

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. All time is yielded back.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jo Emily Handelsman, of Connecticut, to be an Associate Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motions to reconsider are considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. President, due to unavoidable family commitments, I was unable to cast votes relative to rollcall vote No. 215 on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Cheryl Ann Krause to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit and rollcall vote No. 216 on the confirmation of Stuart E. Jones to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iraq. Had I been present, I would have voted yea in each instance. ●

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. RES. 487

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the facts regarding the ongoing IRS scandal that the Obama administration refuses to investigate, refuses to prosecute, refuses to address with honesty and integrity. I want to talk about the facts we know and the facts we don't know, and how we as the Senate can demonstrate fidelity to law and the integrity of the U.S. Government.

Let's talk about what we know.

We know that more than 1 year ago on May 14, 2013, the inspector general of the Treasury Department said that beginning in 2010 the IRS had improperly targeted conservative citizen groups, tea party groups, pro-Israel groups, and pro-life groups. The day the inspector general's report was made public, President Obama had described what occurred as "intolerable and inexcusable." As President Obama put it: "Americans have a right to be angry about it, and I am angry about it."

Well, if President Obama was speaking the truth when he said over a year ago that Americans have a right to be angry about this, then today after over a year of obstruction of justice, of refusing to investigate or prosecute what happened under President Obama's own standard, the Americans have a right to be far more than angry about it.

Likewise, the very same day the inspector general report came out, Attorney General Eric Holder said the IRS

targeting the conservative groups was "outrageous and unacceptable." That was more than a year ago.

What has happened in the year and 2 months that have passed since then? Although both the President and the Attorney General profess outrage and anger, not a single person has been indicted—not a single person. Although both the President and the Attorney General said they would investigate this matter, it has been publicly reported that no indictments are planned. In fact, President Obama went on national television during the Super Bowl and categorically stated, "There was not even a smidgeon of corruption to be found at the IRS."

How far we had come from the day the scandal broke when he said he was angry and the American people had a right to be angry. Fast forward a few months later and he goes on television and says there is not a smidgeon of corruption.

That is a remarkable statement for the President to have made, because Attorney General Eric Holder 4 days earlier had told the Senate Judiciary Committee that there was an ongoing investigation being conducted at the IRS.

President Obama's comments and Eric Holder's comments are facially inconsistent. Either Eric Holder was telling the truth, that there is, in fact, a meaningful ongoing investigation, or President Obama was telling the truth when he said conclusively there is not a smidgeon of corruption. One or the other was not telling the truth or perhaps President Obama was simply prejudging the investigation. Perhaps President Obama was simply attempting to influence its outcome, making clear that the outcome desired from the White House is that there is not a smidgeon of corruption. What happened to the American people having a right to be angry? Now the President is instead telling investigators the conclusion they should reach.

Regardless, it is beyond dispute that the Obama administration, the Justice Department, has not held anyone accountable for this gross abuse of power.

In a hearing in January of this year, Attorney General Eric Holder refused to answer whether even a single victim of the wrongful targeting has been interviewed.

Let me repeat that. The victims who were targeted wrongly by the IRS—the citizens—for exercising their political free speech rights, the Attorney General refused to answer if they had even bothered to interview any of those citizens.

We also note some of the emails that have been made public give the appearance that the Department of Justice may have been directly involved in the illegal targeting of citizen groups based on their political views.

Most stunningly, we know that the lead attorney investigating this matter is a major Democratic donor and a major donor to President Obama. In-

deed, she has given over \$6,000 to President Obama and Democrats in recent years.

No reasonable person would trust John Mitchell to investigate Richard Nixon. Yet the Obama administration is telling the American people the investigation into the wrongful targeting of conservatives will be led by a major Obama Democratic donor. That is contemptuous. It is contemptuous of the law; it is contemptuous of the American people. One would think that if you appoint a major Obama donor to lead the investigation, it is likely that the victims would not be interviewed, that no one would be indicted. And, wonder of wonders, what has happened? The victims have not been interviewed and no one has been indicted.

