United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 160 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 17, 2014 No. 112

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, hear and answer our prayers from Your holy hills. We sleep each night in peace, sustained by Your grace and mercy. Arise, O Lord, and use our lawmakers to fulfill Your purposes. Empower them to make the rough places smooth and the crooked places straight. Give them the wisdom to commune with You throughout the day, leaning confidently upon You for wisdom and striving to be responsible stewards of their calling. Keep them from becoming impatient when anything or anyone causes them to wait.

Lift the light of Your countenance upon us all.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, the Bring Jobs Home Act.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 453, S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

SCHEDULE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, following my remarks and those of the Republican leader, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. 2244—an extremely important piece of legislation. There will be 30 minutes for debate on the Coburn amendment, 20 minutes on the Vitter amendment, 10 minutes on the Flake amendment, and 30 minutes on the Tester amendment. Any remaining time until 12 noon will be for general debate on this legislation.

At 12 noon the Senate will proceed to a series of up to five rollcall votes. Rollcall votes are expected in relation to the Coburn and Flake amendments; however, we expect voice votes on the Vitter and Tester amendments. Upon disposition of the amendments, the Senate will proceed to a rollcall vote on passage of S. 2244, as amended.

We expect to reach an agreement to vote at 2 p.m. on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 849, the nomination of Julie Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit. Senators will be notified when an agreement is reached.

(Mr. WALSH assumed the Chair.)

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. President, the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, who just opened the Senate, has been for many, many years the chair of the foreign operations subcommittee on appropriations. He is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. I wanted to note that while he is on the floor.

Over the past 2 weeks poker players have flocked to Las Vegas because there is an annual World Series of Poker there. It is on ESPN. I do not know how athletic it is, but it is on ESPN, and it draws a lot of attention. Poker is a very important and popular game now—a game of chance, and this tournament—the World Series of Poker—is the most prestigious high-stakes tournament in the world, and 2,400 or 2,500 miles away from Las Vegas, here in Washington, DC, some Senate Republicans are playing a high-stakes game of their own with a humanitarian crisis. But instead of poker chips, they are using kids, children.

Last night the junior Senator from Texas upped the ante and announced that any legislation to address the humanitarian crisis in the Rio Grande Valley must also include a termination of President Obama's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. In other words, before Republicans help our Border Patrol agents and all the other personnel who are trying to do something to handle this humanitarian crisis, they want President Obama to deport the DREAMers who are already here. They are legitimately here. These are children. But instead of considering a thoughtful, compassionate solution to a real-life crisis on our border, radical Republicans are trying to hold these kids ransom.

I have heard Senator DURBIN speak here on the floor. He visited one of these centers in Chicago on Monday. There are mothers with little babies there who have been brought, as the law requires, to Chicago to try to unite them with their families.

We have, as we learned last night in a Senators briefing, more than 50,000 of these children who have arrived at the border, and we have to do something to address that. The people who are required by law to take care of these children—some of whom are babies—do not have the resources to do it.

These are not children sneaking over the border. They come to the people in uniform and say: Here we are. We have an obligation by law to do something about it. But it takes a lot of money to take care of this. We cannot do it unless we get added resources, and what the junior Senator from Texas said is that we are not going to do this unless we deport all these children who came here before—the so-called DREAMers.

Once again, we see there are no substantive solutions being offered by today's Republican Party. Instead of

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

doing something about these children who are at the border, they want to deport hundreds of thousands of these people who are already here.

President Obama's deferred action plan, which is widely popular in the country because it is the right thing to do—and, obviously, Republicans want to get rid of it—what this is all about, his deferred action plan, is about keeping families together in America. It grants immigration officials discretion in considering the cases of children who have lived most of their lives as Americans, even though they were brought here illegally.

Let me give you an example of a young woman from Las Vegas. Her name is Astrid Silva. Astrid came to the United States as a little, tiny girl in a boat across the Rio Grande. Her mother was with her. She was in her—I want to get this right—she was in her dress, confirmation dress or whatever it was. She was just a tiny, little girl. She had her rosary beads and a little doll, and she floated across the river.

She knows no other country than the United States of America. Now, because of what happened, because of the President's action, she can now fly in an airplane. She has done that. She is working on getting her education completed—a wonderful, wonderful, involved woman in what is going on in Nevada. And the junior Senator from Texas wants to send her back to a place she does not know—Mexico? Mr. President, Astrid Silva is an American. It is the only country she knows. It would be cruel and unusual to do what the junior Senator from Texas wants done.

The deferred action plan is a positive step forward, and we should not go back, especially not as a ransom for helping our border personnel to care for desperate children.

I would hope my friend, the Republican leader, can rein in these extreme elements of his caucus so we can achieve a real solution, one worthy of the ideals upon which this Nation was founded.

These children are real—they are little kids—real human beings. They should not be used as pawns in the Republicans' high-stakes game of chicken with President Obama.

AMBASSADORIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, when I first came to the House of Representatives, I had the good fortune of serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee. It was wonderful. I served under Chairman Zablocki from Wisconsin, Chairman Fascell from Florida. It was a wonderful experience to get a view of what was going on in the world, and I enjoyed it very, very much.

But I learned there—and I think we all know; maybe I should have learned it sooner—our national security depends on the qualified men and women who serve as our ambassadors throughout the world.

When I travel overseas, I always make sure I get the staff at these embassies together and tell them how much I appreciate what they do for our country. They are not all ambassadors, of course. There is one per country—we hope.

To apply to be a Foreign Service officer is hard. You have to have really, really good grades. You have to pass a written examination after having graduated from college and maybe with graduate work. Some of them are Ph.D.s. And then, after you pass a written test, you have to pass an oral test. It is very, very difficult.

These are some of the best and brightest in the world, and their ultimate goal—as we had the All-Star Game on Tuesday—is to be an all-star, to be able to play—as they did on Tuesday in Major League Baseball—in the ''all-star game.'' Well, that is what ambassadors are; they are the all stars of the diplomatic corps of this country. Right now, these ambassadors are on the front lines. They are fighting to defend our interests abroad—our security interests, our national interests, and our economic interests. Right now there are gaping holes in our Nation's front lines.

Let's look at who ambassadors really are. Here in the Senate, I had the good fortune to serve with one of the really distinguished ambassadors, Daniel Patrick Moynihan from New York. Prior to coming to the Senate, he was our Ambassador to India. He left his mark on that country. He did a remarkably good job as Ambassador from the United States to India.

The Republican leader and I attended a funeral a week or so ago in Tennessee. The funeral was for Howard Baker, who had been the majority leader in the Senate—a fine man. He married another Senator from Kansas, Nancy Kassebaum. He became, after retiring from the Senate, our Ambassador to Japan. He distinguished himself there again with the remarkably good job he did.

We can go back and look at the beginning of the history of this country. What do we always learn about Thomas Jefferson? We know how smart he was, how he wrote brilliantly. But we also learned in every history lesson about Thomas Jefferson, that he was our Ambassador to France. John Adams was our Ambassador to England. They have set the standard for how important ambassadors are.

Here in the Senate Republicans are stalling ambassadors. Twenty-five percent of all the ambassadorships to the continent of Africa—unfilled. There are gaping holes in our Nation's front lines. Approximately 30 ambassadors are waiting to be confirmed—and waiting and waiting and waiting.

Senate Republicans, who have been so quick to accuse this administration of poor leadership on world issues, are obstructing the confirmation of ambassadors who are desperately needed at embassies all around the world. Republicans are abdicating the Senate's constitutional role to confirm ambassadors.

In previous years ambassadors were just approved so quickly. Once in a while something controversial would come up, but it was once in a great while. As I said, a quarter of U.S. Embassies in Africa do not have an ambassador. We do not have an ambassador in Bosnia. We do not have an ambassador in Vietnam—on and on. Can't we all agree that it is important that American interests be represented in these places? The answer: We cannot agree. The Republicans do not want these ambassadorships filled.

When can these people who want to play in the ''all-star game'' be able to play in the ''all-star game'' and represent the interests of this country? They work in careers that are very difficult. They do not start out as ambassadors. Rarely does that happen.

Each day that goes by more ambassadorships are unfilled. All the ambassador nominees were passed out of committee unanimously. With rare exception they are noncontroversial. I am talking about career ambassadors. These are not political appointees. I am talking about career ambassadors.

What does that mean when I say career ambassadors, career diplomats? These are good men and women who have worked for decades for the U.S. State Department. In most cases these diplomats started working at the lowest levels, processing visa applications, asylum requests, and then became an economic officer, a political officer. By working hard and requiring the necessary expertise, these career diplomats have readied themselves to be ambassadors. It is hard.

Career diplomats do not represent political parties, they represent our country. These long-time professionals have worked for both Democrats and Republicans. They worked for several different administrations. It does not matter, if someone is a Foreign Service officer, whether the President is a Democrat or Republican, they do their job for the country.

Now these professionals are needed to fill vital ambassadorial posts in some of the most volatile regions in the world. Republicans have slammed the brakes on these nominations. At the very least the Senate should confirm these noncontroversial career diplomats. If they want to play games with the political appointees, they can do that, but these career diplomats are not political appointees. They are qualified diplomats who have performed admirably for the State Department for a long time. We need their experience, we need their expertise at embassies all over the world.

Some Senate observers say Republicans are stalling these nominations as a payback for rules changes instituted by the Senate. Let's see if I can try to figure this one out. Republicans are stalling Executive nominees vital to our national interests to get back at Democrats, to get back at me. How is

that? Stalling these nominees is jeopardizing America's interests abroad. It is damaging our Nation's role in global affairs. It is damaging our national security. Is this conjured-up political retribution worth harming the United States? Of course not.

There was a New York Times article within the last 48 hours where Secretary of State John Kerry said: I have 52 important State Department officials who are waiting to be confirmed in the Senate—52. I was stunned to read in that same article a quote from the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee over here, the junior Senator from Tennessee.

Here is what he said: ''Rather than filling vacant embassies to alleviate the national security concerns raised by Secretary Kerry and others, the majority leader— Listen to this one.

—who controls the Senate floor—has chosen to spend this week on a sportsman's bill and previous weeks confirming judges.

Why criticize me for bringing up the sportsmen's bill? This bill was sponsored by a majority of the Republicans. Twenty-six Republicans cosponsored that legislation. The junior Senator from Tennessee is complaining that I brought that up. I guess he is also complaining that I brought up raising the minimum wage, which the Republicans filibustered. Maybe he is also complaining that we have student debt in this country—about $1.3 trillion—and we brought that up to alleviate the pain to families in America with student debt.

Maybe he is complaining because we brought up on the Senate floor something extremely important; that is, that if a woman does the same work as a man, she should get paid the same amount of money—not different work, the same work. She should get the same money. I guess he is complaining because we brought up something that addresses the needs that Americans have; that is, the Hobby Lobby decision from the Supreme Court. We think that is wrong. Women in America, families in America, with some exception, believe that is wrong.

So I agree with the junior Senator from Tennessee. There is an urgent need to fill these diplomatic posts as soon as possible, but for heaven's sake, how could he complain about the substantive legislation which is so important to America that I have just run through?

Then he complains about judges, we are confirming judges. I have been here a while in the Senate. Until Obama became President, with some exception, these nominations went through on unanimous consent. We were not holding up ambassadors. There would be a spat on a judge here and there but not holding up all of the judges. The reason it is taking so long is we have, under the rules of the Senate, what we call postcloture time. That time was originally set up so after we got on a piece of legislation or on a nomination, we could think about it for a little bit. They think about it a lot and do nothing.

Thirty hours on a lot of nominations postcloture, 8 hours on others, judges only 2 hours. We have been able to go through a lot of judges because of that rule change that we made. I thought it was an urgent need 4 months ago when I came to the Senate floor to talk about the growing logjam of our ambassadorial corps around the country. But Senator CORKER's reasoning that these ambassadorial confirmations were delayed unnecessarily by legislation and judicial confirmations is a little weird, a little strange. It is strange and weird for a number of reasons.

I take issue with the notion that the Senate somehow wasted time by legislating and confirming judicial nominees. These are our constitutional duties. We are going to confirm, in the next few days, a post in Georgia. We have two to be filled there. One of them has been waiting for more than 1,000 days. So I think it is important we do this. Why? Because it is our constitutional duty.

We only have so much time to confirm judges, because as I indicated, filibustering nominees, they do it to everybody. We are working through the judges quickly because we changed the rules. Thank goodness we did. The Senate did consider Senator HAGAN's sportsmen's legislation last week. I repeat. That important bill affects—the one that the junior Senator from Tennessee said we should not have brought up—affects 40 million Americans who hunt and fish.

Somebody I used to practice law with has a place in Montana. He took his grandson there and had a wonderful time fishing—no hunting but fishing. This place he has, a little stream goes by there. He said it was the best time he ever had with his grandchild. That is what 40 million people do. That is what we brought up. That is what the junior Senator from Tennessee said was such a bad idea. Twenty-six Republicans cosponsored that legislation. It contributes $200 billion annually to our Nation's economy.

My friend from Tennessee thinks it is a waste of time; we should not have done that. The junior Senator from Tennessee was a cosponsor of the legislation. He is going to go back and tell the people in Tennessee that he made a mistake, he should not have been a cosponsor.

Earlier, he voted to proceed so we could work on the legislation. Then he voted to filibuster it. This is the same tactic we have seen so much over the past 6 years. Republicans obstruct. When asked why they are not accomplishing anything, they blame Democrats. They blame me. The truth is Senate Democrats have continued to press for more and more ambassadorial confirmations while also introducing legislation that helps working families.

As I came to the floor in March to highlight the backlog of ambassadorial confirmations, the Senate has considered an increase in the minimum wage, equal pay for women, student loan refinancing, extension of tax cuts, cost-cutting energy legislation, and a number of other items. These are all important bills to give working Americans a fair shot at a measure of prosperity. Republican filibusters blocked every one of them.

Another issue I have with the Senator from Tennessee is that undoubtedly he knows the Senate traditionally does much of its business through unanimous consent—in fact most of our business. If Republicans agree there is an urgent need to get these nominations done and give their consent, we could confirm all of these ambassadors in a single afternoon. It would only take a few hours in the afternoon. We could do it today.

But it is clearly not a priority for Republicans; otherwise, they would expedite these confirmations. Their behavior on these ambassadorial nominations reminds me of a quote by Gandhi: ''Action expresses priorities.'' Republicans' lack of action on this matter illustrates that they have no priorities in this regard.

So enough with the stalling and enough with retribution. The Senate standoff is not good for this body, and it is hurting American interests abroad. Let's get these ambassador posts filled. Our national security depends on it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 2 p.m. today the Senate vote on cloture on Executive Calendar No. 849, Carnes; further, that if cloture is invoked, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 21, 2014, the Senate resume executive session and all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nomination; further, that following the 2 p.m. cloture vote, the Senate proceed to the consideration and vote on Executive Calendar Nos. 709, Shear, and 834, Mader; further, that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, with this agreement, we expect one rollcall vote beginning at 2 p.m. and two additional voice votes as I have mentioned. I apologize to the Republican leader for taking so much time.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CITIZEN VICTORIES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday the American people actually scored a victory in the ongoing battle against government overreach. They literally rose, spoke out, and they forced the Obama administration to withdraw the latest gem from the ''department of terrible ideas'' over at the Environmental Protection Agency.

They showed two things in the process; first, the need for constant vigilance when it comes to protecting our liberties, especially with the current crowd down at the White House; and, second, the impact ordinary citizens can actually have.

The proposal in question was a uniquely awful idea. The goal was for the EPA to grant itself the authority to garnish the wages of private citizens without even giving them a day in court. Imagine. You received a letter from the government accusing you of violating some obscure regulation, a regulation most likely you never heard of and did not even know you were violating. The government then hits you with massive fines, sometimes on the order of tens of thousands of dollars a day, as you weigh your legal options and whether to fight it in court.

If you cannot or will not pay these fines in the meantime, too bad. Bureaucrats in Washington will take them out of your paycheck anyway—out of our paycheck anyway—without even the option of contesting the government's actions in court for it. This is certainly government overreach at its very worst. That is why I joined Senators THUNE, VITTER, and BARRASSO in speaking out against it. That is why we developed a resolution of disapproval to block it.

But the real key to our success was the action of the American people themselves. They got our help, but they did not sit back and wait. They let their outrage be known. They fought back against this brazen power grab. Thanks to all of those efforts, the administration finally literally threw in the towel yesterday. Certainly we were glad to see it.

But look, the fact that the Obama administration's EPA even introduced this rule in the first place should concern all of us. It was truly outrageous, but it is also not surprising because this is the same administration that just proposed a so-called waters of the U.S. regulation that would expand the government's authority so broadly that the Agency could regulate and fine almost every pothole and ditch in our backyards.

This is the same administration that has been waging a costly war on coal jobs in my State through similarly onerous and arbitrary regulations aimed at pleasing hard-core activists in Washington without any regard for real-world consequences.

It is as though these distant elites in Washington view their mission as ideological warfare. They do not seem the least bit concerned about the casualties they leave behind in the process. I have tried to get some of these bureaucratic foot soldiers down to Kentucky to see the impact of their efforts firsthand, but of course they are not interested. They are not interested in people such as the 32-year-old unemployed miner who walked into a Pikeville pregnancy center to ask for baby clothes. An employee at the center wrote to tell me what this miner had to say.

Here is what he said:

I don't come from a family that has ever had to ask for help. I feel humiliated, but my baby is suffering.

That pregnancy center employee wrote that the look on his face broke her heart. She wrote: ''[But] this is the plight of many of our families in Eastern Kentucky, their livelihood is being taken away by the War on Coal.''

These are the people whom distant bureaucrats in Washington should be forced to meet before they draft their rules. This guy just wants to put food on the table, to keep the lights on, and to give his kids a better life. But the war on coal jobs is taking away more than just his livelihood and that of so many others. It is taking away his dignity as well. Maybe that is why the administration doesn't want to meet Kentuckians like him. Maybe that is why they don't want to look my constituents in the eye. It is a big problem, and that is why I am so proud of the people who stood up to this latest ominous regulation.

Yesterday the EPA confirmed that it won't hold a single hearing within hours of my State as it works to finalize national energy tax regulations that could devastate the lives of tens of thousands of Kentuckians. They don't care, and they are not listening.

Well, I care. I see these folks when I go home. I hear their stories. My heart breaks for them. I am going to keep fighting. I am going to keep fighting against the Obama administration's various power grabs and its regulatory overreach. I am going to keep fighting against the national energy tax. I am going to keep fighting for practical ideas that aim to help struggling families for once—a marked departure from the administration's constant attacks against them—ideas such as the Coal Country Protection Act and the Saving Coal Jobs Act.

These proposals are common sense. If the majority leader would stop blocking them, we could deliver some relief to middle-class families for once. So he should know I am not going to let up and neither are the American people who won this important victory yesterday on another subject over the EPA's latest power grab because, as we also saw with the administration's recent withdrawal of an IRS regulation aimed at restricting free speech, the people can still win with enough determination. Civic involvement works—and given the pattern of abuse we keep seeing with this administration, it is absolutely critical.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consideration of S. 2244, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2244) to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 2244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2021''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting ''and beginning **[**in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014**]** *on January 1, 2016*, shall decrease by **[**1 percent**]** *1 percentage point* per calendar year until equal to 80 percent'' after ''85 percent''.

SEC. 4. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through subparagraph (E) and inserting **[**''shall be $27,500,000,000 and beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.''; and**]** *''shall be the lesser of—*

''(A) $27,500,000,000, as such amount is adjusted pursuant to this paragraph; and

''(B) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year,

provided that beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A) shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.'';

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph 6 *(6)*''; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''for such period'';

[(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking ''for any period referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and

(ii) by striking ''for such period'';]

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) [Reserved.]'';

[(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and]

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent'' and inserting '', terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 135.5 percent''; and

(ii) by inserting ''as calculated under subparagraph (A)'' after ''mandatory recoupment amount''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019'';

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(III) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(II) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''An entity has'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity has''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have 'control' over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having 'control' under subparagraph (A).'';

([A]*B*) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

''(A) the value of an insurer's direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year'' and inserting ''notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year''; and

(II) by striking ''Period or Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

([B]*C*) by striking paragraph (11); and

([C]*D*) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), as previously amended by section 3—

(aa) by striking ''the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''each calendar year'';

(bb) by striking the comma after ''80 percent''; and

(cc) by striking ''such Transition Period or such Program Year'' and inserting ''such calendar year''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''exceed'' and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting ''exceed $100,000,000 with respect to such insured losses occurring in the calendar year.'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''a calendar year''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year'' and inserting ''any calendar year''; and

(C) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking ''the Transition Period or a Program Year'' each place that term appears and inserting ''the calendar year'';

(ii) by striking ''such period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''; and

(iii) by striking ''that period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''.

