

(2) **LAW ENFORCEMENT AUTHORITY.**—With respect to violations of sections 3271 and 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), the Attorney General may authorize any person serving in a law enforcement position in any other department or agency of the Federal Government, including a member of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State or a military police officer of the Armed Forces, to exercise investigative and law enforcement authority, including those powers that may be exercised under section 3052 of title 18, United States Code, subject to such guidelines or policies as the Attorney General considers appropriate for the exercise of such powers.

(3) **PROSECUTION.**—The Attorney General may establish such procedures the Attorney General considers appropriate to ensure that Federal law enforcement agencies refer offenses under section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), to the Attorney General for prosecution in a uniform and timely manner.

(4) **ASSISTANCE ON REQUEST OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any statute, rule, or regulation to the contrary, the Attorney General may request assistance from the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, or the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to enforce section 3271 or 3272 of title 18, United States Code (as so amended). The assistance requested may include the following:

(A) The assignment of additional employees and resources to task forces established by the Attorney General under subsection (a).

(B) An investigation into alleged misconduct or arrest of an individual suspected of alleged misconduct by agents of the Diplomatic Security Service of the Department of State present in the nation in which the alleged misconduct occurs.

(5) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter for 5 years, the Attorney General shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, submit to Congress a report containing the following:

(A) The number of prosecutions under chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), including the nature of the offenses and any dispositions reached, during the previous year.

(B) The actions taken to implement subsection (a), including the organization and training of employees and the use of task forces, during the previous year.

(C) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the President considers appropriate to enforce chapter 212A of title 18, United States Code (as amended by section 2(a) of this Act), and the provisions of this section.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “agency” and “department” have the meanings given such terms in section 6 of title 18, United States Code.

(d) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit any authority of the Attorney General or any Federal law enforcement agency to investigate violations of Federal law or deploy employees overseas.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

(a) **IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVENESS.**—This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—The Attorney General and the head of any other department or agency of the Federal Government to which

this Act or an amendment made by this Act applies shall have 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act to ensure compliance with this Act and the amendments made by this Act.

SEC. 5. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or affect the application of extraterritorial jurisdiction related to any other Federal law; or

(2) to limit or affect any authority or responsibility of a Chief of Mission as provided in section 207 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. 3927).

(b) **INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.**—Nothing in this Act or any amendment made by this Act shall apply to the authorized intelligence activities of the United States Government.

SEC. 6. FUNDING.

If any amounts are appropriated to carry out this Act or an amendment made by this Act, the amounts shall be from amounts which would have otherwise been made available or appropriated to the Department of Justice.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—URGING ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS AGAINST THE DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. GARDNER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 180

Whereas the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) tested nuclear weapons on three separate occasions, in October 2006, in May 2009, and in February 2013;

Whereas nuclear experts have reported that the DPRK may currently have as many as 20 nuclear warheads and has the potential to possess as many as 100 warheads within the next 5 years;

Whereas, according to the 2014 Department of Defense (DoD) report, “Military and Security Developments Involving the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea”, the DPRK has proliferated nuclear technology to Libya via the proliferation network of Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea also provided Syria with nuclear reactor technology until 2007.”;

Whereas, on September 6, 2007, as part of “Operation Orchard”, the Israeli Air Force destroyed the suspected nuclear facility in Syria;

Whereas, according to the 2014 DoD report, “North Korea has exported conventional and ballistic missile-related equipment, components, materials, and technical assistance to countries in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East.”;

Whereas, on November 29, 1987, DPRK agents planted explosive devices onboard Korean Air flight 858, which killed all 115 passengers and crew on board;

Whereas, on March 26, 2010, the DPRK fired upon and sank the South Korean warship Cheonan, killing 46 of her crew;

Whereas, on November 23, 2010, the DPRK shelled South Korea’s Yeonpyeong Island, killing 4 South Korean citizens;

Whereas, on February 7, 2014, the United Nations “Commission of Inquiry on human rights in DPRK (‘Commission of Inquiry’)” released a report detailing the atrocious human rights record of the DPRK;

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby, Chair of the Commission, stated on March 17, 2014, “The Commission of Inquiry has found systematic, widespread, and grave human rights violations occurring in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea. It has also found a disturbing array of crimes against humanity. These crimes are committed against inmates of political and other prison camps; against starving populations; against religious believers; against persons who try to flee the country—including those forcibly repatriated by China.”;

Whereas Dr. Michael Kirby also stated, “These crimes arise from policies established at the highest level of the State. They have been committed, and continue to take place in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, because the policies, institutions, and patterns of impunity that lie at their heart remain in place. The gravity, scale, duration, and nature of the unspeakable atrocities committed in the country reveal a totalitarian State that does not have any parallel in the contemporary world.”;

Whereas the Commission of Inquiry also notes, “Since 1950, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea has engaged in the systematic abduction, denial of repatriation, and subsequent enforced disappearance of persons from other countries on a large scale and as a matter of State policy. Well over 200,000 persons, including children, who were brought from other countries to the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea may have become victims of enforced disappearance,” and states that the DPRK has failed to account or address this injustice in any way;

Whereas, according to reports and analysis from organizations such as the International Network for the Human Rights of North Korean Overseas Labor, the Korea Policy Research Center, NK Watch, the Asan Institute for Policy Studies, the Center for International and Strategic Studies (CSIS), and the George W. Bush Institute, there may currently be as many as 100,000 North Korean overseas laborers in various nations around the world;