But that is not all. We have seen Lois Lerner, the head of the IRS office that illegally targeted conservative citizens, go before Congress and repeatedly plead the Fifth. When a senior government official takes the Fifth, that is an action that should be taken very seriously. Yet it seems in this town partisan politics trumps fidelity to law. What Lois Lerner said in the House of Representatives by pleading the Fifth is effectively standing there saying, "If I answer your question, I may well implicate myself in criminal conduct." That is chilling.

Let me note with sadness that the Democratic Members of this Chamber seem to have no concern about a senior IRS official pleading the Fifth repeatedly because truthfully answering the questions could implicate her in criminal conduct.

Throughout it all Americans have been told that the Obama administration would find out what happened and would take the necessary actions.

Indeed, the new head of the IRS, Commissioner John Koskinen, promised as much. Now we find out that this new Commissioner is also a major donor to President Obama and Democratic causes. This new Commissioner of the IRS has given nearly \$100,000 to the Democratic Party, including \$7,300 to President Obama. What fairminded person would entrust not one but two major Obama donors to investigate how the IRS used political power to go after the enemies of President Obama? Not one but two—the lead lawyers in the Department of Justice heading up the noninvestigation that is not interviewing the victims, that is not indicting anyone, and the head of the IRS giving nearly \$100,000 to Democratic causes.

We received even more striking news, that Commissioner Koskinen tells us the IRS lost Lois Lerner's emails. Oops, sorry. The dog ate my homework.

Madam President, if you or I tried that in our IRS returns, they wouldn't accept that excuse from a citizen. We are told the hard drive crashed and the documents are irretrievable under any circumstances. We also know the IRS didn't follow the law when it failed to

report the hard drive crash that we are told occurred. But make no mistake, these emails haven't just been lost. These emails have been deleted, taped over, and the hard drive physically destroyed according to public news reports. This is Rosemary Woods, when you have Federal Government officials destroying evidence. In the ordinary parlance that is called obstruction of justice. The hard drive magically collapses, magically crashes, and is physically destroyed right after the investigation begins and, I would remind you, the investigation that has resulted in Lois Lerner pleading the Fifth twice.

We are supposed to believe that the emails from the IRS officials in charge of the division that illegally targeted political organizations and has repeatedly pleaded the Fifth to avoid incriminating herself, that her emails have simply vanished innocuously. It happens. It happens to people in the middle of illegal acts. Their records magically disappear right when the investigators are seeking to discover them.

This is an outrage. This is a scandal. This is an insult to anyone concerned about the rule of law, and no one in the Senate, regardless of political party, should stand by and accept this.

But it doesn't end there.

On Wednesday it was reported that Lois Lerner flagged a speaking invitation for Republican Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY for examination. Senator GRASSLEY is the highest ranking Republican on the Senate Judiciary Committee who has been a strong and powerful voice for accountability at the Department of Justice. It is curious that she would be so eager to subject Senator GRASSLEY for extra scrutiny based on a speaking invitation.

Right now, today, the White House is in control of Democrats. There will come a time when Democrats no longer control the White House and the administration. I would ask every Democratic Member of this body, how comfortable are you with the precedent that the IRS can single out Democratic Senators who might disagree with the President's political position? The targeting of CHUCK GRASSLEY, the singling out of CHUCK GRASSLEY, ought to trouble every single Member of this body.

On Tuesday it was reported that the IRS agreed to pay \$50,000 in damages to the National Organization for Marriage because the IRS admittedly unlawfully released confidential information of members of that group to its political opposition.

Let me repeat that. IRS officials have publicly admitted—this is not inference, this is not suggestion, this is what they have admitted—that they leaked personal tax information for the purpose of intimidating a conservative group to the political opposition of that group. That is textbook abuse of power. And I would note the \$50,000 fine—which, by the way, has been paid by U.S. taxpayers—the \$50,000 fine does nothing to address the partisan polit-

ical corruption at the IRS, the abuse of power, or the coverup. A fine does not signal the problem has been fixed.