SEC. 6. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''act of terrorism'' has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term ''certification process'' means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 6 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including any timeline applicable to any certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY ON UPFRONT PREMIUMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) How the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program.

(2) How the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums.

(3) How the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program.

(4) How the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

(5) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small.

(6) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance.

(7) The size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program's current post-event recoupment structure.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the committee-reported amendments are agreed to, and the bill, as amended, is considered as original text for purposes of further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. I ask to speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON are printed in today's RECORD under ''Morning Business.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my good friend from Florida for his heartfelt and his always articulate words. We are now going to debate, finally, the reauthorization of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program.

Senator CRAPO and I have opening statements, but Senator TESTER, who has added an extremely important amendment to this legislation, has a markup shortly, so we are going to accede and let him speak about his amendment first, and then we will get on with our opening statements. I thank Senator TESTER for his hard work on this issue as well as his ability to compromise to get something done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

AMENDMENT NO. 3552

Mr. TESTER. I call up amendment No. 3552, ask for its immediate consideration, and I ask that Senator KLOBUCHAR and Senator PRYOR be added as cosponsors.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Montana [Mr. TESTER] for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR and Mr. PRYOR, proposes an amendment numbered 3552.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under ''Text of Amendments.'')

Mr. TESTER. I thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO and Senators SCHUMER and HELLER for their hard work on helping me on the TRIA bill and for helping me on this amendment, as well as Senator SCHUMER and Senator HELLER for their hard work not only on the TRIA legislation but also on the NARAB amendment, which I am going to talk about in a moment. I also wish to give a special thank-you to Senator JOHANNS, who is a cosponsor on this amendment and somebody with whom I have worked very closely to get this amendment to the point it is today.

The Tester-Johanns amendment is the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Act, otherwise known as NARAB. NARAB is a bill Senator JOHANNS and I introduced last year. It was reported out of the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee on a voice vote.

Our amendment creates a nonprofit association to provide one-stop licensing for insurance agents and brokers operating outside of their home State. This arrangement would fully preserve the authority of State insurance regulators to supervise these markets.

Currently, an insurance agent or broker seeking to operate in multiple States must meet different State-specific licensing requirements and seek approval from each State's insurance commissioner. This process is time consuming, it is costly, it is redundant, and it is sometimes contradictory—without providing any greater consumer protection. That is a big disincentive for smaller agents and brokers to grow their businesses.

This is not a new issue for the insurance industry. Congress recognized the need for a forum to reform the insurance licensing system in 1999 when it incorporated the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Act subtitle into the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act. Unfortunately, at that time Congress did not immediately establish NARAB. As a result, Gramm-Leach-Bliley did not achieve the level of reciprocity and uniformity Congress expected and these efforts to streamline cross-state insurance licensing never took hold. That is why this important amendment is before the Senate today.

Senator JOHANNS' and my amendment would provide insurance agents and brokers with the option of becoming a member of NARAB provided that they meet the professional standards set by the association and undergo a criminal background check.

NARAB will streamline the licensing process for agents and brokers, enabling them to be licensed under one single, strong national licensing standard rather than following different State standards, thereby saving time and money.

In addition to setting rigorous professional standards, the association will let agents and brokers renew their licenses all at once and fully preserve the abilities of regulators to protect consumers and supervise and discipline agents and brokers.

Currently, on average, insurance agents sell their products in eight States, with many serving even more. A one-stop licensing compliance mechanism will benefit all agents and brokers but particularly the smaller folks who must spend time and money dealing with different standards in different States.

A one-stop shop for insurance licensing will help smaller players compete against the bigger competitors. That is good for business, and it is good for consumers.

NARAB represents a decade of effort, and I am pleased we will finally achieve the goals laid out in Gramm-Leach-Bliley. Some feared NARAB would diminish States rights. As a former State legislator, when folks start talking about States rights issues, I pay attention, but in this case I believe they are wrong.

I wish to take a minute and talk about how this amendment protects States rights. Under this amendment, States would retain all authority to license their own resident agents and brokers. The association would be required to notify States when agents and brokers apply for membership, letting the States notify NARAB of any reason membership should not be granted to the producer.

States will also have significant control over NARAB. The nonprofit association would be governed by a board of directors dominated by State insurance regulators and chaired by a State insurance regulator. Most importantly, NARAB deals only with marketplace entry and would not impact the day-to-day regulation of insurance. States will maintain exclusive control of the regulation of marketplace activities, consumer protection requirements, unfair trade practices, and other important areas.

Under this bill, under this amendment, we will preserve the authority of States to supervise insurance producers. Any agent or broker who obtains the authority to operate in a jurisdiction through NARAB is still subject to the full regulatory authority of that State and must comply with all marketplace requirements. Under our amendment, States will continue to receive insurance licensing fees, which will be collected by NARAB and remitted to the States.

This legislation is supported by the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisers, the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers, and the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America. It is also supported by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which has expressed its full support for this bill and the final TRIA bill.

I urge my colleagues to support the Tester-Johanns amendment. It is truly a commonsense amendment that helps not only the industry but also the consumers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHANNS. Mr. President, I will begin today by acknowledging the good work of the good Senator from Montana. This bill has been around for a long time, and it is our hope that we will get to a point today where we can say that finally we have solved the problems.

The Senator from Montana has done an excellent job of laying out what this bill is all about and what it is not about, and I don't feel a need today to repeat what he has said, but let me just make a couple of points.

First, the partnership we had in working on this bill was excellent, and that is why it is this far along. It was a bipartisan effort.

This legislation is long overdue, and it does benefit consumers and businesses all across this great country. It is exactly what we look for. It reduces redtape, it encourages competition and protects State law, and it promotes consumer choice. For these reasons, it is my hope the entire Senate unanimously supports the amendment.

I might mention that we passed this legislation out of the banking committee about a year ago. That was after working on this for about 10

years. The House passed this bill last year by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 397 to 6. So I am pleased we can advance this legislation today as part of the terrorism risk insurance bill, which I also support and will vote yes on.

Frankly, it is refreshing to finally be allowed to vote on amendments on the Senate floor. I hope this is a sign of things to come. I thank Senator SCHUMER and Senator CRAPO for their work in bringing us to this point. Without their work, TRIA would not be where it is today.

I urge the adoption of the amendment. I hope we can move the legislation to the President's desk as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues from Montana and Nebraska for their hard work on not only this legislation but their very important amendment—long overdue. I certainly thank Senators JOHNSON and CRAPO, without whose leadership we couldn't be here to pass this bill. I thank my original cosponsors, Senator KIRK from Illinois who is here, Senator JACK REED, Senator HELLER, Senator MURPHY, Senator JOHANNS, Senator WARNER, Senator BLUNT, and Senator MENENDEZ, all of whom recognized the importance of having this incredibly important program reauthorized.

As author of the original TRIA legislation, I have watched this evolution closely. I could not be more convinced of the necessity to reauthorize the program for the long haul.

I remember the dark days right after 9/11. I was there. The worst thing was the loss of life—people we had all known. I know people who were lost—a guy I played basketball with in high school, a businessman who helped me on the way up, a firefighter with whom I did blood drives. But there was also the economic worry. People thought southern Manhattan would not come back. People thought businesses would flee New York—that New York's greatest days were behind us. And of course the people of New York, with their resiliency, backed up by everyone in this country—including President Bush, very strongly—did come back. But the uncertainty we faced in the immediate aftermath was that there would be no building in southern Manhattan or Manhattan at all. And we have some history.

One of the things that greatly stood in the way was the private sector did not offer any sufficient coverage to protect against the threat of terrorism. No one knew when there might be another terrorist incident. Insurance companies, knowing how large the losses were, figured it was better not to underwrite insurance than write it for such an astronomical sum that the building would not be even economically feasible.

We have some colleagues who said this should be a private sector endeavor. Well, we have history. The private sector was unable, because of the potential economic losses if, God forbid, there was another terrorist attack, whether it be conventional, nuclear, or chemical, to provide terrorism insurance. When that occurs, banks would not finance buildings, knowing there was no insurance backup, and we would have been in huge trouble. That is why we devised the terrorism insurance bill.

For those who say let the private sector do it, we have an experiment. We have what the scientists would call a controlled experiment. When there was no terrorism insurance after 9/11, the private sector would not offer insurance. We even find to this day, as the existing bill expires, fewer people underwrite terrorism insurance and fewer buildings are financed.

So we can do one of two things: We can sit back and let the market handle this on its own and lose millions—literally millions—of jobs, lose economic stability, safety, prosperity, and growth or we can renew this legislation. We can come up with a smart, responsible, risk-sharing system where the private sector is paying upfront. But if, God forbid, there is another serious incident beyond the capability of the private sector to shoulder, the Federal Government can step in and provide a backstop. That is what we have done.

The TRIA Program is a shining example of the government partnering with the private sector to solve problems that neither can solve on its own.

Let me underline, first, the importance to my city of New York. The redevelopment of downtown Manhattan is booming there. People are flocking to live there and work there. It is the hot area of New York again—not just with financial services but with law and advertising and high-tech. It serves as a reminder of the role the Federal Government can and should play in helping facilitate the stability and growth of cities across the country.

This bill will not lessen the impact of a terrorist attack but will help ensure that our cities throughout the country are less vulnerable to the economic devastation that would follow such a horrific event.

But this bill is hardly just focused on New York City. It not only affects every large city—my good friend from Nebraska spoke—it affects the football stadium and any renovations that might occur there in Lincoln. I have been there for a Nebraska-Oklahoma game. It was an amazing experience. It affects any city that has large gatherings of people and buildings—shopping centers, athletic facilities, colleges. So it affects almost every State. That is one of the reasons we have come together and gotten such broad bipartisan support.

We must make sure that every reauthorization of the program provides the certainty lenders and developers need to make the kind of long-term investment our country and large projects need to stimulate job growth and economic growth, and this bill does just that. That is why it was passed out of the banking committee unanimously.

Again, I thank my colleagues, particularly on the other side of the aisle. As Senator JOHANNS said—and we say it on each bill where there is some bipartisan support—this one has overwhelming support. Maybe this bill can be a model that at least on many issues we can work together.

Time is of the essence. Insurance policies for 2015 are already being written. Each day that goes by without a TRIA Program causes great uncertainty in the market and holds back the potential for more development, more construction, more jobs, and more economic growth.

I will talk about the amendments later, but I urge my colleagues, both here in the Senate and in the House, to move as quickly as possible because our economy is greatly affected by it. It is one of those that ''runs quiet, runs deep.'' It is a quiet policy but a policy that greatly affects lots of things that go on.

Again, I thank my colleagues, Senator CRAPO for his good and hard work, as well as Senator JOHNSON and my cosponsors.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I am appreciative of Senator SCHUMER and the work we have been able to do together to move this legislation forward.

I rise today to speak in favor of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA, program. As a cosponsor of this bill, I recognize Senator SCHUMER, Senator KIRK, Senator HELLER, Senator REED, and others for helping to put this bipartisan piece of legislation together.

Chairman JOHNSON and his staff also deserve a great amount of thanks for their strong efforts in moving this bill forward.

Working together, we developed a balanced bipartisan product that was literally unanimously supported in the banking committee 22 to 0. This bill we have put together allows the private insurance industry to absorb and cover the losses of all but the largest acts of terror—ones in which the Federal Government would likely be forced to step in, in any event, if the program were not there. Taxpayer protections have been increased in this reauthorization by moving more of the responsibility for losses on to private insurers.

For those who are not familiar with the program, TRIA was initially passed as a response to the unavailability of terrorism insurance in the wake of 9/11. The private market had already retreated in response to those terrorist attacks. It was then thought that a temporary program would allow the market time to develop products that would allow policyholders to protect themselves from terrorism losses.

More than a decade after the tragic events of 9/11, the temporary inability

to insure against terrorism has abated, and private capital is better positioned to take on more exposure to terrorism.

When the banking committee held its first hearing on TRIA's reauthorization last year, we discussed the ability of the private insurance market to step in to provide terrorism insurance if the TRIA Program expired. In that hearing, and in subsequent meetings with providers, policyholders, and stakeholders, we recognized on a bipartisan basis the continued difficulties associated with providing terrorism insurance required that we look again at extending the act.

Terrorism is difficult to predict. Therefore, the ability to develop products to insure against terrorism is very difficult to do. The size, severity, and frequency of attacks are hard to model. Also, attacks may be highly correlated, making it difficult for private insurers to diversify their risks.

Having TRIA in place was determined to be important. But if the market is too heavily reliant on Federal support, we may deter private companies from coming up with cost-effective solutions. That is why, instead of a straight reauthorization, I and others pushed for reforms to maintain the program and increase protections for taxpayers.

In order to do that, we examined each of the policy levers in the program. The bill marked up by the banking committee would increase the insurance industry's aggregate retention level and the company coinsurance levels. As the program stands today, the Federal Government would recoup any TRIA payments it makes up to $27.5 billion through post-event payments. This industry retention level allows the taxpayer to recover TRIA payments through an industrywide assessment on property-casualty policies. This aspect of the bill was last changed in the 2005 reauthorization. The bill before us today increases that recoupment level by $2 billion a year, to an overall level of $37.5 billion—an additional $10 billion. This is a significant reduction in the potential exposure and cost to taxpayers.

In addition, the bill increases the company coinsurance level from 15 percent to 20 percent over 5 years. This means that before the backstop is reached, each company will take on a greater portion of the losses above their deductible.

In order to get more private capital in the marketplace, Senator FLAKE has an amendment to create an advisory committee to promote the creation and development of private sector risk-sharing mechanisms. I support the addition of the Flake amendment and believe the advisory committee will find private sector solutions that will allow us to further decrease the program in future reauthorizations.

Before I conclude, I have a handful of letters in my possession here from groups across the country strongly supporting and encouraging that we adopt this legislation.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has listed this as a key vote. The Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism, which represents dozens and dozens of the financial sector interests across this country, recommends and encourages that we support this legislation, and the Mortgage Bankers Association, the National Association of Insurance Companies, the Property Casualty Insurers, the National Apartment Association, the National Multifamily Housing Council, and the American Builders Conference.

These are just a sampling of letters we have received from interests across the Nation that support this legislation. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS, INC.,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: on behalf of Associated Builders and Contractors (ABC), a national construction industry association with 70 chapters representing nearly 21,000 members, I am writing to express our support for S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. The bill, introduced by Sen. Chuck Schumer (D–N.Y.), would extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years beyond the current expiration date of December 14, 2014, ensuring the construction industry will be able to secure sufficient terrorism insurance.

Following the tragic attacks on our country on September 11, 2001, terrorism insurance rates skyrocketed and many contractors were unable to secure insurance, forcing projects to be put on hold, costing jobs and hindering economic development. The attacks had a particularly devastating impact on the construction industry: more than one million jobs were lost and $15 billion in real estate transactions were canceled.

In 2002, President Bush signed TRIA into law, immediately providing much needed assurance to builders and lenders. TRIA acted as a spark to help our economy recover in the face of continued terrorist threats by allowing contractors across the country to secure this commercially necessary product.

Since 2002, TRIA has been reauthorized twice in overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion and has continued to act as a public-private partnership to ensure the stability of the terrorism insurance marketplace. The seven year extension contained in S. 2244 would provide a long term backstop that is necessary to ensure the construction industry's future success. Without the extension, banks will be less inclined to lend necessary funds to new construction projects and companies may be forced out of the industry because of financial risks, costing jobs and putting a roadblock in our nation's drive to economic recovery.

In the wake of a recession in which our industry faced a 27.2 percent unemployment rate, the construction economy cannot sustain the uncertainty and disruption that the expiration of TRIA would trigger.

ABC and its members fully support the extension of TRIA, and urges all Senators to support S. 2244.

Sincerely,

GEOFFREY BURR,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

NATIONAL MULTIFAMILY HOUSING COUNCIL, NATIONAL APARTMENT ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: This week the U.S. Senate is scheduled to consider a bill to reauthorize the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA). We commend Chairman Johnson and Ranking Member Crapo for their good work on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Reauthorization Act of 2014. It represents a bipartisan, balanced approach to maintaining the necessary program elements of TRIA while enhancing taxpayer protections. TRIA was first enacted after the events of 9–11 creating a federal backstop so that affordable terrorism coverage would be available and affordable for commercial policyholders across the country, including apartment property owners, developers and managers. The program has been a successful public/private partnership and is fiscally sound.

On behalf of the National Multifamily Housing Council (NMHC) and the National Apartment Association (NAA), we urge your support of S. 2244. As policyholders, our members are anxious to advance legislation in a swift manner to eliminate the uncertainty associated with the year-end program expiration.

NMHC/NAA represent the nation's leading firms participating in the multifamily rental housing industry. Our combined memberships engage in all aspects of the apartment industry, including ownership, development, management and finance. NMHC represents the principal officers of the apartment industry's largest and most prominent firms. NAA is a federation of 170 state and local apartment associations comprised of approximately 64,000 multifamily housing companies representing nearly 7.5 million apartment homes throughout the United States and Canada.

TRIA and subsequent extensions of the program have been the mechanism that provides ready access to affordable insurance coverage. Terrorism risk does not resemble other commercial risks. Unlike natural disasters in which insurers have had significant experiences and data to project the risk of damage, terrorism remains unpredictable and therefore largely uninsurable. The impact of an event can be enormous, and insurance modeling for such risks is still not reliable, thus underscoring the importance of continued federal involvement.

In 2012 data collected from our members relative to their cost of insurance, take up rates for terrorism coverage was 91%. This is not insignificant and demonstrates that certainty offered by TRIA in costs and coverage limits are critical components in a multifamily property owner's continued ability to offer safe and affordable housing.

We thank you for your support of this measure and appreciate your taking steps to move this important legislation one step closer to enactment before the December 2014 expiration.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS M. BIBBY,
PRESIDENT,
National Multi Housing Council.

DOUGLAS S. CULKIN, CAE,
PRESIDENT,
National Apartment Association.

PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA,
July 16, 2014.

Contact: Eileen Gilligan
Phone: 202–639–0497
Email: Eileen.Gilligan@pciaa.net

PCI URGES THE SENATE TO SUPPORT THE TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

Washington—Nat Wienecke, senior vice president, federal government relations of the Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI) issued the following statement in regards to the Senate's upcoming consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014.

''PCI strongly supports passage of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, and commends the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for unanimously passing this legislation and sending it to the full Senate for a vote,'' said Wienecke. ''TRIA is a critical part of the fabric of our national response plan for terrorist attacks. Ensuring America's economic resiliency to terrorist attacks is a solemn responsibility and we call on the members of the Senate to vote aye and move this legislation one step closer to the president's desk.''

PCI is composed of more than 1,000 member companies, representing the broadest cross-section of insurers of any national trade association. PCI members write over $195 billion in annual premium, 39 percent of the nation's property casualty insurance. Member companies write 46 percent of the U.S. automobile insurance market, 32 percent of the homeowners market, 37 percent of the commercial property and liability market, and 41 percent of the private workers compensation market.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES,
July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: as the Senate completes floor consideration of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies respectfully urges you to vote ''yes'' on this critical piece of legislation. A long-term reauthorization of the TRIA program ensures a vital piece of the nation's economic national security infrastructure will continue to encourage private sector involvement in the terrorism insurance marketplace—thereby protecting and promoting our nation's finances, security, and economic strength.

NAMIC is the largest and most diverse property/casualty trade association in the country, with 1,400 regional and local mutual insurance member companies on main streets across America joining many of the country's largest national insurers who also call NAMIC their home. Member companies serve more than 135 million auto, home and business policyholders, writing in excess of $196 billion in annual premiums that account for 50 percent of the automobile/ homeowners market and 31 percent of the business insurance market. More than 200,000 people are employed by NAMIC member companies.

