

S. 2770

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2770, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require providers of a covered service to provide call location information concerning the telecommunications device of a user of such service to an investigative or law enforcement officer in an emergency situation involving risk of death or serious physical injury or in order to respond to the user's call for emergency services.

AMENDMENT NO. 3286

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3286 intended to be proposed to S. 2012, an original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3490

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3490 proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3548

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3548 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3557

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3557 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3563

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3563 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3568

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3568 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3591

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3591 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3624

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3624 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3654

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3654 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3657

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3657 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3683

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3683 intended to be proposed to H.R. 636, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 2796. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws relating to Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I rise to introduce a bill to begin to address the list of historic wrongs against Native American citizens brought by the early U.S. Government.

The idea that these laws were ever considered is disturbing, but the fact that these laws remain on our books is, at best, an oversight. Currently, Native Americans who are U.S. citizens just like you and me are still legally subject to a series of obsolete, historically wrong statutes. These statutes are a sad reminder of the hostile aggression and overt racism that the Federal Government exhibited toward Native Americans as the government attempted to assimilate them into what was considered modern society.

In 2016, laws still exist that would allow for the forced removal of their children, who can be sent to boarding

schools, and they can be denied rations if they refuse. They can still be subject to forced labor on their reservations as a condition of their receipt of supplies. Moreover, they can be denied funding if found drunk on a reservation.

These statutes actually remain on the books of the land and, in many cases, are more than a century old and continue the stigma of subjugation and paternalism from that time period. It is without question that they should be stricken.

We cannot adequately repair history, but we can move forward. Because of this, today I am introducing the RESPECT Act or the Repealing Existing Substandard Provisions Encouraging Conciliation with Tribes Act.

I wish to list some of the 12 existing laws that the RESPECT Act will repeal. In Chapter 25 of the United States Code, section 302, entitled "Education of Indians, Indian Reform School; rules and regulations; consent of parents to placing youth in reform school," the Commissioner of Indian Affairs was directed to place Indian youth in Indian reform schools without the consent of their parents.

The issue of off-reservation Indian boarding schools, in particular, is a rightfully sensitive one for our Native Americans. Between 1879 and into the 20th century, at least 830,000 Indian children were taken to boarding schools to allegedly "civilize them." Many parents were threatened with surrendering their children or their food rations. This law, in fact, is also still on the books.

A requirement exists in section 283, entitled "Regulations for withholding rations for nonattendance at schools," that the Secretary of the Interior could "prevent the issuing of rations or the furnishing of subsistence to the head of any Indian family for or on account of any Indian child or children between the ages of eight and twenty-one years who shall not have attended school in the preceding year in accordance with such regulations."

Yet there still exist other outdated laws relating to wartime status between Indians and the United States, such as those found in section 72 of the Code, entitled "Abrogation of treaties." Here the President was authorized to declare all treaties with such tribes "abrogated if in his opinion any Indian tribe is in actual hostility to the United States."

In section 127, entitled "Moneys or annuities of hostile Indians," moneys or annuities stipulated by any treaty with an Indian tribe could be stopped if the tribe "has engaged in hostilities against the United States, or against its citizens peacefully or lawfully sojourning or traveling within its jurisdiction at the time of such hostilities."

Likewise, in section 128, entitled "Appropriations not paid to Indians at war with United States," none of the appropriations made for the Indian Service could "be paid to any band of Indians or any portion of any band

while at war with the United States or with the white citizens of any of the States or Territories.”

Moreover, in section 138, entitled “Goods withheld from chiefs violating treaty stipulations,” delivery of goods or merchandise could be denied to the chiefs of any tribe by authority of any treaty “if such chiefs” had “violated the stipulations contained in such treaty.”

Finally, in section 129, entitled “Moneys due Indians holding captives other than Indians withheld,” the Secretary of the Interior was “authorized to withhold, from any tribe of Indians who may hold any captives other than Indians, any moneys due them from the United States until said captives shall be surrendered to the lawful authorities of the United States.”

In section 130, entitled “Withholding of moneys or goods on account of intoxicating liquors,” racist identifications tying drunkenness by Indians to receipt of funds still exist, stipulating that no “annuities, or moneys, or goods” could “be paid or distributed to Indians while they” were—and, once again, I will quote—“under the influence of any description of intoxicating liquor, nor while there are good and sufficient reasons leading the officers or agents, whose duty it may be to make such payments or distribution, to believe that there is any species of intoxicating liquor within convenient reach.”

Mandatory work on reservations still exists in section 137, entitled “Supplies distributed to able-bodied males on condition.” Once again, I will quote from the text: “For the purpose of inducing Indians to labor and become self-supporting, it is provided that, in distributing the supplies and annuities to the Indians for whom the same are appropriated, the agent distributing the same could require all able-bodied male Indians between the ages of eighteen and forty-five to perform service upon the reservation, for the benefit of themselves or of the tribe” in return for supplies.