I would note, by the way, where are the Democratic Members of this body standing and saying it is wrong for the IRS to illegally hand over personal information from individual taxpayers for partisan purposes to their political opponents?

I want to underscore that the IRS has admitted they did this and paid a \$50,000 fine and the Democratic Members of this body are apparently not troubled at all. If they are troubled, they keep their troubles very quiet and to themselves.

Americans need a guarantee that the IRS will never be used again to target an administration's political enemy.

When a Republican President, Richard Nixon, attempted to use the IRS to target his political enemies, it was wrong. It was an abuse of power, and he was rightfully condemned on both sides of the aisle. Both Democrats and Republicans stood up to President Nixon when he attempted to use the IRS to target his political enemies and said: This is wrong.

The Obama administration didn't just attempt to do so, it succeeded. It carried out a concerted effort and targeted those who were perceived to be political enemies of the President and targeted those individual citizens. The administration then put two major Democratic donors in charge of the investigation and covered up the truth, including conveniently losing emails from the central player in this figure who has twice pleaded the Fifth.

It was wrong when Richard Nixon tried to use the IRS to target his political enemies, and it was wrong when the Obama administration tried and succeeded to do the same. The difference is when Richard Nixon did so, Republicans had the courage to stand up to Members of their own party. It saddens me that there is not a single Democratic Member of this body who has had the courage to stand up to their own party and say: This abuse of power—using the IRS to target citizens for political beliefs—is wrong.

We need a special prosecutor with meaningful independence to make sure justice is served and that our constitutional rights to free speech, to assembly, and to privacy are protected.

It saddens me to say that the U.S. Department of Justice, under Attorney General Eric Holder, has become the most partisan Department of Justice in the history of our country. I say this as a former associate deputy attorney general at the U.S. Department of Justice. I can tell you there are Democratic alumni across this country who are saddened and heartbroken to see the Department of Justice becoming effectively an arm of the Democratic National Committee.

IRS officials have stonewalled at every turn, and we should not wait a single minute to put an end to the intimidation and bullying of the Amer-

ican people. These are not the actions of a government that respects its citizens. We need to restore that respect, that government officials work for the people and not the other way around.

The Department of Justice has a storied history. There is a history of attorneys general standing up to political pressure, even against the Presidents who have appointed them. Listen, political pressure in this town is nothing new and attorneys general throughout history have had a special mettle of being willing to look into the eyes of the President who appointed them and willing to say: I care more about the rule of law than any partisan allegiance I might have.

When President Richard Nixon faced charges of abusing government power for partisan ends, his attorney general Elliot Richardson, a Republican, appointed Archibald Cox as special prosecutor. Likewise, when President Bill Clinton faced charges of ethical impropriety, his attorney general Janet Reno, a Democrat, appointed Robert Fiske as independent counsel. Sadly, the current attorney general has refused to live up to that bipartisan tradition of independence, of integrity, and of fidelity to law.

I have repeatedly called on Attorney General Eric Holder to remove the investigation from the hands of a major Obama donor and put it instead in the hands of a special prosecutor with meaningful independence who, at a minimum, is not a major Democratic donor. Even the very slightest respect for the rule of law would suggest that the attorney general should not be part and parcel of the political and partisan coverup.

Therefore, in a few moments I intend to ask for unanimous consent to call up a Senate resolution expressing the opinion of the Senate that the Attorney General should appoint a special prosecutor to investigate and prosecute—if the facts support—the IRS targeting of Americans and its potential coverup of those actions.

When I asked the Attorney General whether the Department of Justice investigated the direct involvement of political appointees at the White House—up to and including the President—Attorney General Holder refused to answer that question. That is always the hardest thing for an attorney general to do: Ask the question that raises partisan peril. That is why attorneys general are supposed to be nonpartisan and owe their fidelity to the Constitution and the laws of this United States and to the American people.

The House of Representatives has passed a similar resolution to the one I am submitting. It was sponsored by Congressman JIM JORDAN of Ohio on May 7, 2014. The resolution passed in the House 250 to 168. Twenty-six Democrats voted in favor of the resolution.