NAMIC appreciates the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Banking Committee in reporting legislation by a unanimous vote which both increases taxpayer protections and which will maintain a robust terrorism insurance market for consumers and companies of all sizes. In particular, we applaud the crafters of S. 2244 for recognizing that raising the ''trigger level'' could make it impossible for many small to medium-sized insurers to continue to write terrorism and other business coverages without ultimately doing anything to reduce taxpayer exposure.

As it is, we are encouraging you to pass this compromise legislation to reauthorize a program that has protected the economic security of the United States since its creation following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks.

Sincerely,

JAMES D. GRANDE,
SVP—Federal and Political Affairs, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies.

MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
July 14, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER REID AND LEADER MCCONNELL: On behalf of the Mortgage Bankers Association (MBA), I am writing to urge the Senate to pass S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, which was unanimously approved by the Senate Banking Committee last month. With the year-end expiration of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) looming closer, it is critical that Congress take action to pass a long-term extension of the terrorism risk insurance program.

MBA's paramount objective for TRIA reauthorization is for terrorism risk insurance to remain both available and affordable, in the long-term, for commercial real estate and multifamily properties. The clearest path to this objective is a long-term TRIA extension without modifications. If changes to the program are inevitable, our perspective on TRIA reauthorization legislation is then guided by its potential impact on the availability and affordability of terrorism risk insurance. By introducing a limited number of incremental programmatic modifications, S. 2244 is consistent with past reauthorization efforts that MBA has supported.

A long-term extension of TRIA is essential to the health and vitality of the $2.5 trillion commercial and multifamily real estate finance sector and the nation as a whole. The absence of available and affordable terrorism risk insurance would not only impact the commercial real estate finance center, but would ripple through the economy as buildings became more difficult and costly to finance and purchase.

Any changes to TRIA should be incremental, at most, and implemented over the course of a long-term reauthorization period in order to avoid unintended consequences. Past reauthorization efforts for the program have introduced gradual changes that did not negatively impact the availability and affordability of terrorism risk insurance. A departure from this approach could result in price and availability shocks for terrorism risk insurance. We are pleased the Senate is placing a high priority on TRIA reauthorization.

Regarding S. 2244, MBA offers the following observations:

Long-Term Extension—MBA strongly supports the seven-year extension period because it will allow for extended market certainty that a terrorism risk insurance program will be in place.

Increased Recoupment—The federal government's potential recoupment is increased from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion over a five-year period. The five-year adjustment period ($2 billion per year) represents an incremental approach to an important element of the program.

Increased Insurance Company Co-Pay—After the initial deductible, the insurance company co-pay will be increased by one percent a year for five years until the co-pay increases from 15 percent to 20 percent. This also represents an incremental change to another important element of the program. TRIA reauthorization should take into consideration the potential impacts on small property insurance companies.

MBA urges all members of the Senate to vote in favor of S. 2244 and to oppose amendments that would weaken the TRIA program. We look forward to working with Congress, other policymakers, and engaged stakeholders to ensure the long-term reauthorization of the TRIA program as quickly as possible.

Sincerely,

DAVID H. STEVENS,
President and Chief Executive Officer.

COALITION TO INSURE AGAINST TERRORISM,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: The Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism (CIAT) strongly urges you to support S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. S. 2244 would extend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years.

CIAT represents a wide range of businesses and organizations throughout the transportation, real estate, manufacturing, construction, energy, education, entertainment and retail sectors that regularly must obtain insurance against terrorism. We know firsthand that, as part of its economic national security, America needs a stable, reliable terrorism competitive insurance market so employers can invest in assets and create jobs without assuming the risk and liabilities of a terrorist attack.

Again, we urge you to support S. 2244 and we thank you for your consideration of CIAT's concerns on this vital issue.

Sincerely,

THE COALITION TO INSURE AGAINST TERRORISM.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS,
July 16, 2014.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the over one-million members of the National Association of REALTORS (NAR), I urge you to support S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' when the Senate votes on it on Thursday, July 17th. This bipartisan legislation, unanimously approved by the Senate Banking Committee in June, extends the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) for seven years and makes minimal changes to a program that has worked since its inception in 2002 at virtually no cost to taxpayers.

NAR's membership includes commercial practitioners and brokers who work with clients that would be adversely affected if TRIA is allowed to expire at the end of 2014, or if it is renewed in a manner that constricts the ability of private insurers to make terrorism coverage available and affordable throughout the country. The current TRIA program continues to be a success, keeping private terrorism insurance coverage available and affordable while protecting taxpayers and limiting the federal government's exposure to only the most extreme events. Though we do have concerns that provisions in S. 2244 to increase the mandatory recoupment amount (from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion) could adversely impact the economy in the wake of a terrorist attack, overall we are pleased that the bill received unanimous bipartisan support from the Banking Committee. NAR urges the full Senate to approve it today.

Please give your support to S. 2244 when it reaches the Senate floor. TRIA provides a crucial framework for economic recovery in

the wake of a catastrophic terrorist attack, and allows the United States to maintain a stable terrorism insurance market so employers can invest in properties and create jobs without assuming the risk and liabilities of a terrorist attack. Your support of this extension bill will aid in preventing market uncertainty for years to come.

Sincerely,

STEVE BROWN,
2014 President,
National Association of REALTORS®.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANIES, PROPERTY CASUALTY INSURERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, COMMERCIAL REAL ESTATE FINANCE COUNCIL,

July 8, 2014.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC
Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER REID AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: The undersigned organizations respectfully request quick action on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. This bipartisan legislation was reported last month with a unanimous vote by the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and is essential to retain the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program that has protected U.S. national and economic security since its creation following the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks. To date, a quarter of the Senators have cosponsored S. 2244.

The TRIA program is a vital piece of the nation's economic national security infrastructure. The federal government plays an important and appropriate role in encouraging private sector involvement in the terrorism insurance marketplace—thereby protecting and promoting our nation's finances, security, and economic strength. The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program has been a remarkable success in achieving its primary mission to ''protect consumers by addressing market disruptions and ensure the continued widespread availability and affordability of property and casualty insurance for terrorism risk.''

The undersigned parties are very appreciative of the bipartisan leadership of the Senate Banking Committee in reporting legislation that increases taxpayer protections while retaining broad support of consumer groups and the marketplace. Working together, Sens. Johnson and Crapo and members of the Committee achieved consensus agreement on a bipartisan piece of legislation. The bill reauthorizes the TRIA program for seven years, a period of time that will bring longer-term certainty to the market and facilitate economic development, and increases the ultimate private sector share of the responsibility for insured losses, thereby reducing any potential burden on the taxpayer.

We are particularly appreciative that the Senate consensus bill largely maintains the current thresholds that facilitate broad private participation in the terrorism insurance market. For example, the bill maintains the current $100 million ''trigger''—the minimum size of a terrorist event required to trigger any Federal involvement. An excessive trigger could make it impossible for many small to medium-sized insurers to continue to write terrorism and other business coverages. If insurers are forced out of the market, the result is expected to be less availability of coverage and less competition. That would be antithetical to TRIA's stated purposes. Small and medium-sized insurers represent almost 98 percent of all insurers writing TRIA coverage and almost half of all TRIA-related premiums. Small and medium-sized insurers are a critical source of terrorism coverage as well as other lines of insurance meeting all of needs of American businesses large and small. The primary impact of raising the trigger would be on smaller, regional, and niche insurers whose deductible—and even total exposure—is less than the amount of an elevated trigger level that has been set too high. We applaud the crafters of S. 2244 for recognizing this important fact.

We urge the Senate to take up S. 2244 as quickly as possible. Consumers are already having to purchase terrorism insurance coverage that extends beyond TRIA's current December 31, 2014 expiration without any certainty regarding the levels of protection TRIA will provide. Many newly issued policies contain conditional terrorism exclusions, which could result in no protection for consumers if Congress fails to act in a timely manner. While most stakeholders prefer a straight extension of TRIA with no changes, we recognize and appreciate the bipartisan leadership of the committee in moving S.2224 forward and hope that you can reach agreement to bring this legislation to the Senate floor as soon as possible where we believe it will have overwhelming support.

Given the broad support this bill has already attracted, we would encourage the full Senate to consider this legislation as soon as possible with minimal revisions, and in particular, no amendments to raise the trigger from its current $100 million level. We believe that the current version of the legislation will help maintain a vital program that has succeeded in fostering a robust terrorism insurance market for consumers and companies of all sizes, at virtually no cost to the federal government.

Sincerely,

National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Commercial Real Estate Finance Council.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, July 16, 2014.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, strongly supports S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' and applauds the Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for reporting out this important bill with unanimous support.

In the months following the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the inability for insurance policyholders to secure terrorism risk insurance contributed to a paralysis in the economy, especially in the construction, travel and tourism, and real estate finance sectors. Since its initial enactment in 2002, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act (TRIA) has served as a vital public-private risk sharing mechanism, ensuring that private terrorism risk insurance coverage remains commercially available and that the U.S. economy could more swiftly recover in the event of a terrorist attack.

Catastrophic terrorism remains an uninsurable risk because its frequency and location cannot be accurately predicted, and its potential scale could be economically devastating. TRIA continues to promote long-term availability of terrorism risk insurance for catastrophic terror events and provides a standard of stability for financial markets and recovery after such an attack.

The Chamber strongly urges you to support S. 2244, the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014,'' and may consider votes on, or in relation to, this bill in our annual How They Voted scorecard.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mr. CRAPO. Getting terrorism risk insurance right is important in order to protect taxpayers and to limit economic and physical impacts of any future terrorist attacks on the United States. This bill will help us maintain a properly balanced terrorism risk insurance program that increases the Nation's economic resilience to terrorism. Again, I thank Chairman JOHNSON and Senators SCHUMER, KIRK, REED, and HELLER for their partnership in bringing this bill forward and encourage its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, I haven't spoken that much in this Chamber since I suffered that stroke. I so strongly believe in this legislation to make it happen.

Behind me is a representation of the world's tallest buildings, the 10 tallest buildings in the world. Only one is in the U.S.A. Look over at that tallest one. That still distresses me, the Burj Khalifa, which is right now the tallest building in the world. I believe as the Senator representing Chicagoland, the city that invented the skyscraper, that Chicagoland citizens have a right to grow up in the shadow of the world's tallest buildings. Unless we quantify the risk for building one of these buildings through the TRIA legislation, we will not return skyscrapers to the country that invented skyscrapers.

With that I yield back the remainder of my time.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Senator CRAPO listed some letters and asked that they be put in the RECORD for some groups supporting our legislation.

We have a very long list, and I ask unanimous consent that list be added to the RECORD, the supporters of the legislation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORT S. 2244, THE BIPARTISAN TERRORISM RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2014

On April 10th, following two Banking Committee hearings on the need for Congress to reauthorize TRIA, Senators Schumer (D-NY), Kirk (R-IL), Reed (D-RI), Heller (R-NV), Murphy (D-CT), Johanns (R-NE), Warner (D-VA), Blunt (R-MO) and Menendez (D-NJ) introduced the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014. The sponsors, working with Banking Committee Chairman Johnson and Crapo, crafted a bipartisan compromise with the following key features:

Long-term extension that will promote national security, economic growth and market certainty

7 year extension of TRIA until December 31, 2021.

Improve existing taxpayer protections

Gradually raise the insurer co-payment from 15% to 20% over 5 years.

Gradually raise the mandatory recoupment threshold from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion over 5 years.

When considering S. 2244, the Banking Committee made several improvements to the bill offered by both Republican and Democratic Committee Members, including requiring a study and rulemaking by the Treasury Department to improve the TRIA certification process to provide better guidance and certainty following events that may qualify to be certified as ''acts of terror'' under the program.

Broad support for S. 2244 and extending TRIA

Unanimous, Bipartisan Support in Committee: By a unanimous and bipartisan vote of 22-0, the Banking Committee voted on June 3, 2014, to report S. 2244 to the Senate floor.

Quarter of the Senate are Cosponsors: A quarter of the Senate is now cosponsors of S. 2244, including the original sponsors and Senators Blumenthal (D-CT), Booker (D-NJ), Cardin (D-MD), Chambliss (R-GA), Crapo (R-ID), Donnelly (D-IN), Durbin (D-IL), Franken (D-MN), Gillibrand (D-NY), Isakson (R-GA), Johnson (D-SD), Klobuchar (D-MN), Markey (D-MA), Merkley (D-OR), Mikulski (D-MD), and Tester (D-MT).

Strong Support from a Wide Range of Stakeholders Across the Country: A large number of businesses and organizations have called on Congress to extend TRIA and support S. 2244, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, American Hotel and Lodging Association, Real Estate Roundtable, Realtors, Mortgage Bankers Association, MLB's Office of the Commissioner, NBA, NCAA, NFL and NHL.

S. 2244 is strongly supported by a wide range of organizations, including:

American Association of Port Authorities, American Bankers Association, American Bankers Insurance Association, American Bankers Securities Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Gaming Association, American Hotel and Lodging Association, American Insurance Association, American Land Title Association, American Public Gas Association, American Public Power Association, American Resort Development Association, American Society of Association Executives, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated General Contractors of America, Association of American Railroads, Association of Art Museum Directors, Building Owners and Managers Association International, Boston Properties, Campbell Soup Company.

Coalition to Insure Against Terrorism, Cornerstone Real Estate Advisers, LLC, CRE Finance Council, CSX Corporation, Emerson, Financial Services Roundtable, Food Marketing Institute, Helicopter Association International, Hilton Worldwide, Host Hotels & Resorts, Inc., Institute of Real Estate Management, InterContinental Hotel Group, International Council of Shopping Centers, International Franchise Association, International Safety Equipment Association, International Speedway Corporation, Long Island Import Export Association, Marriott International, Mortgage Bankers Association, NAIOP.

National Apartment Association, National Association of Chain Drug Stores, National Association of Home Builders, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC), National Association of REALTORS, National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association for Stock Car Auto Racing (NASCAR), National Association of Waterfront Employers, National Basketball Association, National Collegiate Athletic Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Football League, National Hockey League, National Multifamily Housing Council, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, New England Council.

Partnership for NYC, Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI), Public Sector Alliance, Public Utilities Risk Management Association, Office of the Commissioner of Baseball, The Real Estate Board of New York, The Real Estate Roundtable, Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Self-Insurance Institute of America, Inc., Starwood Hotels and Resorts, Tenaska, Taxicab, Limousine & Paratransit Association, UJA-Federation of New York, United Airlines, Union Pacific, University Risk Management and Insurance Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Travel Association.

Mr. SCHUMER. Now I would like to discuss the amendment process to preview it for my colleagues a little bit.

I would also ask unanimous consent that quorum calls be counted equally against both sides.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. As was mentioned, I believe by some of my colleagues, the give-and-take on this bill was ideally how things should work. First, a bipartisan group of Senators got together and crafted the legislation. As Senator CRAPO noted, there was some push and pull, what should be the balance between government and the private sector, and we did move a little bit more in giving greater responsibility to the private sector. People should note that at the end of the day the private sector will pay back all the money the government would lay out if, God forbid, there is a terrorist incident, but it would be over a period of time of course.

But we had Democrats and Republicans come together and we came up with a bill. The chairman and ranking member agreed that the bill was a good idea, held hearings, and then we moved forward with the legislation.

Then always comes the even greater morass. We do get some bills passed out of this place with bipartisan support and many of them are significant bills, but then we go to the floor and we wonder what is going to happen now. We have the age-old dispute about how many amendments, what type of amendments, should they be relevant. In this case we asked colleagues on both sides of the aisle who would want amendments.

The amendments that came back were reasonable. Most—not all—were related to terrorism insurance. Those that weren't, such as by Senator TESTER and Senator VITTER, were in the jurisdiction of the Banking Committee, so they at least had some relationship. We did not get a flurry of amendments from all over the place on issues that naturally divide the parties.

Then we had to do some negotiating, but we allowed—Senator CRAPO and Senator JOHNSON allowed every amendment, that any author who wanted to offer an amendment could. We worked out some compromises on the Tester amendment. Senator COBURN had objections, and a compromise was worked out there. Some were withdrawn, but at the end of the day anyone who wanted an amendment got it. Both sides showed restraint, and I think that is what brought us to this position.

So the good news for my colleagues, we have a very limited number of amendments, and we intend to dispose of the entire bill before lunch this morning.

Let me briefly go over the amendments.

Senator COBURN will offer an amendment on recoupment timing. The Coburn amendment would give the Treasury Secretary the ability to extend the recoupment period of up to 10 years following an attack. The problem is the way Senator COBURN had drafted his amendment, it would create a significant score. He offered in it the Banking Committee and it failed on a bipartisan vote, the majority of both parties, I believe, voting against it. But he wanted to offer it on the floor, and so he will.

There is a point of order, a pay-go point of order that will be raised against the Coburn amendment, and I will raise that because it does break the budget. It doesn't have a pay-for in exchange for it. So Chairman JOHNSON and I believe the sponsors of the legislation recommend a ''no'' vote on waiving pay-go against the Coburn amendment.

The Tester amendment, as modified by Senator COBURN, I believe will be voice-voted. Senator TESTER and Senator JOHANNS described that adequately, but it is something long overdue that would create a National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers and make the whole brokerage business work more smoothly. It has very broad support in this body.

Senator VITTER will offer an amendment that would require the President to nominate at least one individual with primary experience working in or supervising community banks on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors. I am sure he will come to the floor to explain his amendment. We expect this amendment, which we will all agree to, will be approved by voice vote, and Chairman JOHNSON has recommended a voice vote to the Members on our side.

Finally, there is a Flake amendment that would create an advisory committee on risk-sharing mechanisms. Again, I think Senator FLAKE will come down at some point and explain his amendment. There will be a recorded vote on this at least as planned now, and I will be supportive and I know Chairman JOHNSON again has recommended a ''yes'' vote on the Flake amendment.

With that, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. 59/b

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3551

Mr. FLAKE. I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so I may call up my amendment 3551, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. FLAKE] proposes an amendment numbered 3551.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish the Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms)

On page 13, after line 22, insert the following:

SEC. 8. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the ''Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms'' (referred to in this subsection as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to offer this amendment. I thank my colleagues, the ranking member of the Banking Committee, and the senior Senator from New York for working with my office to make this possible.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act before us extends for 7 years the Federal loss sharing program developed in response to the market destructions that were caused by 9/11. Created in 2002, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program was intended to be just a 3-year program. This program has since been extended twice, and the bill before us would extend its life through December 31, 2021.

Given the longevity of the program, I think it would be prudent for us to focus some attention on the growing private market reinsurance capability and capacity.

My amendment simply establishes an advisory committee composed of members of the insurance industry to provide recommendations to accelerate the creation and development of private nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms for terrorism losses. I urge my colleagues to join me in taking this modest step toward developing a functioning private-run market for terrorism risk insurance, thereby reducing dependency on the Federal Government in this regard.

I yield the floor and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to make comments on a couple of the amendments that have been or will be presented to the bill.

First, with regard to the amendment presented by Senator FLAKE. As I mentioned in my opening remarks, I support this amendment. One of the issues we deal with in the reauthorization of TRIA each time we face it is the correct balance and the level of government protection and support that needs to be in place to help the market deal with major catastrophic events in the United States and the level of requirement we insist there be from the private sector and how they will step in and deal with these risks on an insurance basis rather than requiring the taxpayers to be the ultimate backstop.

Ultimately our objective should be and must be that the taxpayer be relieved of this kind of burden and that the private sector step in and cover the risks through our private sector insurance markets. I think we have a pretty broad consensus that we are not at the level yet where we can get there, but each time we have reauthorized TRIA, we have moved it closer to that objective, and this legislation itself moves it closer.

As I said in my introductory remarks, we have increased the retention level—in other words, the amount of money the private sector must pay back to the Treasury if the taxpayer is ultimately required to step in and backstop a catastrophic terrorist attack. This legislation will increase that amount by another $10 billion—from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion. We are also increasing the amount of money which the private sector insurance industry must put up upfront before the government steps in and provides a backstop. We are increasing that from a 15-percent copay to 20-percent copay.

We are taking significant steps in this legislation to get to the ultimate objective of having the private sector fully handle the insurance risk due to a catastrophic terrorist attack.

Senator FLAKE has provided an amendment, which I support, that would help us create an advisory committee that will focus on this specific issue and help us to find private sector solutions to allow us to further decrease the program in the future reauthorizations. I think this is an incredibly important amendment, and I believe there is strong bipartisan support for it. It allows us to have advice and support from this advisory committee that would be created under his amendment to take further and more important steps toward achieving the ultimate objective of having to be able to eliminate the need for taxpayer involvement in dealing with catastrophic events such as a terrorist attack.

