council, Director of National Intelligence, and heads of Defense Agencies for purposes of this section.

**SEC. 6. ENSURING THE SAFETY OF CIVIL AVIATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall—

(1) assess the safety implications and vulnerability of the national airspace system by space weather events, as described by the space weather benchmarks under section 3;

(2) assess methods to mitigate the safety implications and effects of space weather on aviation communication systems, aircraft navigation systems, satellite and ground-based navigation systems, and potential health effects of radiation exposure; and

(3) assess options for incorporating space weather into operational training for pilots, cabin crew, dispatchers, air traffic controllers, meteorologists, and engineers.

(b) SPACE WEATHER COMMUNICATION.—The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, shall develop methods to increase the interaction between the aviation community and the space weather research and service provider community.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to; that the

bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 141), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

**EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued**

**NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK**

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here today to celebrate the 18th Annual National Charter Schools Week and thank the students, parents, and teachers from charter schools across the United States for their ongoing contributions to education. Senator BENNET of Colorado and I introduced a resolution marking this event, which the Senate approved yesterday.

Let me tell you my favorite story about charter schools. It was 24 years ago, 1992. I was in my last month as U.S. Secretary of Education, and as my last official act, I wrote a letter to every school superintendent in the country asking them to consider replicating the early success of the State of Minnesota in creating charter schools. There were about a dozen of them then, and they were created by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party of Minnesota. That was consistent with what President George H.W. Bush and I had been encouraging, which was what we called start-from-scratch schools—schools that gave teachers more freedom and parents more choices. We thought that could improve education in the country and might lead to what we call new American schools.

The first charter schools were created in the State of Minnesota nearly a quarter of a century ago, led by the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, and there were about a dozen of them. Since then, there has been broad bipartisan, mainstream support for charter schools.

Let's remember that charter schools are public schools. They are simply public schools which are freer from government rules, Federal rules, State rules, and union rules and which give teachers more freedom to teach the children who are presented to them and parents more freedom to choose those public schools.

Some of those who supported the creation of charter schools include Albert Shanker, the late head of the American Federation of Teachers. In 1997, President Clinton said: We need 3,000 charter schools by the year 2002. George W. Bush, in the No Child Left Behind legislation, supported charter schools. President Obama was a strong supporter of charter schools while he was in office. His first U.S. Secretary of Education, Arne Duncan, called himself a “strong supporter” of charter schools. President Obama’s second U.S. Education Secretary, John King, founded a charter school and ran a system of charter schools. Secretary Betsy DeVos, the current Secretary of Education, has spent most of her life as a strong supporter of charter schools. In 1994, 1998, 2001, and 2015, the U.S. Congress supported charter schools by large margins and in a bipartisan manner. Over 44 States and the District of Columbia have created an environment through their laws for charter schools.

In 30 years, public charter schools have grown from a dozen in Minnesota to more than 6,900 today. Today, charter schools are serving over 3.1 million students. Over 6 percent of all public school students in America today now attend charter schools, and another 1 million students are on waiting lists for charter schools. This past year saw an estimated enrollment increase of over 200,000 students, representing a 7-percent growth in just one school year.

Over half of the students served by these institutions are eligible for free or reduced-priced lunches, over half are students of color, and 17 percent are limited English proficient—all higher percentages than those served in traditional public schools.

As I said earlier, charter schools are about freedom for teachers, choices for parents, and more and better opportunities for students. Charter schools enable people. They enable parents to help their children get a real opportunity by choosing better schools or at least schools that fit them better and help them succeed. They enable students to learn and succeed. They enable teachers to succeed by giving them the freedom to use their firsthand knowledge. They enable administrators to succeed by ending bureaucratic mandates and giving them a chance to use their own good judgment.

In amending the No Child Left Behind Act, which we called the Every Student Succeeds Act, we made a number of changes to strengthen and expand the Federal Charter Schools Program, which since 1994 has given grants to States to start new charter schools.

ESSA, as we call it, made improvements to that program to ensure that those funds are used as effectively as possible to increase the number of high-quality charter schools. Specifically, ESSA invests more Federal funds in the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools with a proven record of success, while still

giving States the flexibility to invest in innovative new methods. ESSA continues Federal support for nonprofit organizations which help charter schools find suitable facilities, while also encouraging States to assist charter schools in this task.

Now these hard-working and creative educators who are seeking to open charter schools have greater flexibility in how they use Federal startup funds—for example, by allowing them to use the funds for transportation or facilities improvement, if that is what they decide is the best use of those funds for their children and their community.

Finally, the Every Student Succeeds Act encourages States to provide charter schools with the support they need to be successful and to hold them accountable when they fail to demonstrate positive results.