Why is it that Democrats in the House of Representatives can muster up the courage to stand up to the partisan pressure from the White House.

Yet in the Senate we hear crickets chirping. This used to be the body praised for its independence and for its ability to stand up to abuse of power.

Just today the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously reversed the Obama administration for the 12th time in the last 2 years in its assertion of overbroad executive authority. This time it asserted that the President unconstitutionally attempted to circumvent the checks and balances of the Constitution by unilaterally appointing recess appointments while the Senate was not in recess.

The U.S. Supreme Court unanimously, by a vote of 9 to 0, said the President's actions were unconstitutional in that case, and once again, as with the IRS, my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle were silent. How is it there is no longer a Robert Byrd, that there is no longer a Ted Kennedy, that there are no longer any Democrats who will defend the institutional integrity of the Senate? How is it when the Supreme Court concludes unanimously that the President's intrusion on the Senate's constitutional authority is unconstitutional not a single Senate Democrat has the courage to stand up to this President? How is it in the face of a senior IRS official repeatedly pleading the Fifth, how is it in the face of the IRS admitting it wrongfully handed over private personal IRS tax data to the political opponents of a citizens group and paid a \$50,000 fine for it, how is it that not a single Democratic Senator does not have the courage to speak up? At what point does it become too much? At what point does it become embarrassing?

Constitutional law professor Jonathan Turley, whom I might note is a liberal and voted for President Obama in 2008, said that President Obama has become the embodiment of the imperial President. He described how Barack Obama has become the President Richard Nixon always wished he could be. I am sorry to say that he has done so with the active aiding and abetting of 55 Democratic Members of this Senate because when Democratic Members of this Senate or any Member of this Senate stands by and allows the President to trample on the rule of law, then any one of us who remains silent is explicit in undermining the Constitution.

This resolution should be unanimous. If the tables were turned and this were a Republican President and a Republican Attorney General had appointed a major Republican donor to lead the investigation into the wrongful targeting of Democrats and destroyed emails and hard drives and publicly admitted to leaking private citizen information to the political opponents of Democrats, the Democratic side of this Chamber would rightly be lighting their hair on fire.

If this were a Republican administration, every media outlet would have banner headlines every single day. I can assure you that at least some Re-

publican Senators would be standing up and saying this abuse of power is wrong.

This resolution should be unanimous because everyone should agree that an investigation should be beyond reproach and should not be handed over to major Democratic donors.

If the allegation—which the report of the inspector general of Treasury has already confirmed in significant respect—is of abuse of government power of the IRS to target citizens for their political beliefs, then you cannot entrust the investigation to someone who is partisan and has a political interest in protecting the party in power. If Attorney General Eric Holder continues to refuse to appoint a special prosecutor, he should be impeached.

When an attorney general refuses to enforce the rule of law, mocks the rule of law, and corrupts the Department of Justice by conducting a nakedly partisan investigation to cover up political wrongdoing, that conduct, by any reasonable measure, constitutes high crimes and misdemeanors.

Attorney General Eric Holder has the opportunity to do the right thing. He can appoint a special prosecutor with meaningful independence who is not a major Obama donor. Yet every time the Attorney General has been called on to do this, he has defiantly said no. In fact, he said in writing in his discretion, no. If Attorney General Eric Holder continues to refuse to appoint a special prosecutor to investigate the abuse of power by the IRS against the American people, he should be impeached.

I agree with President Obama when he said on the day this scandal broke, the American people have a right to be angry. If the American people had a right to be angry over a year ago when the scandal broke, the fact that it has now been covered up and the fact that a partisan investigation has refused to begin to scratch the surface of what happened should make the American people more than angry. It should move them to action. It should move them to accountability. It should move them to hold the officials of our government responsible.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 487. I further ask consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, reserving the right to object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as the chairman of the Finance Committee, which oversees the IRS, I have a question as to whether bringing in a special prosecutor would be a good use of taxpayer money in this case. I am going to spend a few minutes laying

out what is actually going on with respect to this matter.