I strongly support the addition of the Flake amendment. I believe the advisory committee he proposes will find private sector solutions which will allow us to further decrease and ultimately eliminate the program in future reauthorizations.

Another amendment that has been discussed on the floor today by Senator TESTER of Montana and Senator JOHANNS of Nebraska is the NARAB amendment, which is an amendment that will be added to this legislation. This is also an important piece of legislation from the banking committee and it is called the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers, or NARAB. Again, it is a bipartisan piece of legislation that has strong support across the United States in various industries to try to allow our registered agents and brokers to have a more efficient and effective system in which to obtain necessary authorization to conduct their business nationwide.

I am an original cosponsor of this language because it simplifies the process of agent licensing across State lines while preserving the authority of State insurance regulators. This bill has broad support from the insurance community, including the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, the Independent Insurance Agents and Brokers of America, the National Association of Insurance and Financial Advisers, and the Council of Insurance Agents and Brokers.

The creation of NARAB will allow agents and brokers to focus on their responsibilities to their clients and spend

less time dealing with redtape. By reducing costs and increasing competition among insurance producers, we will generate lower costs and better service for consumers. Importantly, NARAB II deals specifically with marketplace entry and would not impact the States' jurisdiction over day-to-day authority in the insurance marketplace. This is a very critical point because I believe one of the biggest issues relating to this legislation is preserving and protecting States rights and State jurisdiction with regard to regulation of the insurance marketplace.

Insurance commissioners of the States will be able to better catch bad actors who, after losing a license in one State, move quickly to enter into another State. State regulators will serve on the board of NARAB with the same objectives they have as insurance commissioners—to protect the public interest by promoting the fair and equitable treatment of insurance consumers.

The idea for NARAB is now 14 years old. We have literally been working on it for that long, and I am hoping we can get this legislation across the finish line today.

These are two important amendments that will come forward today with regard to the TRIA legislation, and there are several more. As we move forward today I am hopeful we will make the kind of progress on these important and critical issues that will enable us to not only pass this legislation but to do so with a strong vote here in the Senate and then get us into a conference with the House so we can put this important legislation, which has been developed on a bipartisan basis, on the President's desk.

Far too often we are seeing gridlock in this Chamber. We have two pieces of legislation today where we have a bipartisan agreement and bipartisan support, and I think it is a good day for the Senate to see this kind of legislation moving forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. President. Let me join my friend Senator CRAPO in congratulating the leadership on both the Republican and Democratic side and the leadership on the banking committee for bringing this bill before us this morning. It is, unfortunately, all too rare when we can bring a piece of legislation to the floor that has been worked on by both sides of the aisle and has broad agreement on both sides of the aisle. Of course, as the Senator from Idaho knows, there is nothing partisan about the effects of not reauthorizing TRIA. This is going to affect every part of the country. Republicans and Democrats, people of liberal and conservative persuasions, will ultimately be paying a lot more and losing a lot more because of our failure to get this bill done. So let me again thank Senator CRAPO and Senator JOHNSON for all the work they have done. I was one of the original cointroducers of this bill, along with Senator SCHUMER and Senator REID, as well as Senators MENENDEZ, WARNER, KIRK, HELLER, JOHANNS, and BLUNT.

Ultimately, we were educated by what happened in the weeks and months following September 11. In that period of time, the real estate market in large parts of this country—certainly in my part of the country surrounding New York City—collapsed. As a result, $15 billion worth of projects stalled overnight, and we lost about 300,000 construction jobs that were planned to come online—all because the insurance industry decided, with justification, that they could no longer insure for the risk of terrorism. Prior to September 11 we got coverage for terrorism essentially at no cost. But after September 11, again, for good reason, for good cause, insurers, without knowing what their exposure was going to be should there be another attack, decided they could no longer insure for that risk. So, in this sense, it logically fell to the Federal Government to provide that assurance that no matter where one is—whether in Idaho or Nebraska or Connecticut or New Jersey—if a person is building a project and they were the subject of terrorism, they would get a backstop of protection for those losses.

Some said at the time: Why don't we treat insurance, when it comes to protecting for terrorism, the same as we protect against other disasters? Of course, we see these threats as fundamentally different. We can make a decision as to whether we want to live in a part of the country that may be subject to greater risk from floods or hurricanes. So we have grown to accept the fact that we are going to pay a little bit more if we are going to have a house or a business right on the water. And we have a program here by which we mitigate that risk so that it is not extraordinarily different, understanding there is still good reason why people have to congregate in those spaces. But a terrorist attack, frankly, whether it happens in New York City right on the precipice of Connecticut, or in Los Angeles or in a rural environment in the Midwest, is an attack on the United States of America. That is an attack on all of us, no matter what specific geography in which it happens to be located. So that is why we made the decision as a Nation to help backstop those localities that may feel the initial burden of having to reconstruct after a terrorism attack, because we believe it is a national responsibility.

So for the practical reason that there was no longer an ability for the insurance industry to calculate how on Earth they would assess a premium based on the enormous potential loss of a terrorist event, and because of the fact that as Americans we felt as though we should come together and insure against this risk, we passed TRIA initially. Over time we have come together as Republicans and Democrats to reauthorize it.

Now, as time has gone on, we have had a conversation about how to best share this responsibility between the public sector and the private sector, because we expect that private insurers still should, as is their business, pick up some of this cost. So this version of the bill continues along the line of transferring some of this responsibility from the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayers to private insurers. For instance, the underlying legislation continues to have a 20-percent deductible. But after that 20-percent deductible is met, under the previous version of the bill the insurer was responsible for picking up 15 percent of the cost. Under this bill they are going to pick up 20 percent of the cost. So there is a little bit more responsibility built in for the cost of paying out claims after a terrorist attack is picked up by insurers.

There is a provision in the bill which says the Federal Treasury will recoup the costs from insurers of any claims it pays out. It can do that over a long period of time. Previously, it was mandatory to recoup all of that money for claims under $27 billion. Now that number is $37 billion. So we now have a mandatory return to the Treasury of any claims under $37 billion, which is an additional protection for taxpayers as well as an additional responsibility for insurers now because we will collect from the insurers for losses up to a higher amount than the previous law. I think all of this is pretty reasonable.

I wish there were more days such as this and weeks such as this—although maybe TRIA isn't infused with the same kind of politics that other issues such as immigration reform and energy reform and criminal justice reform can be—but this was made possible by some really hard work by a number of people who knew this was right to do for the country. Speaking as a Senator from a State that has a big stake in the reauthorization of TRIA, I say thank you to all of the people who made this possible and give an advanced shout-out to the House of Representatives which we hope will pass this bipartisan bill in an expeditious manner. Connecticut cares about this because we were, as I said, on the edge of the attack of September 11. We lost dozens and dozens of Connecticut residents in that attack. Our economy was effectively shut down because of the inability to assess this risk throughout the real estate sector surrounding New York City. But we also are home to some of the biggest and, frankly, most responsible property and casualty insurers. The Hartford and Travelers, in particular, have been a big part of trying to figure out a public-private partnership to solve this problem, and this certainly helps them to be able to provide more of a very important product to the rest of the country.

So, again, my thanks to all of those who made this piece of legislation possible. My hope is we get a big vote later today across the aisle, sending a message to the House of Representatives

that they can take this bipartisan piece of legislation, pass it, and then get it to the President's desk. Then we can, once again, give some sense of surety to our insurance markets and our real estate market that the United States of America is, once again, going to step up and decide that terrorism, no matter where it happens—whether it is in New York City or in Topeka—is not going to get this country back.

I yield the floor, and I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3550

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to temporarily set aside the pending amendment so that I may call up my amendment No. 3550, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. VITTER] proposes an amendment numbered 3550.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To reaffirm the importance of community banking and community banking regulatory experience on the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, to ensure the Federal Reserve Board of Governors has a member who has previous experience in community banking or community banking supervision)

On page 13, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 8. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than $10,000,000,000 in total assets.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I rise to talk about this amendment which I look forward to being adopted on this important terrorism risk insurance reauthorization bill. It is a commonsense amendment. It is about the Federal Reserve Board, and it says at least one member of that important Board should have significant experience as a community banker or a community bank supervisor.

This used to be commonplace because community banks—smaller institutions—were and are an important part of our financial system. In fact, these days it is one part of our financial system that sets us apart from many others, such as Canada and Europe, which are far more dominated by mega-institutions. Of course, the United States has some very big institutions, and they serve an important role and they have an important place, but smaller institutions, so-called community banks, serve a vital role as well and particularly in smaller communities and in more rural areas they serve those communities in a way megabanks simply do not.

I have been looking at this trend on the Federal Reserve, and unfortunately there is an unmistakable trend away from having adequate representation from folks with community bank experience; that same trend has been toward having the Federal Reserve Board completely dominated by academics and folks with megabank and academic economist experience.

This chart I have in the Chamber shows that trend. From 1936 until the present, it goes decade by decade. The chart is a little busy, and we have this color coding here, but basically we can see this huge growth in the domination of this red category: folks with pure academic economic experience. Folks with community bank experience, which used to actually dominate the Federal Reserve Board several decades ago, are now very limited.

Look, there is nothing wrong with folks with academic experience, but it should not be so dominant on the Federal Reserve and we should have regular representation from community banks or community bank supervisors because that is a vital part of our banking system.

My amendment is therefore very simple. It would mandate that at least one member of the Federal Reserve Board have that experience, have direct community bank experience or have direct experience as a community bank supervisor. Specifically, we are talking about institutions with less than $10 billion in total assets.

This bill follows a letter several of my colleagues joined me in sending to President Obama. We were asking him to nominate an individual with that sort of experience, and I thank the cosigners on that letter: Senators TESTER, MORAN, MERKLEY, COBURN, and JOHANNS on the committee; and noncommittee Members Senators HIRONO, KING, FRANKEN, BALDWIN, BEGICH, LANDRIEU, HEINRICH, and UDALL.

We seem to be making progress in that regard. There is widespread reporting that the White House is considering a list of candidates for the Federal Reserve with community banking experience. But this specific mandate—just one member, a very modest mandate—would help ensure that happens and would help ensure that regularly happens into the future to reverse this trend, to get more balance on the Federal Reserve Board.

This is very important in the context of the too-big-to-fail debate. Too big to fail helped lead to the crisis several years ago in the banking industry. It helped lead to the massive bailouts of mega-institutions, and unfortunately I am one who believes—and there are many others—that too big to fail is alive and well today, and in some ways Dodd-Frank institutionalized too big to fail. It did not end too big to fail in any way.

We need to do a number of things to even the playing field, to make it fairer for smaller institutions, community banks that serve our smaller communities in rural areas, particularly on the Federal Reserve Board, which is such a significant governing and supervisory board in our banking industry.

I specifically thank the ranking member of the committee, Senator CRAPO, for his support of this concept, his support in negotiations of this amendment, and his very active involvement in getting this amendment accepted on to the TRIA bill.

I think the ranking member may have a few words about this and other matters. I will relinquish the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I will just take a moment to speak about Senator VITTER's amendment, which I strongly support.

During Dr. Yellen's nomination hearing, I noted the need to fill additional vacancies at the Federal Reserve Board with individuals bringing balanced viewpoints. The President should nominate someone with community bank experience to the Board to fill at least one of the remaining vacancies.

Community banks play an important role in their local economies and face a disproportionate burden from our existing regulations. We should ensure that the perspective of these banks is represented in policymaking. That is what this amendment does, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, just one final wrapup issue. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter of support for this amendment from ICBA, the Independent Community Bankers of America.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 17, 2014.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the Independent Community Bankers of America and the more than 6,500 community banks nationwide, I write to urge you to vote YES on Amendment 3550, offered by Senator David Vitter, to the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (S. 2244). This amendment would ensure at least one member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve (the Board) has experience as a community banker or as a supervisor of community banks. The Board not only plays

a key role in our economy by promoting employment and stable prices, but is also an important regulatory body for the U.S. and global financial system. A broad range of representation on the Board is critical to its effectiveness.

Community banks are vitally important to the nation's economy, particularly with respect to small business lending and providing banking services in small and rural communities. These banks and the communities they serve have vital interests at stake in the economic, banking, and payment system issues that come before the Board. The Board must consider how best to tier regulation to meet regulatory objectives without disproportionately impacting community banks. Expertise is also required to ensure that regulations intended for the largest banks do not unintentionally sweep in community banks. The unexpected compliance problems associated with the December 2013 Volcker Rule vividly illustrate this risk.

By requiring community bank representation on the Board, Senator Vitter's amendment will help secure the future of the community banking industry and the customers and communities that depend on it. Again, ICBA urges you to vote YES on this important amendment.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

CAMDEN R. FINE,
President and CEO.

Mr. VITTER. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 3549

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendment be set aside and my amendment No. 3549 be called up.

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

The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. COBURN] proposes an amendment numbered 3549.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To allow the Secretary to extend the deadline for collecting terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums if the mandatory recoupment is morethan $1,000,000,000)

On page 4, line 21, strike ''(i)''.

On page 4, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

(i) in clause (i)—

On page 4, line 22, strike ''(i)'' and insert ''(I)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 4, line 23, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)''and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 1, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 3, strike ''(ii)'' and insert ''(II)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 4, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 6, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 8, strike ''(III)'' and insert ''(cc)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 10, strike ''(iii)'' and insert ''(III)'' and move such subclause 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 11, strike ''(I)'' and insert ''(aa)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 13, strike ''(II)'' and insert ''(bb)'' and move such item 2 ems to the right.

On page 5, line 14, strike the period at the end and insert ''; and''.

On page 5, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) DEADLINE EXTENSIONS.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—If the mandatory recoupment amount under subparagraph (A) is more than $1,000,000,000 in any given calendar year, the Secretary may extend the applicable deadline for collecting terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums under clause (i) for a period not to exceed more than 10 years after the date on which such act of terrorism occurred.

''(II) DETERMINATION.—Any determination by the Secretary to grant an extension under subclause (I) shall be based on—

''(aa) the economic conditions in the commercial marketplace, including the capitalization, profitability, and investment returns of the insurance industry and the current cycle of the insurance markets;

''(bb) the affordability of commercial insurance for small- and medium-sized businesses; and

''(cc) such other factors as the Secretary considers appropriate.

''(III) REPORT.—If the Secretary grants an extension under subclause (I), the Secretary shall promptly submit to Congress a report—

''(aa) justifying the reason for such extension; and

''(bb) detailing a plan for the collection of the required terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums.''.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. President, we have before us a bill where unfortunately we do not believe in markets. We are told markets will not work, so we have a terrorism risk insurance bill. That means the Federal Government is going to be the insurer of last resort. There have been some improvements over what we have put forward in the past, and I agree with those improvements if in fact we have to do this. I am not convinced we have to do it, but we are going to do it, and I understand that. I think the work of the committee, of which I am a member, has been very good.

But there is one real problem with this bill, and it is about smoke and mirrors, it is about not being honest with the American people. This bill was designed so it would have no score. It was not designed to do the best we can for America should we have a tragedy, and it was not designed to create the flexibility that would be necessary if we do have a tragedy.

Let me outline this for you. The way this bill is set up is that we could have a significant tragedy, God forbid, in this country from a terrorist attack, and the bill will mandate spikes in casualty and property insurance far above what will need to happen because we passed the bill to pass a CBO score. So what could happen is we would have to collect billions of dollars over an 18-month period through premium increases on everybody in the country, not just where we had the problem—everybody in the country—because we have designed a bill that will in fact mandate that or at least could mandate that.

I have been around this place for 10 years. I know exactly what is going to happen if that comes about through this TRIA bill. The first thing that will happen is the Senate and the House will pass an elimination of this requirement. So what will happen is the American taxpayer will get stuck with all this. They all know that. Everybody agrees they designed the bill to meet CBO. So what I put in was an amendment that would give flexibility to the Treasury so we do not, after one tragedy, create another tragedy with markedly elevated casualty and property rates. We still recoup the money, but we do it over a longer period of time, if it is necessary, and we give the Secretary of the Treasury the ability to do that.

My friend from New York says there is a budget point of order that lies against it. It does according to CBO. I agree, it does. But the difference between this and most budget points of order is my amendment will not increase the deficit one penny—not one penny.

I would also note that my colleague from New York has voted to override budget points of order every time they have been offered this year. So it is going to be curious to me to all of a sudden have a budget point of order raised by someone who has voted to override the budget point of order every time it has been offered in the Senate this session, and it goes to why we should not pass this bill without common sense in terms of how we collect the recoupment.

I understand the constraints of CBO, but I also understand common sense. So we are going to play the game on the constraints, and we are ultimately going to pass on—rather than recoup—we are ultimately going to pass it on to the American taxpayer, which hollows out the whole purpose of the bill.

So this has a billion-dollar score, on which we are going to have a point of order, which I am sure I will lose. But when you vote for this bill, know you are not voting for what the bill says it is going to do because it is going to do something completely different than what it says, if we were to have one of these catastrophies.

The political pressure to not have these massive increases in property and casualty insurance—this place will fall, and so will the House, and we will change this, and we will have the score then. We will have the score then, and ultimately your children will pay for the cost of this terrorism risk insurance, not the people who are owning the property today, not the insurance company. We will just kick the can down the road, just as we have on everything else.

It would seem to me that we would want to do something that works along

the parameters of this bill, and we ought to build in flexibility to this bill so that—it may be 10 years that we get on one of these because the bill is divided up to meet the score so it does not score in any one period. So over an 18-month period we could have to recoup it all and people could not tolerate those kinds of rate increases in their businesses or their homes. They would not be able to tolerate it and we would change it. Just as I am asking for us to change it now and be honest with the American people, we are going to change it if that happens.

We will change this, and we will delay the onset of the collection of this recoupment. Everybody knows that will happen. So why not be honest about it and put it in the bill now and waive the budget point of order because it does not change the deficit one penny. It changes when we collect it, but we still collect it against the risk of not collecting it at all.

That is what I ask my colleagues. I do not expect to win the amendment, but it is another confirmation to the American people that we are not about truth, we are not about doing commonsense things; we are about playing games and we are about satisfying the demands of the industry over which this applies.

Nobody knows what could happen in this country in terms of terrorism, but everybody knows I am right about this issue.

All I am saying is: Fess up. Be honest, colleagues. Let's build the flexibility in this so we do not have to address it, and the Treasury Secretary, no matter whether it is a Democrat or Republican administration, can use common sense to guide about how fast this recoupment will come; otherwise, you have not done anything to improve this bill if, in fact, this is not accepted.

I will be leaving here at the end of the year. Hopefully, we never see another terrorism event in this country. But if we do, it will be a sweet irony when you all say: Oops, time out. We are not going to do what we said we were going to do in that bill because the country cannot take it. What you will do is put one tragic event on top of another. You will not do that. So what will happen? You will change this bill. You will get that score. You will call it an emergency. You will do it anyway.

All I am asking is, be honest about what is going to ultimately happen on this should we have an event and it fall within one of these close parameters, based on what we said in the bill, because we are running the bill according to what CBO says, not as to what common sense is.

I look forward to having a vote on this amendment. I understand my likelihood of being successful. But I also understand the lack of honesty in dealing with the American people if we do not accept this amendment.

I yield the floor.

TERRORIST ATTACKS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues to speak about S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, TRIA, which I have cosponsored.

First, I commend Banking Committee Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO for their leadership on this important issue. Their efforts, along with those of the sponsors and cosponsors of the bill, led to a unanimous committee vote of 22 to 0 to report the legislation favorably to the full Senate. It is heartening to see legislation like this come together on such a strong bipartisan basis.

Reauthorizing TRIA is vital and not just from a Banking Committee perspective. I also have the privilege of serving on the Armed Services Committee. It is through this dual lens, and from what we know of the significant terrorist threats our Nation still faces, that compels me to believe that we need to reauthorize TRIA as soon as possible.

We must keep markets effectively and efficiently operating in light of these threats. We must continue to have policies in place to make sure our economy stays on track in the event of another attack on our Nation.