Charter schools are public schools stripped of many Federal, State, and union rules and constraints that are placed on traditional public schools. The money the State would ordinarily spend on the district school follows each child to the charter school instead.

Across Tennessee, more than 30,000 students now have that same opportunity to attend one of 107 charter schools, and they are thriving as a result. A recent study by Stanford University found that on average, Tennessee students attending charter schools gained the equivalent of 86 additional days of instruction in reading and 72 additional days of instruction in math each year than did students attending traditional district schools. In other words, they make almost a year and a half’s worth of progress in a single school year.

More than 80 percent of students attending charter schools in Tennessee are low income, and more than 94 percent are African American or Hispanic. In other words, charter schools in Tennessee are making a difference for those students who have traditionally been least well-served by our Nation’s public schools. That is a worthy event to celebrate in this 18th annual National Charter Schools Week, to celebrate how charter schools have grown from a dozen start-from-scratch schools in the State of Minnesota 25 years ago to more than 6,900 today.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, Scott Pruitt, Mike Flynn, Betsy DeVos—there is a pattern here. This administration keeps choosing people who seem like the wrong fit to run their

agency, and now we are about to add Jay Clayton to the list.

He is different in a lot of ways. I met with him. He is a good person. He is a sensible person desiring to be a public servant, and he is a very smart lawyer. But he is not the right candidate to lead the SEC because it is on the frontlines of making sure that Wall Street follows the rules. And that is the No. 1 issue here because Mr. Clayton has too many ties to the industry that he would be in charge of overseeing.

Wall Street is full of his friends and business contacts, and there is nothing wrong with that, generally. We need lawyers in the securities industry. We need honorable people who help companies to do an IPO, but that doesn’t mean that individual is appropriate to be in charge of the SEC and in charge of reining in Wall Street. That causes the problem.

I do not question Mr. Clayton’s integrity. I have no doubt that he is a good person. But how can we say that the best person to hold Wall Street in check is someone with strong ties to the big banks, someone who has built his career there, who very well may go back to his old law firm in a few years?

I talked with Mr. Clayton at his confirmation hearing about whether he would go back to Wall Street after his time at the SEC ended, and he said he couldn’t rule it out. That is just one of several concerns that I have. If we look at Mr. Clayton’s statements about the SEC, it is clear that he is not the right person to be the cop on the Wall Street beat.

He has talked about “monitoring” the financial sector; that is the word he used—“monitoring.” But the United States does not need someone to “monitor” Wall Street. We need someone who will aggressively enforce the rules, to make sure we don’t have a repeat of 2008, when the big banks made so many bad and reckless decisions that our economy failed.

We have a very short memory in Washington about what happened to our country less than 10 years ago, but the rest of the country remembers. There are far too many communities still working to recover from the great recession.

Now is not the time to walk back the small steps toward progress we have made in protecting the economy from bad actors on Wall Street. But I am afraid this is what could happen under this administration, including if Mr. Clayton should be confirmed.

In his confirmation hearing, he said he wants to lighten the penalties companies face when they get into trouble with the SEC, and that is not something I can support. We cannot expect big banks and investment firms to play by the rules when they know they can pay a small fine and keep behaving badly as a cost of doing business. Regulation and enforcement has a cost, but that cost is meant to put the burden on the actors who are causing the problem

instead of allowing the burden to fall on the rest of us—to fall on American families.

The cost is there, one way or the other. The question is, Who should pay it?

Even if the Senate disagrees on enforcement and regulation, I hope we can agree that conflicts of interest have gone too far. This administration has diminished the meaning of public service in the context of conflicts of interest. Instead of looking out for conflicts of interest, it has leaned into them. Instead of protecting the country from corruption, it is putting our country in real danger. And at some point, it is up to the Senate to be a Senate—to do something. We have to decide where to draw the line. How long do we let this go on?

I am a “no” on Mr. Clayton’s nomination. I urge all Senators who care about ending conflicts of interest and putting a tough cop on the Wall Street beat to join me and vote no on this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Mr. Jay Clayton, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission.

On January 4, 2017, then President-elect Trump announced his intention to nominate Jay Clayton to be the next chairman of the SEC. He noted that “Jay Clayton is a highly talented expert on many aspects of financial and regulatory law, and he will ensure our financial institutions can thrive and create jobs while playing by the rules.”

This sentiment was proven by Mr. Clayton’s testimony and interactions during his nomination hearing. In fact, he passed out of the Banking Committee by a vote of 15-to-8, with bipartisan support.