Whereas these forced North Korean laborers are often subjected to harsh working conditions under the direct supervision of DPRK officials, and their salaries contribute to anywhere from \$150,000,000 to \$230,000,000 a year to the DPRK state coffers;

Whereas, according to the Director of National Intelligence’s (DNI) 2015 Worldwide Threat Assessment, “North Korea’s nuclear weapons and missile programs pose a serious threat to the United States and to the security environment in East Asia.”;

Whereas the 2015 DNI report states, “North Korea has also expanded the size and sophistication of its ballistic missile forces, ranging from close-range ballistic missiles to ICBMs, while continuing to conduct test launches. In 2014, North Korea launched an unprecedented number of ballistic missiles.”;

Whereas, on December 19, 2015, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) declared that the DPRK was responsible for a cyberattack on Sony Pictures conducted on November 24, 2014;

Whereas, from 1998 to 2008, the DPRK was designated by the United States Government as a state sponsor of terrorism;

Whereas the DPRK is currently in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1695 (2006), 1718 (2006), 1874 (2009), 2087 (2013), and 2094 (2013);

Whereas the DPRK repeatedly violated agreements with the United States and the other so-called Six-Party Talks partners (the Republic of Korea, Japan, the Russian Federation, and the People’s Republic of China) designed to halt its nuclear weapons program, while receiving significant concessions, including fuel, oil, and food aid;

Whereas the Six Party talks have not been held since December 2008; and

Whereas, on May 9, 2015, the DPRK claimed that it has test-fired a ballistic missile from a submarine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) finds that the DPRK represents a serious threat to the national security of the United States and United States allies in East Asia and to international peace and stability, and grossly violates the human rights of its own people;

(2) urges the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury to impose additional sanctions against the DPRK, including targeting its financial assets around the world, specific designations relating to human rights abuses, and a redesignation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terror; and

(3) warns the President against resuming the negotiations with the DPRK, either bilaterally or as part of the Six Party talks, without strict pre-conditions, including that the DPRK—

(A) adhere to its denuclearization commitments outlined in the 2005 Joint Statement of the Six-Party talks;

(B) commit to halting its ballistic missile programs and its proliferation activities;

(C) cease military provocations; and

(D) measurably and significantly improve its human rights record.

SENATE RESOLUTION 181—DESIGNATING MAY 19, 2015, AS “NATIONAL SCHIZENCEPHALY AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Ms. HEITKAMP) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 181

Whereas schizencephaly is an extremely rare developmental birth defect characterized by abnormal slits, or clefts, in the brain;

Whereas individuals with bilateral schizencephaly, the more severe case, commonly have developmental delays, delays in speech and language skills, problems with brain-spinal cord communication, limited mobility, and shorter lifespans;

Whereas schizencephaly is the second rarest brain malformation, and only approximately 7,000 cases have ever been reported;

Whereas promoting education and increasing awareness among health professionals and families will lead to early intervention and treatment options for individuals with schizencephaly; and

Whereas continued Federal support for medical research will help identify causes, improve diagnostics, and develop promising treatments for schizencephaly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates May 19, 2015, as “National Schizencephaly Awareness Day”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 182—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT DEFENSE LABORATORIES HAVE BEEN, AND CONTINUE TO BE, ON THE CUTTING EDGE OF SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT AND SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 14, 2015, AS THE “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE LABORATORY DAY”

Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL,

Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 182

Whereas a Defense laboratory is defined as any laboratory, Department of Defense-funded research and development center, or engineering center that is owned by a military service and funded by the Federal Government;

Whereas Defense laboratories should be commended for the unique role the laboratories have played in numerous innovations and advances in the areas of defense and national security;

Whereas technological progress is responsible for up to half the growth of the United States economy and is the principal driving force behind long-term economic growth and increases in the standard of living in the United States;

Whereas defense-supported research and development has led to new products and processes for state-of-the-art military weapons and technology, as well as for the public good;

Whereas Defense laboratories frequently partner with State and local governments and regional organizations to transfer technology to the private sector;

Whereas Defense laboratories are at the forefront of cutting-edge science and technology, earning prestigious national and international awards for research and technology transfer efforts;

Whereas the innovations produced at the Defense laboratories of the United States fuel economic growth by creating new industries, companies, and jobs;

Whereas the work of the Defense laboratories is essential to the continued prosperity of the United States; and

Whereas May 14, 2015, would be an appropriate day to designate as the “Department of Defense Laboratory Day”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 14, 2015, as the “Department of Defense Laboratory Day” in recognition of the work and accomplishments of the national network of Defense laboratories;

(2) recognizes that supporting research and development, including federally sponsored work performed at the Defense laboratories, is key to maintaining United States innovation and competitiveness in a global economy;

(3) acknowledges that the knowledge base, technologies, and techniques generated in the Defense laboratory system serve as a foundation for the defense industrial base;

(4) reaffirms the importance of robust investment in Defense laboratories to preserving the technological superiority of the Armed Forces in the 21st century; and

(5) encourages the Defense laboratories, the executive branch agencies, and Congress to hold an outreach event on May 14, 2015, “Department of Defense Laboratory Day”, to raise public awareness of the work of the Defense laboratories.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1366. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1367. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1368. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1369. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1370. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1371. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1372. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1373. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1374. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1375. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1376. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1377. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1378. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1379. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1380. Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1381. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1382. Ms. STABENOW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1383. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1384. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. INHOFE)) submitted an amendment intended