In short, reauthorizing TRIA is not only a matter of economic security; it is also a matter of national security. And so, I again thank the chairman for his leadership on this vital issue.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I thank Senator REED for his valuable contributions to the work of the Banking Committee. I also thank him for working with me on this matter and for his continued efforts to bolster our national security.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman. I would like to clarify one point. While TRIA is silent on whether a nuclear, chemical, biological, or radiological related terrorist attack or any kind of cyber-related attack are covered, I believe our intent with S. 2244 is that these attacks would continue to fall within the scope of TRIA's covered lines, as they do today, provided that statutory prerequisites are met. Does the chairman agree with this assessment?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes. The Committee makes this point clear in the Committee Report for S. 2244, and I thank the Senator again for his work on this issue.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman again, and I look forward to swift passage of this legislation here in the Senate, and hopefully in the House as well.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today I commend my colleagues for a strong bipartisan vote in favor of S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act.

After the attacks of September 11, 2001, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act, or TRIA, helped stabilize the commercial property market. This has allowed for continued commercial property development and real estate lending for office buildings, hotels, malls, and tourist attractions across the United States. In Florida, TRIA has been particularly important for continued development in the tourism sector—which is a critical part of the economy.

The passage of S. 2244 today illustrates the widespread, continued support for TRIA and the need for a backstop to guarantee sufficient capacity for businesses to insure against catastrophic terrorist events, including coverage for events involving a nuclear, biological, chemical or radiological element. At the same time, S. 2244 also ensures that taxpayers are a top priority and includes a recoupment mechanism to guarantee that taxpayers are made whole if the backstop is triggered.

I now hope that the House of Representatives will take quick action on S. 2244 so that the President can sign this legislation and assure continued stability in the commercial property and insurance market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, I rise today to support S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. Congress first enacted TRIA into law in 2002 after the commercial property sector saw major disruptions in the ability to obtain financing and terrorism risk insurance following the September 11 terrorist attacks.

TRIA stabilized the markets and provided a government backstop to these unique markets, allowing commercial property development and real estate lending to continue for everything from hotels, stadiums, malls, to tourist attractions across the country. Experts and stakeholders testified at several banking committee hearings that there remains a clear and longstanding need for the kind of government backstop TRIA provides.

We also learned the private insurance market for terrorism risk exists because of TRIA, not in spite of it.

The long-term 7-year extension this bipartisan bill provides will promote national security, economic growth, and market certainty. While many Members in this Chamber would be fine with extending TRIA in its current form, this tough compromise has two additional changes that will further protect taxpayers: gradually raising both the insurer copayment from 15 percent to 20 percent, and the mandatory recoupment threshold from $27.5 billion to $37.5 billion.

We were careful, however, in reaching this compromise not to raise the trigger, which would drive small insurers out of the market and reduce the availability and affordability of coverage for businesses nationwide. This bipartisan bill also does not pick what modes of terrorist attacks should get preferential treatment over other forms of attacks.

The entire Senate banking committee voted to report the bill to the floor by a unanimous and bipartisan 22-to-0 vote. Stakeholders across the board strongly support the Senate's bipartisan approach to extending TRIA,

including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Hotel and Lodging Association, the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, and the Real Estate Roundtable, to name just a few.

Let me commend Senators SCHUMER, CRAPO, KIRK, REED, HELLER, and others from both sides of the aisle for their leadership on this issue. I thank them as well as their staffs for working with Ranking Member CRAPO and me and our staffs to craft this bipartisan compromise to extend TRIA for another 7 years. We would not be here today without all of their efforts.

TRIA must be renewed soon, given the program expires at the end of the year, and policyholders have increasingly reported challenges in renewing contracts for 2015. To that end, I urge my colleagues to support S. 2244.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HELLER. 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. HELLER. Mr. President, I rise to speak on S. 2244, the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act. This is a bill I have worked on closely with my colleagues Senators SCHUMER, KIRK, and REED from Rhode Island. I also want to thank Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CRAPO, who have been instrumental in getting this bill to this point. Without their leadership, we would not be here today.

The terrorist attacks on September 11 caused a sudden and dramatic shock in the domestic market for terrorism insurance. After the attack there was a tremendous amount of uncertainty about the frequency and potential size of future attacks. Insurers quickly withdrew from the terrorist coverage market, and a new threat to our economy emerged.

In response, Congress passed TRIA, to provide a Federal insurance backstop for terrorism coverage. Since the passage in 2002, TRIA has helped ensure the widespread availability of affordable insurance against terrorism. This helped spur new development and protected existing real estate throughout our country.

TRIA was reauthorized in 2005 and reauthorized again in 2007. It is currently set to expire at the end of this year unless Congress acts. Unfortunately, the tragic bombing in Boston last year has shown that even years after September 11, the threat of terrorism still exists and we must continue our efforts to prevent, respond, and recover from any possible attacks in the future.

I wish to remind my colleagues that terrorism is not only an issue for big cities in New Jersey, on the east coast, in the Midwest, Chicago, terrorism is a real threat in both rural and urban areas, north, south, east, and west. That is why I have been so involved in trying to get TRIA extended.

In my home State, Las Vegas is considered one of the leading international business and tourism destination cities in the world. Southern Nevada welcomes almost 40 million tourists annually and has a population of nearly 2 million people. We have 35 major hotels along the Las Vegas strip. Many of them could have up to 15,000 occupants at any given time. According to the Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce, in 2013, the total economic impact of tourism was $45.2 billion, supporting 47 percent of the region's gross product, and 383,000 jobs, nearly half of the total workforce in southern Nevada.

My point in citing these statistics is if a terrorist attack were to occur in Las Vegas, our entire State economy would be devastated without TRIA.

It is not just about Las Vegas. In northern Nevada, our tourism and gaming industry is the largest private employer in Washoe County, which also includes Reno. They know that unless they have access to affordable terrorism coverage, they will have difficulty starting new capital projects and creating new jobs.

You will find similar stories across our Nation in every State. Currently, there is no evidence that the terrorism risk insurance market is prepared to provide coverage without TRIA. Without TRIA, most developments would halt because businesses would not be able to access and afford the necessary insurance that is often required to secure a loan.

TRIA has helped many hotels, hospitals, office complexes, shopping centers, colleges, and universities have access to terrorism insurance coverage.

The bill before us today is truly a bipartisan bill. It received a unanimous 22-to-0 vote in the banking committee. Such a strong vote only reinforces the bipartisan work that went into crafting this legislation.

I, along with my colleagues on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, agreed to several key reforms that would increase the insurance industry's aggregate retention level and coinsurance levels, which will significantly reduce the potential cost to taxpayers.

It is my hope that we can easily pass this important legislation with a strong bipartisan vote and send this bill to the House as soon as possible. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and let's not wait until the end of the year to extend this critical program.

With that, I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, as we near the votes on this bill, I wish to take one more opportunity to speak in favor of the TRIA reauthorization legislation.

Again, I thank Senators SCHUMER, HELLER, and KIRK and their staffs and Senator REED for all their hard work in bringing forward this legislation.

I also thank Chairman JOHNSON and his staff for moving forward so quickly and aggressively on this legislation. Together, we were able to put together a bill that allows the program to continue to function while increasing the movement toward ultimate taxpayer protection.

As I mentioned before, we were able to approve this bill out of committee with a 22-to-0 unanimous vote. The agreement of all the members of the banking committee that we should move this bill forward speaks to the importance of this critical legislation and to the level of the added taxpayer protections we were able to build into it.

Our bill increases the level of losses that the private sector will absorb before reaching the Federal backstop. We do that by increasing the coinsurance level of any company participating in TRIA so that each company will shoulder a greater percentage of the losses. We also increase by $10 billion the level of mandatory post-event recoupments to $37.5 billion, which means that the taxpayer will ultimately recover all TRIA losses except in the most extreme events.

This bill will continue a program that reduces our economic vulnerability to terrorism, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

One last time, I thank Senator JOHNSON and Senator SCHUMER for their strong support and for our ability to work together and break the mold, if you will, by having a bipartisan movement forward on this important and critical legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Once again I thank the chair and the ranking member of the banking committee, TIM JOHNSON and MIKE CRAPO, for their great work.

I say to my colleagues, this is a very good example of much cooperation—bipartisan cooperation, Democrat and Republican—a 22-to-0 unanimous vote out of the committee. It is also cooperation between private industry and the government. Industry, insurance, and others knew they had to shoulder a greater share of the load as we move on after 9/11 but that only government could be the backstop at the end of the day.

Again, this is an economic development issue above anything else. It is not out of whose pocket what money comes. If the greatest problem America faces is good-paying jobs—well, if we were not to renew terrorism insurance, we would lose many good-paying jobs.

This amendment will allow those jobs to continue and grow. People will

not build major edifices, major complexes—whether they be skyscrapers in Chicago or New York, whether they be football stadiums in Idaho or South Carolina or major shopping centers in South Dakota—unless they know there is a backstop, because insurers will not insure if they think terrorism could just totally wipe them out. And that means we wouldn't get financing for these projects.

It is an outstanding piece of legislation. My hope, in conclusion, is that the House would pass our bill. We know there are some concerns in the House, but there is a bipartisan coalition of Democrats and Republicans who really favor the approach we have taken. I know there are some in the House who don't believe government should be involved here, but that is, with all due respect, a purist view.

We have cut back on some of the government's obligations. MIKE CRAPO and many of our colleagues from the other side of the aisle made that happen. But at the same time, without the government backstop, we would do real harm to our economy.

I hope we can get a very large vote in the Senate—bipartisan—because if we do, it should importune the House to perhaps pass our legislation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to make a couple points on the Coburn amendment, and then I will raise a point of order.

The current bill, S. 2244, is budget neutral, as the past TRIA bills have been. On the other hand, CBO has said Senator COBURN's amendment is not fully paid for, violating the Senate's PAYGO rule.

Basically, the amendment—even though I know the sponsor does not intend it that way—is a killer amendment. CBO has said the amendment would cause S. 2244 to increase the Federal deficit in both the 5-year and 10-year budget windows.

Senator COBURN offered this amendment in committee. It was roundly defeated by a bipartisan vote of 16 to 6 against it.

I appreciate Senator COBURN's effort to provide more flexibility to the timeframe for recoupment by the government in case of a terrorist attack, but in fact the banking committee, led by Senator JOHNSON, and my office have worked with CBO for a number of months to determine whether there could be more flexibility in the recoupment process. Unfortunately, CBO has yet to identify a way to provide more flexibility in the recoupment period while still ensuring the program remains budget neutral as it is now.

It is also important to note that if recoupment by the government poses any unforeseen challenge after a future attack, nothing would stop the Treasury Secretary from asking the Congress then to provide that flexibility.

The bottom line is that TRIA is too important to allow this amendment and nonreauthorization of the program because it is not budget neutral. We don't want to give anybody an excuse.

I am hopeful Senator COBURN will support TRIA's final passage, even if his amendment isn't agreed to, as he did in committee. But for those of us whose priority is to reauthorize this program, I urge my colleagues to vote to sustain the budget point of order and oppose the amendment.

Mr. President, I raise a point of order that the pending amendment violates section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the concurrent resolution on the budget for the fiscal year 2008.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, pursuant to section 904 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the waiver provisions of applicable budget resolutions, I move to waive all applicable sections of that act and applicable budget resolutions for purposes of the pending amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

All debate time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 229 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Ayotte	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Burr	Heller	Roberts
Chambliss	Hoeven	Rubio
Coats	Inhofe	Scott
Coburn	Isakson	Sessions
Cochran	Johanns	Shaheen
Collins	Johnson (WI)	Shelby
Corker	Kirk	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Cruz	McCain	Vitter
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Fischer	Moran	Wicker

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Bennet	Booker
Begich	Blumenthal	Boxer
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Pryor
Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Cardin	King	Reid
Carper	Klobuchar	Rockefeller
Casey	Landrieu	Sanders
Donnelly	Leahy	Schumer
Durbin	Levin	Stabenow
Feinstein	Markey	Tester
Franken	McCaskill	Udall (NM)
Gillibrand	Menendez	Walsh
Hagan	Merkley	Warren
Harkin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Murphy	Wyden
Heitkamp	Murray	
Hirono	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 48 and the nays are 49. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected and the amendment falls.

CHANGE OF VOTE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, on rollcall vote No. 229, I was present and voted aye. The official record has me listed as absent. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the official record be corrected to accurately reflect my vote. This will in no way change the outcome of the vote.

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

(The foregoing tally has been changed to reflect the above order.)

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3550

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to Vitter amendment No. 3550.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield back all time.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for a voice vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 3550) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to Flake amendment No. 3551.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. This is a good amendment and will be supported by Chairman JOHNSON and myself.

I yield back all time.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Leg.]

YEAS—97

Ayotte	Graham	Murphy
Baldwin	Grassley	Murray
Barrasso	Hagan	Nelson
Begich	Harkin	Paul
Bennet	Hatch	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Pryor
Blunt	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Heller	Reid
Boozman	Hirono	Risch
Boxer	Hoeven	Roberts
Brown	Inhofe	Rockefeller
Burr	Isakson	Rubio
Cantwell	Johanns	Sanders
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Sessions
Chambliss	King	Shaheen
Coats	Kirk	Shelby
Coburn	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cochran	Landrieu	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Corker	Lee	Toomey
Cornyn	Levin	Udall (CO)
Crapo	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Cruz	Markey	Vitter
Donnelly	McCain	Walsh
Durbin	McCaskill	Warner
Enzi	McConnell	Warren
Feinstein	Menendez	Whitehouse
Fischer	Merkley	Wicker
Flake	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Moran	
Gillibrand	Murkowski	

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The amendment (No. 3551) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 3552

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate prior to a vote in relation to the Tester amendment No. 3552.

The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to Tester amendment No. 3552.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I yield back all time and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Thre is a sufficient second.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 231 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Ayotte	Gillibrand	Mikulski
Baldwin	Graham	Moran
Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Begich	Hagan	Murphy
Bennet	Harkin	Murray
Blumenthal	Hatch	Nelson
Blunt	Heinrich	Paul
Booker	Heitkamp	Portman
Boozman	Heller	Pryor
Boxer	Hirono	Reed
Brown	Hoeven	Reid
Burr	Inhofe	Risch
Cantwell	Isakson	Rockefeller
Cardin	Johanns	Sanders
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Casey	Johnson (WI)	Scott
Chambliss	Kaine	Shaheen
Coats	King	Shelby
Cochran	Kirk	Stabenow
Collins	Klobuchar	Tester
Corker	Landrieu	Thune
Cornyn	Leahy	Toomey
Crapo	Lee	Udall (CO)
Cruz	Levin	Udall (NM)
Donnelly	Manchin	Vitter
Durbin	Markey	Walsh
Enzi	McCain	Warner
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warren
Fischer	McConnell	Whitehouse
Flake	Menendez	Wicker
Franken	Merkley	Wyden

NAYS—4

Coburn	Rubio
Roberts	Sessions

NOT VOTING—3

Alexander	Coons	Schatz

The bill (S. 2244), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 2244

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF TERRORISM INSURANCE PROGRAM.

Section 108(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by striking ''December 31, 2014'' and inserting ''December 31, 2021''.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL SHARE.

Section 103(e)(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended by inserting ''and beginning on January 1, 2016, shall decrease by 1 percentage point per calendar year until equal to 80 percent'' after ''85 percent''.

SEC. 4. RECOUPMENT OF FEDERAL SHARE OF COMPENSATION UNDER THE PROGRAM.

Section 103(e) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''shall be'' and all that follows through subparagraph (E) and inserting ''shall be the lesser of—

''(A) $27,500,000,000, as such amount is adjusted pursuant to this paragraph; and

''(B) the aggregate amount, for all insurers, of insured losses during such calendar year,

provided that beginning in the calendar year that follows the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the amount set forth under subparagraph (A) shall increase by $2,000,000,000 per calendar year until equal to $37,500,000,000.'';

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''for each of the periods referred to in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6)''; and

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''for such period'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) [Reserved.]'';

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking ''occurring during any of the periods referred to in any of subparagraphs (A) through (E) of paragraph (6), terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 133 percent'' and inserting '', terrorism loss risk-spreading premiums in an amount equal to 135.5 percent''; and

(ii) by inserting ''as calculated under subparagraph (A)'' after ''mandatory recoupment amount''; and

(D) in subparagraph (E)(i)—

(i) in subclause (I)—

(I) by striking ''2010'' and inserting ''2017''; and

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019'';

(ii) in subclause (II)—

(I) by striking ''2011'' and inserting ''2018'';

(II) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(III) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''; and

(iii) in subclause (III)—

(I) by striking ''2012'' and inserting ''2019''; and

(II) by striking ''2017'' and inserting ''2024''.

SEC. 5. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

The Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) in section 102—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively;

(ii) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking ''An entity has'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity has''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—An entity, including any affiliate thereof, does not have 'control' over another entity, if, as of the date of enactment of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014, the entity is acting as an attorney-in-fact, as defined by the Secretary, for the other entity and such other entity is a reciprocal insurer, provided that the entity is not, for reasons other than the attorney-in-fact relationship, defined as having 'control' under subparagraph (A).'';

(B) in paragraph (7)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (F) and inserting the following:

''(A) the value of an insurer's direct earned premiums during the immediately preceding calendar year, multiplied by 20 percent; and'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (B); and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), as so redesignated by clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) through (F), for the Transition Period or any Program Year'' and inserting ''notwithstanding subparagraph (A), for any calendar year''; and

(II) by striking ''Period or Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(C) by striking paragraph (11); and

(D) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (16) as paragraphs (11) through (15), respectively; and

(2) in section 103—

(A) in subsection (c), by striking ''Program Year'' and inserting ''calendar year'';

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), as previously amended by section 3—

(aa) by striking ''the Transition Period and each Program Year through Program Year 4 shall be equal to 90 percent, and during Program Year 5 and each Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''each calendar year'';

(bb) by striking the comma after ''80 percent''; and

(cc) by striking ''such Transition Period or such Program Year'' and inserting ''such calendar year''; and

(II) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''exceed'' and all that follows through clause (ii) and inserting ''exceed $100,000,000 with respect to such insured losses occurring in the calendar year.'';

(ii) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any Program Year thereafter'' and inserting ''a calendar year''; and

(iii) in paragraph (3), by striking ''the period beginning on the first day of the Transition Period and ending on the last day of Program Year 1, or during any other Program Year'' and inserting ''any calendar year''; and

(C) in subsection (g)(2)—

(i) by striking ''the Transition Period or a Program Year'' each place that term appears and inserting ''the calendar year'';

(ii) by striking ''such period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''; and

(iii) by striking ''that period'' and inserting ''the calendar year''.

SEC. 6. IMPROVING THE CERTIFICATION PROCESS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''act of terrorism'' has the same meaning as in section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note);

(2) the term ''certification process'' means the process by which the Secretary determines whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism under section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note); and

(3) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall conduct and complete a study on the certification process.

(c) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall include an examination and analysis of—

(1) the establishment of a reasonable timeline by which the Secretary must make an accurate determination on whether to certify an act as an act of terrorism;

(2) the impact that the length of any timeline proposed to be established under paragraph (1) may have on the insurance industry, policyholders, consumers, and taxpayers as a whole;

(3) the factors the Secretary would evaluate and monitor during the certification process, including the ability of the Secretary to obtain the required information regarding the amount of projected and incurred losses resulting from an act which the Secretary would need in determining whether to certify the act as an act of terrorism;

(4) the appropriateness, efficiency, and effectiveness of the consultation process required under section 102(1)(A) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) and any recommendations on changes to the consultation process; and

(5) the ability of the Secretary to provide guidance and updates to the public regarding any act that may reasonably be certified as an act of terrorism.

(d) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(e) RULEMAKING.—Section 102(1) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) TIMING OF CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 9 months after the report required under section 6 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 is submitted to the appropriate committees of Congress, the Secretary shall issue final rules governing the certification process, including any timeline applicable to any certification by the Secretary on whether an act is an act of terrorism under this paragraph.''.

SEC. 7. GAO STUDY ON UPFRONT PREMIUMS.

(a) STUDY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall complete a study on the viability and effects of the Federal Government assessing and collecting upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''Program'').

(b) REQUIRED CONTENT.—The study required under subsection (a) shall examine, but shall not be limited to, the following issues:

(1) How the Federal Government could determine the price of such upfront premiums on insurers that participate in the Program.

(2) How the Federal Government could collect and manage such upfront premiums.

(3) How the Federal Government could ensure that such upfront premiums are not spent for purposes other than claims through the Program.