Mr. Clayton is a highly regarded and exceptionally qualified candidate. As a partner at a prominent law firm, he built a reputation as a highly skilled financial markets expert, representing clients of all types and sizes, both domestically and internationally. He has also invested in a younger generation of lawyers, passing on his knowledge as an adjunct professor at the University of Pennsylvania.

Throughout the nomination process, Mr. Clayton has proved his dedication to unbiased and fair conduct.

Mr. Clayton’s comments, experience, and actions provide me with confidence that he will lead the SEC with the highest integrity and effectiveness.

The SEC has an important three-part mission: to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and to facilitate capital formation. At his nomination hearing, Mr. Clayton echoed the importance of the SEC’s mission and how the SEC can do more to ensure that our markets remain the envy of the world.

Although the United States capital markets remain the most robust in the

world, they have been challenged by competition from abroad. During his hearing, Mr. Clayton observed that our capital markets have become less attractive to businesses than they ever have been before. Capital markets drive innovation and job creation, and access to them is the lifeblood of our economy.

The JOBS Act helped revitalize primary markets, and both Congress and the SEC should continue to find ways to help companies go public and allow investors to share in their successes. Mr. Clayton pledged to do just that. He committed to working with his fellow Commissioners, with SEC staff, with Congress, and with the President to support and defend our capital markets.

Mr. Clayton also repeatedly committed at his nomination hearing that he would protect investors. He stated that he is “100 percent committed to rooting out any fraud and shady practices in our financial system.”

During the Banking Committee’s hearings on Mr. Clayton, some raised the concern that he previously represented many firms on Wall Street and that he would continue to look out for their best interests. He appropriately responded by pledging to the American people that he will show no favoritism to anyone and maintain a high degree of transparency.

Given Mr. Clayton’s strong qualifications and his pledge to work to improve capital formation and uphold investor protections, I urge my colleagues to support his nomination. Congress and the SEC, led by Mr. Clayton and the American people, can ensure that the U.S. financial system and markets remain the preferred destination for investors throughout the world. I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes on the nomination of Mr. Jay Clayton.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes and delay the vote until 5:25 p.m., until the completion of my remarks.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Presiding Officer’s forbearance and also the cooperation always of the chairman of the Banking Committee, Senator CRAPO. We had a good hearing today on reinsurance and on European Union issues on insurance regulation. I appreciated the work we were able to do there and the work we are doing on Russian sanctions, which is increasingly important, as we see, as the clear links between Russia and the

American elections are becoming clearer. The links are becoming clearer and clearer to Senators in both parties.

I rise in opposition to the nomination of Jay Clayton to the Securities and Exchange Commission. We have seen this movie before, where we nominate someone to chair the Securities and Exchange Commission who starts off almost handcuffed with their hands behind their back because he has—as did his predecessor—far too many conflicts of interest, far too many demands for recusal, far too many cases he has worked on.

We hear of a President who talks about draining the swamp, who wants regulators and people in Washington who don’t have conflicts of interest and who can look at this in a fair-minded, clear-eyed way. Instead, we see a White House that is full of Goldman Sachs former officials. In fact, the White House on some days looks like a retreat of Goldman Sachs executives. That is a long way from clearing the swamp.

What we are seeing in the case of Mr. Clayton—and we had a good meeting with him, and I thought his testimony was pretty good—is that he is smart, he is educated, he knows these issues well, but he is going to have to recuse himself because of conflicts with UBS, Deutsche Bank, and Goldman Sachs. He has worked on so many of these cases as a Wall Street lawyer for so many years that at this Securities and Exchange Commission—where the President still hasn’t appointed a Democrat, which really he is supposed to do but hasn’t seemed to have gotten around to it—that we are going to see all kinds of opportunities for mischief, we are going to see all kinds of delays and tie votes, and we will see an inability for the SEC to operate when they should.

I oppose the confirmation of Jay Clayton. I think he is capable, but he will not serve this country well. He will not keep corporations and, especially, banks honest on all kinds of corporate governance issues. He will not be as supportive of the investor public because of these recusals and conflicts that he faces. I think it is a bad idea, again. I opposed the previous Democratic nominee for this job because she had far too many recusals and conflicts that she had to do. I think this is a mistake to do this again.

I ask my colleagues to vote no, to oppose the confirmation of Jay Clayton to the Securities and Exchange Commission.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Clayton nomination?

Mr. BROWN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DURBIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hatch	Roberts
Boozman	Heitkamp	Rounds
Burr	Heller	Rubio
Capito	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Scott
Cassidy	Johnson	Shaheen
Cochran	Kennedy	Shelby
Collins	King	Strange
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McCain	Tillis
Cruz	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Nelson	
Flake	Paul	

NAYS—37

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Sanders
Brown	Heinrich	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Udall
Coons	Leahy	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Franken	Murray	

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin Isakson

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on the nomination of Jay Clayton to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Executive Calendar No. 36.