There are already five IRS investigations that have either concluded or are ongoing. There was the original Treasury inspector general audit, in addition to ongoing investigations by four congressional committees, the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee, and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

The Senate Finance Committee, the committee I chair, has been conducting a bipartisan investigation for more than a year. I repeat: This is a bipartisan investigation. In fact, the committee's report was essentially ready to be released last week when the IRS informed us that some emails were missing because of a hard drive crash. So that colleagues understand just how bipartisan our effort has been, Senator HATCH and I have worked closely on this every step of the way since I had the honor of becoming the chair of the Finance Committee. When we heard of the hard drive problem, the two of us, a Democrat and a Republican, immediately asked the IRS Commissioner to come to my office where we asked pointed questions of Commissioner Koskinen. We didn't wait 10 days. We didn't wait a week. The two of us, a Democrat and a Republican, felt it was an important part of our committee's bipartisan inquiry, so we had Mr. Koskinen come to our office. And this has just been one example—it happens to be very recent—of the bipartisan efforts that have been made looking into this matter.

The Finance Committee staff, Democrats and Republicans, have reviewed over 700,000 pages of documents and interviewed 30 IRS employees. Those interviews were done jointly. We had Democrats and Republicans doing them together. Now, as we continue to look at how this is going to unfold, the Treasury Department Inspector General—that is Mr. Russell George—has agreed to investigate the most recent matter, and he briefed our staff just yesterday on the work plan for getting their investigation done promptly. Once the committee determines what happened with the hard drive crashes, then the committee will, again on a bipartisan basis, move forward with releasing our report—the report that was almost ready to be released when the IRS informed us that the emails were missing because of a hard drive crash and when Senator HATCH and I together brought Mr. Koskinen immediately to my office.

I heard my colleague say that things would be different if this were a Republican administration. Well, I want it understood—I want every Senator to understand this. Senator HATCH and I would be doing exactly what we are doing now, with the same diligence, if it was a Republican administration. That, in my view, is the bottom line, because that is what bipartisanship is

all about. That is the way an important inquiry ought to be handled.

There is nothing of value that a special prosecutor would bring to the table, and it certainly would involve significant cost to American taxpayers. In fact, many of us can remember special prosecutors abusing their power, spending millions of dollars of taxpayer money, and going on for years and years without concluding their investigations. Too often, special prosecutors have turned into lawyers' full employment programs. They ought to be reserved for when there is evidence of criminal wrongdoing inside the government. It would be premature to appoint a special prosecutor with the bipartisan Finance Committee report almost finished.

I will just close by saying I am a pretty bipartisan fellow. In fact, sometimes I get a fair amount of criticism for being too bipartisan. I want it understood this is a bipartisan inquiry that is being done by the book. Senator HATCH and I are looking at these matters together. We talk about it frequently. Those witnesses were interviewed together. We brought Mr. Koskinen in immediately. My view is that it would be premature to appoint a special prosecutor with the bipartisan Finance Committee report almost finished.

If we look at this in terms of what is at issue now, we can bring the facts to light with our own investigators and our own bipartisan inquiry and avoid the special prosecutor disasters of the past.

I object to the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I thank my friend from Oregon for his impassioned comments. I would note for the RECORD a few things he did not say. My friend from Oregon chose not to say a word about the fact that Lois Lerner, a senior IRS official, has twice pleaded the Fifth in front of the House of Representatives. To that he had not a single response.

My friend from Oregon chose to say not a word to the fact that the IRS singled out Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY for special scrutiny. To that, he said not a word.

My friend from Oregon chose to say not a word to the fact that the IRS has now admitted to illegally handing over private personal information from a citizen group to its political opponents for partisan political purposes, and has paid a \$50,000 fine. That is not an allegation. That is not a theory. That is what the IRS has admitted to and paid a \$50,000 fine for with taxpayer funds. Yet I am sorry to say my friend from Oregon had not a word to say about that abuse of power.

I mentioned before that from the Democratic Members of this Chamber, when it comes to the abuse of power by the Obama administration, there are crickets chirping.