(4) How the assessment and collection of such upfront premiums could affect take-up rates for terrorism risk coverage in different regions and industries and how it could impact small businesses and consumers in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas.

(5) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on insurers both large and small.

(6) The effect of collecting such upfront premiums on the private market for terrorism risk reinsurance.

(7) The size of any Federal Government subsidy insurers may receive through their participation in the Program, taking into account the Program's current post-event recoupment structure.

(c) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report on the results of such study to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

(d) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The study and report required under this section shall be made available to the public in electronic form and shall be published on the website of the Government Accountability Office.

SEC. 8. MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The first undesignated paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 241) is amended by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''In selecting members of the Board, the President shall appoint at least 1 member with demonstrated primary experience working in or supervising community banks having less than $10,000,000,000 in total assets.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and apply to appointments made on and after that effective date, excluding any nomination pending in the Senate on that date.

SEC. 9. ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.

(a) FINDING; RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—

(1) FINDING.—Congress finds that it is desirable to encourage the growth of nongovernmental, private market reinsurance capacity for protection against losses arising from acts of terrorism.

(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act, any amendment made by this Act, or the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (15 U.S.C. 6701 note) shall prohibit insurers from developing risk-sharing mechanisms to voluntarily reinsure terrorism losses between and among themselves.

(b) ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RISK-SHARING MECHANISMS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall establish and appoint an advisory committee to be known as the ''Advisory Committee on Risk-Sharing Mechanisms'' (referred to in this subsection as the ''Advisory Committee'').

(2) DUTIES.—The Advisory Committee shall provide advice, recommendations, and encouragement with respect to the creation and development of the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a).

(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of 9 members who are directors, officers, or other employees of insurers, reinsurers, or capital market participants that are participating or that desire to participate in the nongovernmental risk-sharing mechanisms described under subsection (a), and who are representative of the affected sectors of the insurance industry, including commercial property insurance, commercial casualty insurance, reinsurance, and alternative risk transfer industries.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on January 1, 2015.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014''.

SEC. 202. REESTABLISHMENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title III of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6751 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

"SEC. 321. NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REGISTERED AGENTS AND BROKERS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Association').

''(b) STATUS.—The Association shall—

''(1) be a nonprofit corporation;

''(2) not be an agent or instrumentality of the Federal Government;

''(3) be an independent organization that may not be merged with or into any other private or public entity; and

''(4) except as otherwise provided in this subtitle, be subject to, and have all the powers conferred upon, a nonprofit corporation

by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act (D.C. Code, sec. 29–301.01 et seq.) or any successor thereto.

"SEC. 322. PURPOSE.

''The purpose of the Association shall be to provide a mechanism through which licensing, continuing education, and other nonresident insurance producer qualification requirements and conditions may be adopted and applied on a multi-state basis without affecting the laws, rules, and regulations, and preserving the rights of a State, pertaining to—

''(1) licensing, continuing education, and other qualification requirements of insurance producers that are not members of the Association;

''(2) resident or nonresident insurance producer appointment requirements;

''(3) supervising and disciplining resident and nonresident insurance producers;

''(4) establishing licensing fees for resident and nonresident insurance producers so that there is no loss of insurance producer licensing revenue to the State; and

''(5) prescribing and enforcing laws and regulations regulating the conduct of resident and nonresident insurance producers.

"SEC. 323. MEMBERSHIP.

''(a) ELIGIBILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any insurance producer licensed in its home State shall, subject to paragraphs (2) and (4), be eligible to become a member of the Association.

''(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR SUSPENSION OR REVOCATION OF LICENSE.—Subject to paragraph (3), an insurance producer is not eligible to become a member of the Association if a State insurance regulator has suspended or revoked the insurance license of the insurance producer in that State.

''(3) RESUMPTION OF ELIGIBILITY.—Paragraph (2) shall cease to apply to any insurance producer if—

''(A) the State insurance regulator reissues or renews the license of the insurance producer in the State in which the license was suspended or revoked, or otherwise terminates or vacates the suspension or revocation; or

''(B) the suspension or revocation expires or is subsequently overturned by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(4) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUIRED.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—An insurance producer who is an individual shall not be eligible to become a member of the Association unless the insurance producer has undergone a criminal history record check that complies with regulations prescribed by the Attorney General of the United States under subparagraph (K).

''(B) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY HOME STATE.—An insurance producer who is licensed in a State and who has undergone a criminal history record check during the 2-year period preceding the date of submission of an application to become a member of the Association, in compliance with a requirement to undergo such criminal history record check as a condition for such licensure in the State, shall be deemed to have undergone a criminal history record check for purposes of subparagraph (A).

''(C) CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORD CHECK REQUESTED BY ASSOCIATION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall, upon request by an insurance producer licensed in a State, submit fingerprints or other identification information obtained from the insurance producer, and a request for a criminal history record check of the insurance producer, to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(ii) PROCEDURES.—The board of directors of the Association (referred to in this subtitle as the 'Board') shall prescribe procedures for obtaining and utilizing fingerprints or other identification information and criminal history record information, including the establishment of reasonable fees to defray the expenses of the Association in connection with the performance of a criminal history record check and appropriate safeguards for maintaining confidentiality and security of the information. Any fees charged pursuant to this clause shall be separate and distinct from those charged by the Attorney General pursuant to subparagraph (I).

''(D) FORM OF REQUEST.—A submission under subparagraph (C)(i) shall include such fingerprints or other identification information as is required by the Attorney General concerning the person about whom the criminal history record check is requested, and a statement signed by the person authorizing the Attorney General to provide the information to the Association and for the Association to receive the information.

''(E) PROVISION OF INFORMATION BY ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Upon receiving a submission under subparagraph (C)(i) from the Association, the Attorney General shall search all criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including records of the Criminal Justice Information Services Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that the Attorney General determines appropriate for criminal history records corresponding to the fingerprints or other identification information provided under subparagraph (D) and provide all criminal history record information included in the request to the Association.

''(F) LIMITATION ON PERMISSIBLE USES OF INFORMATION.—Any information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) may only—

''(i) be used for purposes of determining compliance with membership criteria established by the Association;

''(ii) be disclosed to State insurance regulators, or Federal or State law enforcement agencies, in conformance with applicable law; or

''(iii) be disclosed, upon request, to the insurance producer to whom the criminal history record information relates.

''(G) PENALTY FOR IMPROPER USE OR DISCLOSURE.—Whoever knowingly uses any information provided under subparagraph (E) for a purpose not authorized in subparagraph (F), or discloses any such information to anyone not authorized to receive it, shall be fined not more than $50,000 per violation as determined by a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(H) RELIANCE ON INFORMATION.—Neither the Association nor any of its Board members, officers, or employees shall be liable in any action for using information provided under subparagraph (E) as permitted under subparagraph (F) in good faith and in reasonable reliance on its accuracy.

''(I) FEES.—The Attorney General may charge a reasonable fee for conducting the search and providing the information under subparagraph (E), and any such fee shall be collected and remitted by the Association to the Attorney General.

''(J) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed as—

''(i) requiring a State insurance regulator to perform criminal history record checks under this section; or

''(ii) limiting any other authority that allows access to criminal history records.

''(K) REGULATIONS.—The Attorney General shall prescribe regulations to carry out this paragraph, which shall include—

''(i) appropriate protections for ensuring the confidentiality of information provided under subparagraph (E); and

''(ii) procedures providing a reasonable opportunity for an insurance producer to contest the accuracy of information regarding the insurance producer provided under subparagraph (E).

''(L) INELIGIBILITY FOR MEMBERSHIP.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Association may, under reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to an insurance producer on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E), or where the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action, as described in paragraph (2).

''(ii) RIGHTS OF APPLICANTS DENIED MEMBERSHIP.—The Association shall notify any insurance producer who is denied membership on the basis of criminal history record information provided under subparagraph (E) of the right of the insurance producer to—

''(I) obtain a copy of all criminal history record information provided to the Association under subparagraph (E) with respect to the insurance producer; and

''(II) challenge the denial of membership based on the accuracy and completeness of the information.

''(M) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'criminal history record check' means a national background check of criminal history records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

''(b) AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—The Association may establish membership criteria that bear a reasonable relationship to the purposes for which the Association was established.

''(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF CLASSES AND CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) CLASSES OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may establish separate classes of membership, with separate criteria, if the Association reasonably determines that performance of different duties requires different levels of education, training, experience, or other qualifications.

''(2) BUSINESS ENTITIES.—The Association shall establish a class of membership and membership criteria for business entities. A business entity that applies for membership shall be required to designate an individual Association member responsible for the compliance of the business entity with Association standards and the insurance laws, rules, and regulations of any State in which the business entity seeks to do business on the basis of Association membership.

''(3) CATEGORIES.—

''(A) SEPARATE CATEGORIES FOR INSURANCE PRODUCERS PERMITTED.—The Association may establish separate categories of membership for insurance producers and for other persons or entities within each class, based on the types of licensing categories that exist under State laws.

''(B) SEPARATE TREATMENT FOR DEPOSITORY INSTITUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No special categories of membership, and no distinct membership criteria, shall be established for members that are depository institutions or for employees, agents, or affiliates of depository institutions.

''(d) MEMBERSHIP CRITERIA.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association may establish criteria for membership which shall include standards for personal qualifications, education, training, and experience. The Association shall not establish criteria that unfairly limit the ability of a small insurance producer to become a member of the Association, including imposing discriminatory membership fees.

''(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In establishing criteria under paragraph (1), the Association shall not adopt any qualification less protective to the public than that contained in the National Association of Insurance Commissioners (referred to in this subtitle as the

'NAIC') Producer Licensing Model Act in effect as of the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014, and shall consider the highest levels of insurance producer qualifications established under the licensing laws of the States.

''(3) ASSISTANCE FROM STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association may request a State to provide assistance in investigating and evaluating the eligibility of a prospective member for membership in the Association.

''(B) AUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION SHARING.—A submission under subsection (a)(4)(C)(i) made by an insurance producer licensed in a State shall include a statement signed by the person about whom the assistance is requested authorizing—

''(i) the State to share information with the Association; and

''(ii) the Association to receive the information.

''(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed as requiring or authorizing any State to adopt new or additional requirements concerning the licensing or evaluation of insurance producers.

''(4) DENIAL OF MEMBERSHIP.—The Association may, based on reasonably consistently applied standards, deny membership to any State-licensed insurance producer for failure to meet the membership criteria established by the Association.

''(e) EFFECT OF MEMBERSHIP.—

''(1) AUTHORITY OF ASSOCIATION MEMBERS.—Membership in the Association shall—

''(A) authorize an insurance producer to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance in any State for which the member pays the licensing fee set by the State for any line or lines of insurance specified in the home State license of the insurance producer, and exercise all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry out such activities, including claims adjustments and settlement to the extent permissible under the laws of the State, risk management, employee benefits advice, retirement planning, and any other insurance-related consulting activities;

''(B) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for purposes of authorizing the insurance producer to engage in the activities described in subparagraph (A) in any State where the member pays the licensing fee; and

''(C) be the equivalent of a nonresident insurance producer license for the purpose of subjecting an insurance producer to all laws, regulations, provisions or other action of any State concerning revocation, suspension, or other enforcement action related to the ability of a member to engage in any activity within the scope of authority granted under this subsection and to all State laws, regulations, provisions, and actions preserved under paragraph (5).

''(2) VIOLENT CRIME CONTROL AND LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1994.—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to alter, modify, or supercede any requirement established by section 1033 of title 18, United States Code.

''(3) AGENT FOR REMITTING FEES.—The Association shall act as an agent for any member for purposes of remitting licensing fees to any State pursuant to paragraph (1).

''(4) NOTIFICATION OF ACTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when an insurance producer has satisfied the membership criteria of this section. The States (including State insurance regulators) shall have 10 business days after the date of the notification in order to provide the Association with evidence that the insurance producer does not satisfy the criteria for membership in the Association.

''(B) ONGOING DISCLOSURES REQUIRED.—On an ongoing basis, the Association shall disclose to the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC a list of the States in which each member is authorized to operate. The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when a member is newly authorized to operate in one or more States, or is no longer authorized to operate in one or more States on the basis of Association membership.

''(5) PRESERVATION OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND MARKET CONDUCT REGULATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—No provision of this section shall be construed as altering or affecting the applicability or continuing effectiveness of any law, regulation, provision, or other action of any State, including those described in subparagraph (B), to the extent that the State law, regulation, provision, or other action is not inconsistent with the provisions of this subtitle related to market entry for nonresident insurance producers, and then only to the extent of the inconsistency.

''(B) PRESERVED REGULATIONS.—The laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions of any State referred to in subparagraph (A) include laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions that—

''(i) regulate market conduct, insurance producer conduct, or unfair trade practices;

''(ii) establish consumer protections; or

''(iii) require insurance producers to be appointed by a licensed or authorized insurer.

''(f) BIENNIAL RENEWAL.—Membership in the Association shall be renewed on a biennial basis.

''(g) CONTINUING EDUCATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall establish, as a condition of membership, continuing education requirements which shall be comparable to the continuing education requirements under the licensing laws of a majority of the States.

''(2) STATE CONTINUING EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS.—A member may not be required to satisfy continuing education requirements imposed under the laws, regulations, provisions, or actions of any State other than the home State of the member.

''(3) RECIPROCITY.—The Association shall not require a member to satisfy continuing education requirements that are equivalent to any continuing education requirements of the home State of the member that have been satisfied by the member during the applicable licensing period.

''(4) LIMITATION ON THE ASSOCIATION.—The Association shall not directly or indirectly offer any continuing education courses for insurance producers.

''(h) PROBATION, SUSPENSION AND REVOCATION.—

''(1) DISCIPLINARY ACTION.—The Association may place an insurance producer that is a member of the Association on probation or suspend or revoke the membership of the insurance producer in the Association, or assess monetary fines or penalties, as the Association determines to be appropriate, if—

''(A) the insurance producer fails to meet the applicable membership criteria or other standards established by the Association;

''(B) the insurance producer has been subject to disciplinary action pursuant to a final adjudicatory proceeding under the jurisdiction of a State insurance regulator;

''(C) an insurance license held by the insurance producer has been suspended or revoked by a State insurance regulator; or

''(D) the insurance producer has been convicted of a crime that would have resulted in the denial of membership pursuant to subsection (a)(4)(L)(i) at the time of application, and the Association has received a copy of the final disposition from a court of competent jurisdiction.

''(2) VIOLATIONS OF ASSOCIATION STANDARDS.—The Association shall have the power to investigate alleged violations of Association standards.

''(3) REPORTING.—The Association shall immediately notify the States (including State insurance regulators) and the NAIC when the membership of an insurance producer has been placed on probation or has been suspended, revoked, or otherwise terminated, or when the Association has assessed monetary fines or penalties.

''(i) CONSUMER COMPLAINTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall—

''(A) refer any complaint against a member of the Association from a consumer relating to alleged misconduct or violations of State insurance laws to the State insurance regulator where the consumer resides and, when appropriate, to any additional State insurance regulator, as determined by standards adopted by the Association; and

''(B) make any related records and information available to each State insurance regulator to whom the complaint is forwarded.

''(2) TELEPHONE AND OTHER ACCESS.—The Association shall maintain a toll-free number for purposes of this subsection and, as practicable, other alternative means of communication with consumers, such as an Internet webpage.

''(3) FINAL DISPOSITION OF INVESTIGATION.—State insurance regulators shall provide the Association with information regarding the final disposition of a complaint referred pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), but nothing shall be construed to compel a State to release confidential investigation reports or other information protected by State law to the Association.

''(j) INFORMATION SHARING.—The Association may—

''(1) share documents, materials, or other information, including confidential and privileged documents, with a State, Federal, or international governmental entity or with the NAIC or other appropriate entity referenced in paragraphs (3) and (4), provided that the recipient has the authority and agrees to maintain the confidentiality or privileged status of the document, material, or other information;

''(2) limit the sharing of information as required under this subtitle with the NAIC or any other non-governmental entity, in circumstances under which the Association determines that the sharing of such information is unnecessary to further the purposes of this subtitle;

''(3) establish a central clearinghouse, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a central clearinghouse, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators), through which members of the Association may disclose their intent to operate in 1 or more States and pay the licensing fees to the appropriate States; and

''(4) establish a database, or utilize the NAIC or another appropriate entity, as determined by the Association, as a database, for use by the Association and the States (including State insurance regulators) for the collection of regulatory information concerning the activities of insurance producers.

''(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The provisions of this section shall take effect on the later of—

''(1) the expiration of the 2-year period beginning on the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014; and

''(2) the date of incorporation of the Association.

"SEC. 324. BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a board of directors of the Association, which shall have authority to govern and supervise all activities of the Association.

''(b) POWERS.—The Board shall have such of the powers and authority of the Association as may be specified in the bylaws of the Association.

''(c) COMPOSITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall consist of 13 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, of whom—

''(A) 8 shall be State insurance commissioners appointed in the manner provided in paragraph (2), 1 of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as the chairperson of the Board until the Board elects one such State insurance commissioner Board member to serve as the chairperson of the Board;

''(B) 3 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with property and casualty insurance producer licensing; and

''(C) 2 shall have demonstrated expertise and experience with life or health insurance producer licensing.

''(2) STATE INSURANCE REGULATOR REPRESENTATIVES.—

''(A) RECOMMENDATIONS.—Before making any appointments pursuant to paragraph (1)(A), the President shall request a list of recommended candidates from the States through the NAIC, which shall not be binding on the President. If the NAIC fails to submit a list of recommendations not later than 15 business days after the date of the request, the President may make the requisite appointments without considering the views of the NAIC.

''(B) POLITICAL AFFILIATION.—Not more than 4 Board members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall belong to the same political party.

''(C) FORMER STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONERS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If, after offering each currently serving State insurance commissioner an appointment to the Board, fewer than 8 State insurance commissioners have accepted appointment to the Board, the President may appoint the remaining State insurance commissioner Board members, as required under paragraph (1)(A), of the appropriate political party as required under subparagraph (B), from among individuals who are former State insurance commissioners.

''(ii) LIMITATION.—A former State insurance commissioner appointed as described in clause (i) may not be employed by or have any present direct or indirect financial interest in any insurer, insurance producer, or other entity in the insurance industry, other than direct or indirect ownership of, or beneficial interest in, an insurance policy or annuity contract written or sold by an insurer.

''(D) SERVICE THROUGH TERM.—If a Board member appointed under paragraph (1)(A) ceases to be a State insurance commissioner during the term of the Board member, the Board member shall cease to be a Board member.

''(3) PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—In making any appointment pursuant to subparagraph (B) or (C) of paragraph (1), the President may seek recommendations for candidates from groups representing the category of individuals described, which shall not be binding on the President.

''(4) STATE INSURANCE COMMISSIONER DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State insurance commissioner' means a person who serves in the position in State government, or on the board, commission, or other body that is the primary insurance regulatory authority for the State.

''(d) TERMS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided under paragraph (2), the term of service for each Board member shall be 2 years.

''(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

''(A) 1-YEAR TERMS.—The term of service shall be 1 year, as designated by the President at the time of the nomination of the subject Board members for—

''(i) 4 of the State insurance commissioner Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(A), of whom not more than 2 shall belong to the same political party;

''(ii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(B); and

''(iii) 1 of the Board members initially appointed under paragraph (1)(C).

''(B) EXPIRATION OF TERM.—A Board member may continue to serve after the expiration of the term to which the Board member was appointed for the earlier of 2 years or until a successor is appointed.

''(C) MID-TERM APPOINTMENTS.—A Board member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which the predecessor of the Board member was appointed shall be appointed only for the remainder of that term.

''(3) SUCCESSIVE TERMS.—Board members may be reappointed to successive terms.

''(e) INITIAL APPOINTMENTS.—The appointment of initial Board members shall be made no later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers Reform Act of 2014.

''(f) MEETINGS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

''(A) at the call of the chairperson;

''(B) as requested in writing to the chairperson by not fewer than 5 Board members; or

''(C) as otherwise provided by the bylaws of the Association.

''(2) QUORUM REQUIRED.—A majority of all Board members shall constitute a quorum.

''(3) VOTING.—Decisions of the Board shall require the approval of a majority of all Board members present at a meeting, a quorum being present.

''(4) INITIAL MEETING.—The Board shall hold its first meeting not later than 45 days after the date on which all initial Board members have been appointed.