Let me summarize what I said in the beginning. In the year 2016 in the United States, Native Americans—citizens like you and me—are still legally subject to outrageous, racist, and outdated laws that were wrong at their inception. There is no place in our legal code for such laws.

In my home State of South Dakota, which is home to 9 tribes and roughly 75,000 enrolled members, we strive to work together to constantly improve relationships and to mend our history through reconciliation and mutual respect. It is not always easy, but with our futures tied together, with our children in mind, reconciliation is something we are committed to.

History also proves that since the onset of the government’s relationship with the tribes, it has been complicated and challenging over the years, sometimes downright dark and disrespectful, and to this day often has

led to mistreatment by the Federal Government.

As Governor of South Dakota, I proclaimed 2010 the Year of Unity in South Dakota. This was done in recognition of the need to continue building upon the legacy and work of those who came before us. The year 2010 also marked the 20th anniversary of the Year of Reconciliation in South Dakota, which was an effort by the late Governor George Mickelson as a way to bring all races together. The Year of Unity and the Year of Reconciliation were efforts to build upon a common purpose, acknowledge our differences, and yet find ways to work together. I suspect we could use a lot more of that in Washington, DC.

While legislative bodies before us have taken steps to rectify our previous failures relative to Native Americans, sadly, these laws remain, and out of a sense of justice, I believe we should repeal them. Imagine a scenario where descendants of those from Norway, Britain, Italy, or any other country for that matter, were treated with the same patronizing air of superiority. Only Native Americans face this discrimination, and it is long overdue to repeal these noxious laws.

I would take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and to put an end to this blatant discrimination against Native Americans. We can’t change our history, but we can start to change the paternalistic mentality of the Federal Government toward the Native people.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 419—CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA MEN’S HOCKEY TEAM FOR WINNING THE 2016 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION I MEN’S HOCKEY CHAMPIONSHIP

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

S. RES. 419

Whereas the University of North Dakota (referred to in this preamble as “UND”) men’s hockey team won the 2016 National Collegiate Athletic Association (referred to in this preamble as the “NCAA”) division I men’s hockey championship game in Tampa Bay, Florida, on April 9, 2016, in a hard-fought victory over the Quinnipiac University Bobcats of Connecticut by a score of 5 to 1;

Whereas the UND men’s hockey team had an incredible 2015–16 season, during which Coach Brad Berry became the first head coach to win an NCAA division I men’s hockey national championship in an individual’s first season as head coach;

Whereas the UND men’s hockey team won its eighth NCAA division I men’s hockey championship and ended the 2015–16 season with a 34–6–4 record;

Whereas Coach Brad Berry and the coaching staff have instilled character and perseverance in the UND men’s hockey team play-

ers and have done an outstanding job coaching the UND men’s hockey program;

Whereas under the leadership of Interim President Ed Schafer and Athletic Director Brian Faison, academic and athletic excellence has been promoted at UND;

Whereas thousands of UND fans attended the NCAA division I men’s hockey championship game, reflecting the tremendous fan base of UND, which showcases the spirit and dedication of UND hockey fans and has helped to propel the success of the UND men’s hockey team; and

Whereas the UND men’s hockey team’s victory in the 2016 NCAA division I men’s hockey championship was also a victory for the entire State of North Dakota: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the University of North Dakota men’s hockey team, the 2016 National Collegiate Athletic Association division I men’s hockey champions;

(2) commends the players, coaches, and staff of the University of North Dakota men’s hockey team for their hard work and dedication; and

(3) recognizes the students, alumni, and loyal fans for supporting the University of North Dakota men’s hockey team on a successful quest to capture another National Collegiate Athletic Association division I men’s hockey championship trophy for the University of North Dakota.

SENATE RESOLUTION 420—CONGRATULATING THE 2016 NATIONAL CHAMPION AUGUSTANA VIKINGS FOR THEIR WIN IN THE 2016 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II MEN’S BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT

Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 420

Whereas, on March 26, 2016, the Augustana University Vikings defeated the Lincoln Memorial University Railsplitters 90 to 81 in the championship game of the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men’s Basketball Tournament in Frisco, Texas;

Whereas this is the first national title for the Augustana Vikings basketball program and the third national title overall for the school;

Whereas Augustana senior student athletes Daniel Jansen and Casey Schilling have been named 2 of 13 finalists for the Bevo Francis Award, which honors the player who had the best overall season within Small College Basketball;

Whereas the Augustana coach, Tom Billeter, was named Coach of the Year by the National Association of Basketball Coaches;

Whereas, during the 2015–2016 season, the Augustana Vikings finished with a record of 34–2; and

Whereas the presence of 3 seniors and 4 juniors on the roster of the Augustana Vikings represents the commitment of those students to the university and the work of Augustana University to enshrine the ideal of the student athlete into the ethos of the university: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the Augustana University men’s basketball team and its loyal fans on the performance of the team in the 2016 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II Men’s Basketball Tournament; and