On vote No. 118, had I been present, I would have voted nay on the confirmation of the Clayton nomination, Executive Calendar No. 36.●

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF EXECUTIVE ORDER 9066

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, May 6, 2017, marks a 75-year-old moral stain on Oregon's history. On this day in 1942, the city of Portland was declared free of all Japanese Americans.

As part of the Nation's response to the bombing of Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066 in February 1942. In doing so, the President authorized the removal of anybody deemed "threatening." The President's action was based in fear and prejudice rather than any actual threat, and many Japanese Americans paid the price as innocent people were separated from their families and traumatized.

The United States would ultimately incarcerate more than 120,000 U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents of Japanese ancestry. The Federal Government deemed Japanese Americans who lived on the west coast a "threat," putting my State of Oregon on the frontlines of this injustice.

Forced out of their homes and businesses, many of Oregon's Japanese American families moved into the animal stalls of what was then the Pacific International Livestock and Exposition Center in north Portland. Eventually, a total of 3,700 men, women, and children from Oregon and parts of Washington were held at the center. These families were later sent off with thousands of other Japanese Americans to quickly erected camps across the United States.

Despite the anti-Japanese fever burning across the United States, thousands of Japanese Americans were serving valiantly on the battlefields of Europe. We throw around the word "patriot" a lot these days, but I can't think of a more patriotic story than those Japanese Americans who signed up to defend the same country that had locked up their families.

Units like the famed 42nd and men like my friend and former colleague Senator Dan Inouye displayed an exceptional degree of courage and valor abroad. Back home, Japanese American civil rights leaders like Minoru Yasui and Fred Korematsu were challenging the prejudices that led to Executive Order 9066, the internment, and other injustices faced by Japanese Americans and permanent residents.

As the son of Jewish parents who fled Nazi Germany, I feel especially compelled today to remind my colleagues and my countrymen of this dark chapter in our Nation's history. It is especially important to recall this history today because it seems some Americans have slipped back into an era of fear-mongering, bigotry, and hate.

I have seen countless expressions of kindness and decency in my years representing Oregon, which is why I have faith that people across our State and the country will continue to stand up and say "no more." That is why I also want to honor the truly courageous Japanese Americans and others who

fought the pain and fear caused by Executive Order 9066. They were on the right side of the argument then and now.

Finally, I would like to recognize the Oregon Nikkei Endowment for all its work to bring us together to reflect on this day. Thank you to all the partners who have and will continue to fight for the rights of every American. I stand with them in solidarity today and always.

TRIBUTE TO HENSON MOORE

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, Today I wish to honor Congressman Henson Moore and recognize his years of service, including his leadership on the Battle of New Orleans Bicentennial Commission.

Raised in Hackberry, LA, Henson moved to Baton Rouge where he graduated from Baton Rouge High School and later Louisiana State University, LSU. He also received his law degree in 1965 and master's degree in 1973 from LSU. Henson honorably served in the Army from 1965 to 1967 and, in 1974, was elected to Congress where he represented Louisiana's Sixth Congressional District for 12 years.

In 1987, Henson was named commissioner of the Panama Canal Consultative Committee by President Reagan. In 1989, he was named Deputy Secretary at the Department of Energy and, in 1992, was named White House Deputy Chief of Staff for President George H.W. Bush.

Following his retirement as president and CEO of American Forest and Paper Association in 2006, Henson and his wife, Carolyn, returned to Baton Rouge.

Henson's public service and involvement with numerous for-profit and nonprofit boards has earned him many noteworthy honors and awards, among them the Secretary Gold Medal, U.S. Department of Energy, induction into the Louisiana Political Hall of Fame, induction into the LSU Alumni Association Hall of Distinction, and the chancellor's Sesquicentennial Service Award. More recently, he was honored as the 2011 LSU Alumnus of the Year. Henson also served as chairman of the Forever LSU Campaign, the most successful fundraising effort in the university's history, and in 2014 was named chairman of the Battle of New Orleans Bicentennial Commission.

Fought on January 8, 1815, the Battle of New Orleans was the final major battle of the War of 1812 and a decisive victory for the United States. As chairman of the Bicentennial Commission, Henson planned and ran a number of activities throughout the New Orleans area. The commission and chairman were all volunteers; they received no money in exchange for their work, and there was no State money used for this commission. In his address on the bicentennial, Henson joked, "When the Legislature created the Bicentennial Commission, it had the foresight to