''(g) RESTRICTION ON CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—Board members appointed pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (c)(1) shall not have access to confidential information received by the Association in connection with complaints, investigations, or disciplinary proceedings involving insurance producers.

''(h) ETHICS AND CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—The Board shall issue and enforce an ethical conduct code to address permissible and prohibited activities of Board members and Association officers, employees, agents, or consultants. The code shall, at a minimum, include provisions that prohibit any Board member or Association officer, employee, agent or consultant from—

''(1) engaging in unethical conduct in the course of performing Association duties;

''(2) participating in the making or influencing the making of any Association decision, the outcome of which the Board member, officer, employee, agent, or consultant knows or had reason to know would have a reasonably foreseeable material financial effect, distinguishable from its effect on the public generally, on the person or a member of the immediate family of the person;

''(3) accepting any gift from any person or entity other than the Association that is given because of the position held by the person in the Association;

''(4) making political contributions to any person or entity on behalf of the Association; and

''(5) lobbying or paying a person to lobby on behalf of the Association.

''(i) COMPENSATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), no Board member may receive any compensation from the Association or any other person or entity on account of Board membership.

''(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PER DIEM.—Board members may be reimbursed only by the Association for travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates consistent with rates authorized for employees of Federal agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from home or regular places of business in performance of services for the Association.

"SEC. 325. BYLAWS, STANDARDS, AND DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS.

''(a) ADOPTION AND AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS.—

''(1) PROCEDURES.—The Association shall adopt procedures for the adoption of bylaws and standards that are similar to procedures under subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(2) COPY REQUIRED TO BE FILED.—The Board shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, all proposed bylaws and standards of the Association, or any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, accompanied by a concise general statement of the basis and purpose of such proposal.

''(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Any proposed bylaw or standard of the Association, and any proposed amendment to the bylaws or standards of the Association, shall take effect, after notice under paragraph (2) and opportunity for public comment, on such date as the Association may designate, unless suspended under section 329(c).

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the Board or the Association to the requirements of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').

''(b) DISCIPLINARY ACTION BY THE ASSOCIATION.—

''(1) SPECIFICATION OF CHARGES.—In any proceeding to determine whether membership shall be denied, suspended, revoked, or not renewed, or to determine whether a member of the Association should be placed on probation (referred to in this section as a 'disciplinary action') or whether to assess fines or monetary penalties, the Association shall bring specific charges, notify the member of the charges, give the member an opportunity to defend against the charges, and keep a record.

''(2) SUPPORTING STATEMENT.—A determination to take disciplinary action shall be supported by a statement setting forth—

''(A) any act or practice in which the member has been found to have been engaged;

''(B) the specific provision of this subtitle or standard of the Association that any such act or practice is deemed to violate; and

''(C) the sanction imposed and the reason for the sanction.

''(3) INELIGIBILITY OF PRIVATE SECTOR REPRESENTATIVES.—Board members appointed pursuant to section 324(c)(3) may not—

''(A) participate in any disciplinary action or be counted toward establishing a quorum during a disciplinary action; and

''(B) have access to confidential information concerning any disciplinary action.

"SEC. 326. POWERS.

''In addition to all the powers conferred upon a nonprofit corporation by the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act, the Association shall have the power to—

''(1) establish and collect such membership fees as the Association finds necessary to impose to cover the costs of its operations;

''(2) adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws, procedures, or standards governing the conduct of Association business and performance of its duties;

''(3) establish procedures for providing notice and opportunity for comment pursuant to section 325(a);

''(4) enter into and perform such agreements as necessary to carry out the duties of the Association;

''(5) hire employees, professionals, or specialists, and elect or appoint officers, and to fix their compensation, define their duties and give them appropriate authority to carry out the purposes of this subtitle, and determine their qualification;

''(6) establish personnel policies of the Association and programs relating to, among other things, conflicts of interest, rates of compensation, where applicable, and qualifications of personnel;

''(7) borrow money; and

''(8) secure funding for such amounts as the Association determines to be necessary and appropriate to organize and begin operations of the Association, which shall be treated as loans to be repaid by the Association with interest at market rate.

"SEC. 327. REPORT BY THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year, the Association shall submit to the President, through the Department of the Treasury, and the States (including State insurance regulators), and shall publish on the website of the Association, a written report regarding the conduct of its business, and the exercise of the other rights and powers granted by this subtitle, during such fiscal year.

''(b) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) with respect to any fiscal year shall include audited financial statements setting forth the financial position of the Association at the end of such fiscal year and the results of its operations (including the source and application of its funds) for such fiscal year.

"SEC. 328. LIABILITY OF THE ASSOCIATION AND THE BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES OF THE ASSOCIATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Association shall not be deemed to be an insurer or insurance producer within the meaning of any State law, rule, regulation, or order regulating or taxing insurers, insurance producers, or other entities engaged in the business of insurance, including provisions imposing premium taxes, regulating insurer solvency or financial condition, establishing guaranty funds and levying assessments, or requiring claims settlement practices.

''(b) LIABILITY OF BOARD MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.—No Board member, officer, or employee of the Association shall be personally liable to any person for any action taken or omitted in good faith in any matter within the scope of their responsibilities in connection with the Association.

"SEC. 329. PRESIDENTIAL OVERSIGHT.

''(a) REMOVAL OF BOARD.—If the President determines that the Association is acting in a manner contrary to the interests of the public or the purposes of this subtitle or has failed to perform its duties under this subtitle, the President may remove the entire existing Board for the remainder of the term to which the Board members were appointed and appoint, in accordance with section 324 and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in accordance with the procedures established under Senate Resolution 116 of the 112th Congress, new Board members to fill the vacancies on the Board for the remainder of the terms.

''(b) REMOVAL OF BOARD MEMBER.—The President may remove a Board member only for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office.

''(c) SUSPENSION OF BYLAWS AND STANDARDS AND PROHIBITION OF ACTIONS.—Following notice to the Board, the President, or a person designated by the President for such purpose, may suspend the effectiveness of any bylaw or standard, or prohibit any action, of the Association that the President or the designee determines is contrary to the purposes of this subtitle.

"SEC. 330. RELATIONSHIP TO STATE LAW.

''(a) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.—State laws, regulations, provisions, or other actions purporting to regulate insurance producers shall be preempted to the extent provided in subsection (b).

''(b) PROHIBITED ACTIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No State shall—

''(A) impede the activities of, take any action against, or apply any provision of law or regulation arbitrarily or discriminatorily to, any insurance producer because that insurance producer or any affiliate plans to become, has applied to become, or is a member of the Association;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it pay fees different from those required to be paid to that State were it not a member of the Association; or

''(C) impose any continuing education requirements on any nonresident insurance producer that is a member of the Association.

''(2) STATES OTHER THAN A HOME STATE.—No State, other than the home State of a member of the Association, shall—

''(A) impose any licensing, personal or corporate qualifications, education, training, experience, residency, continuing education, or bonding requirement upon a member of the Association that is different from the criteria for membership in the Association or renewal of such membership;

''(B) impose any requirement upon a member of the Association that it be licensed, registered, or otherwise qualified to do business or remain in good standing in the State, including any requirement that the insurance producer register as a foreign company with the secretary of state or equivalent State official;

''(C) require that a member of the Association submit to a criminal history record check as a condition of doing business in the State; or

''(D) impose any licensing, registration, or appointment requirements upon a member of the Association, or require a member of the Association to be authorized to operate as an insurance producer, in order to sell, solicit, or negotiate insurance for commercial property and casualty risks to an insured with risks located in more than one State, if the member is licensed or otherwise authorized to operate in the State where the insured maintains its principal place of business and the contract of insurance insures risks located in that State.

''(3) PRESERVATION OF STATE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit a State from investigating and taking appropriate disciplinary action, including suspension or revocation of authority of an insurance producer to do business in a State, in accordance with State law and that is not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, against a member of the Association as a result of a complaint or for any alleged activity, regardless of whether the activity occurred before or after the insurance producer commenced doing business in the State pursuant to Association membership.

"SEC. 331. COORDINATION WITH FINANCIAL INDUSTRY REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

''The Association shall coordinate with the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority in order to ease any administrative burdens that fall on members of the Association that are subject to regulation by the Financial Industry Regulatory Authority, consistent with the requirements of this subtitle and the Federal securities laws.

"SEC. 332. RIGHT OF ACTION.

''(a) RIGHT OF ACTION.—Any person aggrieved by a decision or action of the Association may, after reasonably exhausting available avenues for resolution within the Association, commence a civil action in an appropriate United States district court, and obtain all appropriate relief.

''(b) ASSOCIATION INTERPRETATIONS.—In any action under subsection (a), the court shall give appropriate weight to the interpretation of the Association of its bylaws and standards and this subtitle.

"SEC. 333. FEDERAL FUNDING PROHIBITED.

''The Association may not receive, accept, or borrow any amounts from the Federal Government to pay for, or reimburse, the Association for, the costs of establishing or operating the Association.

"SEC. 334. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this subtitle, the following definitions shall apply:

''(1) BUSINESS ENTITY.—The term 'business entity' means a corporation, association, partnership, limited liability company, limited liability partnership, or other legal entity.

''(2) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term 'depository institution' has the meaning as in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

''(3) HOME STATE.—The term 'home State' means the State in which the insurance producer maintains its principal place of residence or business and is licensed to act as an insurance producer.

''(4) INSURANCE.—The term 'insurance' means any product, other than title insurance or bail bonds, defined or regulated as insurance by the appropriate State insurance regulatory authority.

''(5) INSURANCE PRODUCER.—The term 'insurance producer' means any insurance agent or broker, excess or surplus lines broker or agent, insurance consultant, limited insurance representative, and any other individual or entity that sells, solicits, or negotiates policies of insurance or offers advice, counsel, opinions or services related to insurance.

''(6) INSURER.—The term 'insurer' has the meaning as in section 313(e)(2)(B) of title 31, United States Code.

''(7) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF BUSINESS.—The term 'principal place of business' means the State in which an insurance producer maintains the headquarters of the insurance producer and, in the case of a business entity, where high-level officers of the entity direct, control, and coordinate the business activities of the business entity.

''(8) PRINCIPAL PLACE OF RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal place of residence' means the State in which an insurance producer resides for the greatest number of days during a calendar year.

''(9) STATE.—The term 'State' includes any State, the District of Columbia, any territory of the United States, and Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(10) STATE LAW.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'State law' includes all laws, decisions, rules, regulations, or other State action having the effect of law, of any State.

''(B) LAWS APPLICABLE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.—A law of the United States applicable only to or within the District of Columbia shall be treated as a State law rather than a law of the United States.

''SEC. 335. SUNSET.

''The provisions of this subtitle, and any program or authorities established or granted therein or derived therefrom, shall terminate on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Association approves its first member pursuant to section 323.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act is amended by striking the items relating to subtitle C of title III and inserting the following new items:

''Subtitle C—National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers

''Sec. 321. National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.
''Sec. 322. Purpose.
''Sec. 323. Membership.
''Sec. 324. Board of directors.
''Sec. 325. Bylaws, standards, and disciplinary actions.
''Sec. 326. Powers.
''Sec. 327. Report by the Association.
''Sec. 328. Liability of the Association and the Board members, officers, and employees of the Association.
''Sec. 329. Presidential oversight.
''Sec. 330. Relationship to State law.
''Sec. 331. Coordination with Financial Industry Regulatory Authority.
''Sec. 332. Right of action.
''Sec. 333. Federal funding prohibited.
''Sec. 334. Definitions.
''Sec. 335. Sunset.''.

BRING JOBS HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture vote with respect to the Carnes nomination now occur at 1:45 p.m. today, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maryland.

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

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

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, it is my understanding later today we are going to have an opportunity to approve a resolution that was voted out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee yesterday that deals with the tragic events in the Middle East between Israel and Hamas. I just want to read part of that resolution, the action part of the resolution, because I hope it expresses the views of each Member of the Senate.

It reaffirms the Senate's support for Israel's right to defend its citizens and ensure the survival of the State of Israel. It condemns the unprovoked rocket fire at Israel. It calls on Hamas to immediately cease all rocket and other attacks against Israel. It calls upon the Palestinian Authority of President Abbas to dissolve the unity governing arrangement with Hamas and condemn the attacks on Israel.

We all are very concerned about the tragic consequences of the conflict between Israel and Hamas. Our strongest desire is that we can end the attacks and the missiles and that we can get Israel and the Palestinians to negotiate a peace agreement, a lasting agreement for two states living side-by-side, the Jewish State of Israel and a Palestinian State.

But the recent military action taken by the Israel Defense Forces in Gaza is a direct response to Hamas's barrage of rockets and mortar attacks against civilian targets in Israel. Labeled as a terrorist organization, Hamas is directly responsible for the innocent loss of life of both Israelis and Palestinians. It is very tragic what Israel is doing it is doing so to defend its civilian population from the incoming rockets.

What Hamas is doing is indiscriminately sending missiles into Israel, targeting innocent populations. Hamas's actions to extend its reach deeper into Israel and its failure to end continuing attacks undermine efforts to attain peace and security in the region.

The Israel Defense Forces began Operation Protective Edge Tuesday, July 8, with one goal, one goal in mind; that is, to stop Hamas's continued rocket attacks against Israel's civilians. Since the start of the operation, there have been over 1,000 rockets that have been launched into Israel. Most of those rockets hit targets. Fortunately, they were not major population centers because of Iron Dome. I thank the policy of this country, the United States, in providing Israel the Iron Dome missile defense system, which has been responsible for bringing down approximately 200 of the rockets that otherwise would have hit population centers in Israel.

Earlier this week, Egypt proposed an immediate cease-fire, followed by a series of meetings in Cairo with high-level delegations from both sides. Israel accepted that cease-fire immediately. They said: Fine. Let's do it. We want to stop the attacks of rockets into our country. We want to have a discussion for peace. They did it immediately. For 6 hours the IDF suspended operations against Hamas, but during this time Hamas fired 50 rockets into Israel. So the Israel Defense Forces were ordered to resume attacks against terrorist targets following continued inbound rockets and Hamas's official statement that it rejected the cease-fire.

I think what Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said on CBS's ''Face the Nation'' on Sunday sums it up best. I am quoting from the Prime Minister: The difference between us is that we are using missiles to protect our civilians and they are using their civilians to protect their missiles.

In other words, what Hamas is doing is putting its missile locations in population centers, in schools, in hospitals, in mosques, in a direct way to use human shields. What a difference. Israel is trying to protect its civilian population. Hamas is putting their civilian population at great risk.

Hamas must end its rocket and mortar attacks, recognize Israel's right to exist, renounce violence, and honor all past agreements to peacefully move toward a two-state solution. That is what we want to see. I strongly support Israel's right to defend its citizens against threats to its security and existence. Hamas must end. It must be marginalized. It cannot be allowed to continue its terrorist activities. We must find a way to advance a stable and lasting peace between Israel and the Palestinian people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I would like to concur with the comments of my friend, the Senator from Maryland, on the tragedy in Israel and the Middle East. I also want to say a special thanks to my friend, the Senator from Tennessee, for allowing me to jump in line for a moment.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2265

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I rise to say that I think it is abhorrent and I think most American people would be greatly distressed to know that some of their money could be sent to terrorist organizations, that some of their money could be sent to Hamas.

Hamas has now joined a unity government with the Palestinian Authority. We give several hundred million dollars a year to the Palestinian Authority. I am appalled to think we could be somehow indirectly paying for missiles that Hamas is launching on Israel. I support the resolution that will shortly come forward condemning Hamas's activities.

I want more teeth in this. I would like to see legislation that says: You know what. If Hamas wants to come out of the cold, they want to recognize Israel and renounce terror, maybe. But if they are going to continue to say, as one of their leaders said recently, that our path is resistance and a rifle, our choice is jihad, if Hamas is going to continue to laugh and to cheer with glee with the killing of three teenage Israeli citizens, one of whom was an American citizen, Hamas should not—and we should guarantee that Hamas should not—get any of our money. So I will ask for unanimous consent to pass a bill to guarantee that Hamas will not receive any of our foreign aid.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 2265 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed,

the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I know the Senator from Kentucky tried to have this bill heard this week in a business meeting. I know the Senator knows I supported that effort to cause this bill to be marked up in the Foreign Relations Committee, which is where it should be dealt with.

I thank him for his concern about foreign aid. I think he has brought a voice to the Senate which has raised many concerns about how we are spending taxpayer money. I thank him for raising some of the issues he has brought forth. As it relates to the bill itself, I have spoken to officials from Israel. I know one of the goals is to do something that complements Israel and helps Israel.

I know they have some concerns with the way it is constructed and actually, in many ways if this bill were to become law, it would create a heightened security problem for Israel. So we have had a constructive conversation I think on the floor. I would like to talk with the Senator a little bit further about some potential changes to the legislation. I think that would be more appropriate than passing it by unanimous consent. I thank him again for his nature, the way he works with all of us. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the Senator from Tennessee.

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

IRAN

Mr. GRAHAM. I know the Senator is supposed to be chairing a hearing here in a moment. But the Senator is the ranking member on Foreign Relations. I wish to compliment the Senator from Tennessee and Senator MENENDEZ. The Senators have been a very effective team. The subject matter is Iran. July 20 will be here shortly.

I ask Senator CORKER, what is his view of where we stand with the Iranian nuclear program and what are his concerns?

Mr. CORKER. First of all, no one has taken a more important role in our foreign policy and security issues than the Senator from South Carolina. I thank him for that. I know on my last trip to Afghanistan, he was there serving his Reserve duty. I thank the Senator for the many contributions to all of these debates. I want to say that I think, similar to many in this body, when the initial agreement was put forth and it had a 6-month extension on it, there was a lot of concern. What I am concerned about, and the Senator from South Carolina I think may share some of this, is that what we are going to end up with are a series of rolling interim agreements.

What we have is Iran doing everything they can to evade sanctions that have been put in place. We have countries that see the opportunity possibly for Iran to come out from under being a rogue state. I am worried we are putting ourselves in a situation where we are losing all of the leverage Congress, working with the administration, but Congress led on in putting these sanctions in place.

We are coming up on July 20. I was very disappointed that, in essence in March, the administration agreed to the fact that Iran would be able to have centrifuges to enrich uranium. It was something that, to me, at the beginning of a negotiation, to give one of the biggest things one can possibly give to a country such as Iran on the front end, put us in a very bad position.

But here is my concern: It is July 17. This agreement ends on July 20. I believe we are losing the leverage that all of us worked so hard to put in place. I am worried the coalition we have is dissipating. It feels to me as though Iran is rope-a-doping us on this agreement.

What I hope is going to happen—I know the Senator and I are going to be in a briefing later today. I hope the administration is going to share with us, very clearly, what the gaps are between where they are and where Iran is.

It is my hope that gap is going to be very narrow. I do not think that is going to be the case. My sense is the administration is going to ask for an extension over the next few days. That concerns me. Here is what I hope Congress will do: I hope Congress somehow will have the ability, through the majority leader's efforts and all of us on the floor, to weigh in on any final agreement that is put in place. I think that is very important. I know the Senator tried to produce legislation to make that happen. I have done the same thing.

Secondly, I hope the administration will agree there will be no more extensions, period. I am pretty sure they are going to be asking for one. It is unfortunate. When you put in place an agreement on the front end that you have that ability, it then creates the essence that it does not create the focus, if you will, that is necessary to bring this to a conclusion.

Again, what I hope will happen is that Congress will have a final say on any removal of sanctions—any removal of sanctions. But my hope is that before any type of sanctions relief takes place, Congress will have the opportunity to weigh in. I had a long conversation yesterday with our lead negotiator. I shared these same concerns, that I just feel the moment slipping away from us. I think all of us want to see a diplomatic solution. I do not think there is anybody on this floor that wants to see anything less than a great result diplomatically.

But I think many of us are concerned we are losing our leverage, time is slipping away, the coalition is dissipating. Some of the parties, as the Senator knows, have differing interests now. We have had some conflicts arise over the course of time where we are at significant odds with some of our partners in these negotiations.

With Russia we have the issue in Ukraine and Crimea. With China we have issues in the South and East China Sea. So all of this is making me very concerned about our ability to reach a diplomatic solution, even though I want more than anything—on this issue, more than anything, I want us to have a solid diplomatic solution that allows us to go forward and know that Iran does not have the ability to break out and become a nuclear threat to the region, to the world, and certainly create instability.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his leadership. We are working together. We hope to make this bipartisan. If there is an agreement reached with the Iranians—and I agree, I hope there will be, that Congress can have a say about that agreement.