Now, I am pleased that my friend from Oregon and the Finance Committee has engaged in an investigation of what occurred. We don't know what that investigation will conclude. But I find it interesting that he said it is premature for a special prosecutor. Fourteen months ago was when President Obama said: I am angry and the American people have a right to be angry—14 months ago. Fourteen months and not a single person has been indicted. Fourteen months and most of the victims haven't been interviewed. Fourteen months they have publicly announced they don't intend to indict anyone. Yet, it is premature. If the American people had a right to be angry 14 months ago, which is what President Obama told us, what should we feel 14 months later after partisan stonewalling and obstruction of justice? The American people had a right to be angry.

I would note a Senate committee is conducting an investigation and will issue a report, but the Senate committee can't indict anyone. The Senate committee can't prosecute anyone. My friend from Oregon says it is premature to have a special prosecutor because, apparently, holding people who break the laws, who commit criminal conduct to abuse IRS power to target individual citizens based on their political views—apparently, holding them accountable—is not a priority for a single Democratic member of this Chamber. That saddens me.

It saddens me that we don't have 100 Senators in this room saying, regardless of what party we are in, it is an embarrassment to have this "investigation"—and I put that word in quotes, because a real investigation involves interviewing the victims; a real investigation involves following the evidence where it leads. I would note my friend from Oregon, in describing the Senate committee's investigation, mentioned that they interviewed some IRS employees, but notably absent from whom he said they interviewed was anyone at the White House, anyone political. Apparently, they were not interviewed. We don't know. But he didn't mention them if they were.

It is an embarrassment that this so-called investigation is led by a partisan Democratic donor who has given over \$6,000 to President Obama and Democrats. It is an embarrassment that the IRS obstruction of justice is led by a major Democratic donor who has given nearly \$100,000. Every one of us takes an oath to the Constitution. Every one of us owes fidelity to rule of law. When we have the Department of Justice behaving like an arm of the DNC, protecting the political interests of the White House instead of upholding the law, it undermines the liberty of every American. I am saddened that Democratic Members of this Chamber will not stand up and say: I have a higher obligation to the Constitution and the rule of law and the American people than I have to my Democratic Party. That is a sad state of affairs, but it is also a state of affairs that is outraging the American people, that is waking up the American people.

President Obama had it right when he said 14 months ago the American

people are right to be angry about this. He was correct. And when elected officials, when appointed officials of the Obama administration mock the rule of law, demonstrate contempt for Congress, and abuse their power against the individual citizenry, against we the people, the people have a natural and immediate remedy that is available in November every 2 years. This November, I am confident the American people will follow the President's advice and demonstrate that they are angry about the abuse of power and even angrier about the partisan coverup in which all 55 Democratic Senators have actively aided and abetted.

If Attorney General Eric Holder is unwilling to appoint a special prosecutor, if he insists on keeping this prosecution in the control of a major Obama donor, then Attorney General Eric Holder should be impeached, because the rule of law matters more than any partisan political problem.

Thank you, Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, first of all, let me thank the Senator from Texas for raising this issue of the IRS. I have commented over the last few days that if this was, in fact, a Republican administration that had been engaged in this issue, this would have led every newscast in America. It would have been leading every newscast in America for the last week. It would have been compared to Watergate. Instead, what we have seen is the American news media, by and large, has largely ignored it.

One of the commentators last night on television added up all the minutes they dedicated to a soccer player who bit some other competitor compared to the amount of time they have dedicated to the fact that one of the most powerful agencies of the U.S. Government not just destroyed records, potentially—but even now we have been given news they tried to target a U.S. Senator for an internal audit—and the soccer player won. He got a lot more attention. There was a lot more news coverage paid to the guy who bit somebody than to the issue of the IRS.

So I thank the Senator from Texas for raising it here today before we head to our respective States for the Fourth of July because it is an issue that deserves our attention.

WORLD CUP SOCCER

Mr. RUBIO. There is another issue that deserves our attention. By the way, on the subject of soccer, since I am on it, I will confess I am not an expert on soccer, nor have I, frankly, historically been an enormous fan. To me football means you wear a helmet and some shoulder pads and you run into