President Obama felt as though he needed to come to Congress to get approval to enter into Syria. The Senator led the effort to pass the resolution in the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator and Senator MENENDEZ working together. The Senator from Tennessee delivered Republican votes to try to help the President. He drew a red line and nothing happened.

So if he believes he needs input from the Congress about going to Syria, I hope the President will understand that the Congress wants input when it comes to the Iranian nuclear program. As a matter of fact, I hope we will demand it, because of all the decisions President Obama will make in his two terms as President, on the foreign policy front this is the most consequential.

Why do I say this? The Iranian regime with a nuclear capability is a nightmare for the world.

Does Senator CORKER agree with me, based on his travels in the region, that if we allowed the Iranians to have a robust enrichment capability—and what am I talking about is taking uranium and enriching it to the point where they can use it for commercial fuel to run a nuclear power reactor. The problem with enrichment is you can go beyond making commercial grade fuel. You can actually use that process to make a bomb. Without enrichment capability you can't make the bomb.

So they are demanding the right to enrich and it was given away in March. It was a huge mistake.

If you made a list of countries you would not trust to enrich uranium—based on their behavior and disruptive nature—I would put Iran on the top of the list. My fear is that we are about to do with the Iranians what we did with the North Koreans—that you have a deal on paper that gives them an enrichment capability to be contained by

U.N. inspection. And in North Korea the rest is history.

When it comes to the Iranians, I am not going to turn our fate over, as a nation, to a bunch of U.N. inspectors trying to contain their uranium enrichment program. I know Israel will not.

But this is the ripple effect. Does the Senator agree with me that any right to enrich we give to the Shia Persians in Iran, the Sunni Arabs are going to insist on an equivalent right?

Mr. CORKER. The Senator is exactly right. I was in the region this year, and there is tremendous concern about, obviously, Iran breaking out in this regard. Candidly, there are many conversations about ways for them to compensate for that because they obviously want a counter to Iran's being a nuclear-armed country.

As you know, with some of the proliferation that takes place, there are ways of buying those capabilities without even developing them yourself. So, yes, that is a major concern.

Our friend, Senator MENENDEZ, on the other side of the aisle—with whom you work so closely—I certainly don't want to speak for him, but I use a frame of reference that he has used on so many occasions; that is, it is one thing to dismantle their ability to enrich and produce a nuclear weapon and it is a whole different thing to just mothball.

What I fear is that we are creating a situation where, again, we have these countries that come together, we have the sanctions that are in place, and we let those sanctions dissipate. Then all of a sudden—and I think the Senator knows already—the economy in Iran is picking up and inflation has dropped if you allow those to dissipate.

It took a lot of effort to put these sanctions in place. Again, there are a lot of differing interests today that didn't exist when these were put in place. Then all of a sudden we have a situation where they break out again because they have those capabilities. They have mothballed; they have not been dismantled. Not to speak of the fact that we don't know what is going on in Parchin—we don't know what may happen with the Arak facility.

Again, I hope the administration will be very clear about the gaps that exist today. My sense is they are going to extend and, again, I have grave concerns about what that is going to mean relative to getting to a good end.

Mr. GRAHAM. Along those lines, Senator MENENDEZ has been one of the leading voices in the Senate and in the Nation about having a cautious eye toward Iran.

They have an enrichment capability. Over the last decade it has grown moderately.

This idea of moderate voices in Iran—the President of Iran was elected as a moderate. I don't believe that dichotomy really exists. This whole game of good cop/bad cop is going on in front of our eyes—in this case good president/bad ayatollah.

The ayatollah, the Supreme Leader of Iran, weighed in a few days ago talking about centrifuges 10 times greater than they have today. I am sure what he is trying to do is become the bad guy. When he puts out the number 190,000 and you wind up with 15 or 20, it is like a good deal.

I can promise you one centrifuge in the hands of the Iranians is a risk. Thousands of centrifuges in the hands of Iranians is stupid. We would be crazy to let that happen.

If they want a nuclear power program for peaceful purposes, sign me up.

As a matter of fact, as far as any deal, I would put in the deal the ability for the international community—Russia, the United States, and China working together or separately—to build a powerplant inside of Iran to give them nuclear power as long as we control the fuel cycle.

Fifteen nations have nuclear power programs that do not enrich. Canada and Mexico have nuclear power programs, but they don't enrich uranium.

As a matter of fact, we are telling our friends in South Korea: Don't begin to enrich. We are telling our friends in the United Arab Emirates: You can have nuclear power, but don't enrich.

I would find it incredible for us to tell allies that we trust them not to enrich because it could set off unintended consequences, but we are agreeing to let one of the enemies of mankind have that capability because they are demanding it.

I hope and I pray a deal can come about that will neuter the nuclear ambitions of the Iranians and give them what they claim to want—a peaceful nuclear power program. But I don't believe that is what they want. I don't think they would be doing all the things they have been doing—lying, cheating, and building plants under a mountain—if all they wanted was a peaceful nuclear power program.

As a matter of fact, our intelligence community tells us the program they have today has been put to military use. They denied that, but we can't get to the bottom of it.

What is the Senator's view about the likelihood of the Iranians lying about the fact that they have tried to militarize their program?

Mr. CORKER. I think, based on past behavior, that would be one's expectation. Again, we know there are facilities that are operating, and we haven't been able to get into those facilities.

When you look at the facts, one of the things that is not even being addressed is the whole delivery system—their ability to deliver the weaponry. None of this discussion thus far, to my knowledge, has anything to do with their developing capabilities to actually deliver a nuclear weapon.

What I am concerned about—the Senator focused on the centrifuges and it is the central issue—no question. I think the Senator has wisely pointed out how the Supreme Leader has tried to move the goalpost so far down the field that just getting to the 30- or 40-yard line looks good to us. But we also did the same on the front end of the deal by acknowledging in the preamble or the four-page agreement that enrichment certainly could occur.

But here is what is happening, I fear. On every other single portion—not just the centrifuge—the goal posts are being moved. In other words, the things that we thought were going to take place on the front end—whether it was the Arak facility and what was going to occur there or what was going to happen in other pieces of the deal—all of that adds up to very important elements or a final deal. I am afraid what is happening is the goalpost is moving on all of those as time goes on.

Mr. GRAHAM. I couldn't agree more. As a matter of fact, dismantling has become something new. They have a big stockpile of highly enriched uranium. We are talking about diluting it, but the U.N. resolution called for its removal, so this deal is to the left of the U.N. resolution. As a matter of fact, this whole agreement is getting to the left of what the United Nations has been.

What about this scenario? It is one thing to have fissile material in the hands of the ayatollah and they could make a bomb, but they still have a lot of highly enriched uranium still inside of Iran. What is the possibility of a dirty bomb, where they turn that highly enriched uranium over to a terrorist organization and it makes its way here without their fingerprints being on it?

Mr. CORKER. One of the ways that Iran has destabilized the region has been through proxies that it funds.

Let's face it. Until they became involved in Syria—as the Senator has talked about on the floor—through their proxy, Hezbollah, actually the moderate in the opposition was gaining ground. So their utilization of terrorist groups to achieve their end, obviously, is their normal mode of operation.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, continue.

Mr. CORKER. So when you think about the possibilities of their being able to create, as the Senator mentioned, a dirty bomb—which would create tremendous terror wherever it might have been implemented—that is something I think is frightening—more than frightening.

It would be something that would be not quite as destabilizing as, obviously, having a full-blown nuclear weapon, but something that would be very damaging to world security.

Mr. GRAHAM. I know we are going to have a vote in a second, but we will end our thoughts.

The reason 3,000 Americans were killed on 9/11 and not 3 million is that the terrorist groups that wish us harm could not find capabilities beyond the airplanes. They are trying. They are trying to get weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, highly enriched uranium, fissile material.

My fear is that if a regime such as Iran is given the capability to enrich,

it will become a North Korea where they break out.

I will not turn the fate of the United States over, with my vote, to a bunch of U.N. inspectors—where the only hope of a breakout is a bunch of U.N. inspectors.

The whole real goal for me is to have a capability that is very small, face-saving in nature, that can't lead to a breakout. Don't have something robust that can lead to a breakout and expect the U.N. to protect us because they can't. They didn't do it in North Korea.

At the end of the day I think the decision we are going to make as a nation—through our President—hopefully with direction and input, will be the biggest decision we have made as a nation on the foreign policy front in decades, because, if we get this wrong, if we allow the Iranian ayatollah to achieve a new nuclear capability, every Sunni Arab is going to want like capability, and we are on the road to Armageddon.

Look at the Middle East and ask yourselves: Is this a good place to give people nuclear capability? Would they use it?

Hamas is firing every rocket in its inventory, and they could care less where it lands; they hate Israel that much.

The Sunni Arabs feel more threatened by the Shia Persians than they do by the Israelis.

It is commonly believed that Israelis have a nuclear capability. Not one Sunni nation has tried to procure a weapon of their own to counter that presumed capability. Every Sunni Arab state has told me, you, and everybody else who will listen, that if the Shia Persians get a capability they are going to match that capability because they see that threat as existential.

Israel sees the threat in Iran—with a nuclear capability in Iranian hands—as existential.

I see it as existential to the United States. We have an opportunity here for negotiations to end this well. But what I hope we will not do is, through negotiations, create a scenario where they break out like the North Koreans.

If I have the choice between a bad deal through negotiations that will lead to a nuclear Iran over time and military force—as distasteful as that might be—I am going to pick military force because we have to stop their ambitions to become a nuclear nation.

If we don't stop them, it would be similar, in my view, to have let Hitler have the bomb when we could have done something about it.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator again for his tremendous contributions to this body and every foreign policy debate that we have.

The President did seek congressional approval on the authorization of the use of military force in Syria. It was not something he had to do, but he sought it, and I am pleased that he did.

I was proud to be a part of writing that agreement with our chairman and other members of the committee to give him the power to do that. And actually, to be candid, I regret that things took the course they took, but the President elected to do that.

As the Senator mentioned, a nuclear-armed Iran is a whole different scale. What I hope will happen is that the President will agree there will be no more extensions if they ask for one in the next few days, and I am almost certain that is what is going to happen.

No. 2, I hope you will commit to letting Congress weigh in on the final decision. I actually think that will be useful for them in the negotiation. I really do think that having a backstop would be useful to them, but if the President doesn't agree to that, I hope we, on our own, will pass legislation which ensures that is the case.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. I concur, and I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

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

CARING FOR REFUGEES

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, in the last year I have been to Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon to visit Syrian refugees and the organizations that work with them. I have seen the effects of refugees fleeing violence on these nations. Lebanon has 4 million people. They are having to care for 1 million refugees from Syria—one in four members of their population.

These countries, especially Jordan and Lebanon, are small—much smaller than the United States. They are much poorer than the United States. Jordan has very little water for their own citizens, much less refugees, but they have shown a real sense of compassion and hospitality in treating these Syrian refugees who are fleeing violence and coming over their border. Lebanese citizens even run double school shifts—their own kids in the morning and Syrian refugees in the afternoon.

When I have been in the Middle East in these countries, I have wondered what would happen if refugees fleeing violence in other countries came to the United States. I wonder if we would show the same compassion to refugees that is being shown by these poorer nations.

I wish to say a few words about the crisis at the border now because we are now faced with that question—refugees fleeing violence and coming to the United States.

Who are the children coming to the United States? They are overwhelmingly refugees from three Central American countries—52,000 just this year. They are not just coming to the United States; they are also flooding into Costa Rica and Nicaragua.

Senator MENENDEZ held a hearing this morning, and we had testimony. What is the reason they are coming? And the testimony was this: The reason they are coming is overwhelmingly the violence in the neighborhoods where they live that forces their parents to decide that to keep them safe, they should leave.

What is the source of the violence? Again, overwhelmingly, the testimony is that the source of the violence is the drug trade that has corrupted the neighborhoods and made them dangerous. The kids are fleeing violence driven by the drug trade.

Here is the sort of sad punch line: Where does the drug trade originate? The drug trade is originating because of the significant demand in the United States for illegal drugs, especially cocaine.

So these kids are fleeing to the United States because Americans are buying illegal drugs in such numbers and the dollars being shipped south are creating conditions for gang warfare and cartels, turning these nations into transit points for drugs.

I know these children, and I know their neighborhoods. I lived in El Progreso, Honduras, in 1980 and 1981. Six hundred kids from El Progreso have already come to the United States as unaccompanied refugees this year.

Honduras, a beautiful country with beautiful people, a longtime ally of the United States, is now the murder capital of the world. There are more people murdered in Honduras than in any other country. El Salvador is No. 4 in the world, and Guatemala is No. 5 in the world.

I recently met with President Hernandez of Honduras to talk about what we can do. So what should we do? Let's get to the prescription. What should we do?

First, we have to stop blaming the kids or assuming they are bad people. They are not. We need to show the same compassion for refugees fleeing violence and coming to the United States as nations such as Lebanon, Turkey, and Jordan show to refugees fleeing violence and coming to their nations.

Secondly, we need to work on our legal process and the resources the President asked for. I have some criticisms of exactly how those dollars will be spent and the particular protections these refugees need when they arrive. Remember, it is a 2008 law we are dealing with that was passed unanimously by Congress and signed by President Bush.

We need to do immigration reform. The fact that we haven't done it for so long creates a sense of confusion. If we can clearly elaborate what our immigration policy is, it will dispel myths.

More support for security in Central America is critical. We need to interdict more drugs. General Kelly, the head of SOUTHCOM, says we let 75 percent of the drugs that come into the United States go by us. We know where they are, but we haven't put the military resources in place to interdict them.

Finally, we have to tackle the U.S. demand for drugs because that is what is driving the violence in the neighborhoods which is causing kids to flee.

In conclusion, this year is the 75th anniversary of a very shameful event—the voyage of the St. Louis. The St. Louis was a ship that left Germany in 1939 with hundreds of Jews onboard. These Jews were fleeing violence and antisemitism to come to the new world. They were not allowed to disembark in Cuba, they were not allowed to disembark in the United States, and they were not allowed to disembark in Canada. Eventually, the ship had to be routed back to Europe, where, research shows, hundreds of those Jews who had to get back off in Europe died in the Holocaust.

The testimony this morning was that if we, without due process, send these children home, many will die as a result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. KAINE. That lesson of the St. Louis should stick with us, and there are many things we can do to avert this crisis and to show our good hearts as Americans.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Harry Reid, Patrick J. Leahy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Dianne Feinstein, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie K. Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher Murphy, Cory A. Booker, Martin Heinrich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Alaska (Mr. BEGICH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''nay.''

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 232 Ex.]

YEAS—68

Ayotte	Harkin	Murphy
Baldwin	Hatch	Murray
Bennet	Heinrich	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Portman
Booker	Hirono	Pryor
Boxer	Inhofe	Reed
Brown	Isakson	Reid
Cantwell	Johanns	Rockefeller
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Sessions
Casey	King	Shaheen
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Shelby
Coats	Landrieu	Stabenow
Cochran	Leahy	Tester
Collins	Levin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Manchin	Udall (NM)
Durbin	Markey	Walsh
Feinstein	McCain	Warner
Flake	McCaskill	Warren
Franken	Menendez	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wicker
Graham	Mikulski	Wyden
Hagan	Murkowski	

NAYS—23

Barrasso	Enzi	McConnell
Blunt	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Burr	Heller	Scott
Corker	Hoeven	Thune
Cornyn	Johnson (WI)	Toomey
Crapo	Kirk	Vitter
Cruz	Lee	

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Coons	Roberts
Begich	Moran	Sanders
Coburn	Paul	Schatz

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 68, the nays are 23. The motion is agreed to.

NOMINATION OF JULIE E. CARNES TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

The clerk will report the nomination. The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julie E. Carnes, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

NOMINATION OF DAVID B. SHEAR TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David B. Shear, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David B. Shear, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense?

The nomination was confirmed.

NOMINATION OF DAVID ARTHUR MADER TO BE CONTROLLER, OFFICE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Arthur Mader, of Virginia, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David Arthur Mader, of Virginia, to be Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, Office of Management and Budget?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

BRING JOBS BACK HOME ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I come to the floor today to reiterate my opposition to legislation that would impose new tax burdens on businesses in New Hampshire and I believe would have a serious impact on our economy.

Earlier this week Majority Leader REID started a fast-track process to bring a bill to the floor that includes the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. This is legislation that would for the first time allow States to collect sales taxes from businesses in New Hampshire. As a result, this bill would impose significant new tax compliance burdens on entrepreneurs in New Hampshire—the same entrepreneurs who are trying to grow their businesses and create jobs on the Internet.

In New Hampshire we don't have a sales tax, so our businesses are not used to collecting one. That is why New Hampshire businesses are so concerned that if this bill passes, they will

be forced to collect sales taxes from not just 1 State but 46 other States and 9,600 taxing jurisdictions across the country. The redtape would be a nightmare for small companies with only a few employees.

I heard from one small business owner in Hudson, NH. His business is about to reach $1 million in revenue, but his company has only six employees. Under the legislation, the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, his company might be considered a large business. The company has plans to grow, but it would be forced to reconsider as it approaches this arbitrary threshold and then is covered under the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act.

E-commerce has been a real boon to small businesses in New Hampshire and across the country. It has helped companies find new markets for their products and new revenues. But for companies looking to grow through online sales, this legislation represents an artificial ceiling for creating jobs and expanding jobs through e-commerce.

I will raise a few concerns about what this legislation would mean for small business. First, each State has different sales and use taxes, so businesses would need new software to figure out how to collect and remit those taxes. Small businesses would also need to collect personal information from each buyer to make sure they are complying with all State and local sales taxes. These small businesses might then have to deal with audit and enforcement actions from other States, and the same businesses might have to answer to taxing authorities in places where they have no representation whatsoever. As States and localities consider new taxes, these small businesses would have no voice in that process because they have no representation in those jurisdictions.

These are just a few examples of the many unintended consequences this legislation would create. These burdens on small businesses will stifle e-commerce. That is why it was so disappointing to learn that the sponsors of the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act have attached it to another measure that is meant to encourage e-commerce, the Internet Tax Freedom Act. That legislation bans taxes on Internet access.

The Internet Tax Freedom Act has broad bipartisan support. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation. Since 1998 the Internet Tax Freedom Act has kept the Internet free of new taxation, which has helped the Internet flourish and become the driver of economic activity it is today.

Unfortunately, this ban on new Internet access taxes expires this November, and Congress must take action to keep the Internet tax-free. I strongly support keeping the Internet tax-free, and the vast majority of Congress supports it. In fact, just this week the House voted to make this ban on Internet taxation permanent. The Internet Tax Freedom Act could pass the Senate and the House today with strong bipartisan support. Yet based on the action earlier this week, the Senate may be asked to consider a bill that includes new tax burdens on small businesses. That is right. It doesn't make sense, but on a bill that is meant to keep the Internet free from taxation, there is now an effort to impose new tax collection burdens on Internet retailers, and that not only doesn't make sense, I think it is just wrong.

Just yesterday I sent a letter with a bipartisan group of our colleagues urging leadership to bring a clean Internet Tax Freedom Act bill to the floor. I was joined by Senators CRUZ, AYOTTE, TESTER, MERKLEY, and PAUL. We believe the Internet should be tax-free and that we should pass this noncontroversial legislation as soon as possible.

We also think it is wrong to use a critical, must-pass extension of this law to keep the Internet tax-free as a vehicle to pass a fundamental shift in how e-commerce operates. Combining these two very different issues into one bill does nothing to protect New Hampshire's small businesses from the flawed so-called Marketplace Fairness Act.

We should keep this Internet sales tax legislation from moving forward, the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. We should do that because it is bad for New Hampshire and the other States that have no sales taxes that are in the same position as New Hampshire. It is bad for small businesses and it is bad for our economy.

Thank you very much, Madam President. I yield the floor and note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I wish to recognize my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator AYOTTE, who I think has come to the floor to also express her concerns about the commingling of the Internet Tax Freedom Act with the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. She will be speaking from her perspective about the concerns it places on New Hampshire's small businesses. I am very pleased to see my colleague from New Hampshire here to also express her concern about what is happening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Madam President, I certainly wish to thank my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN.

As she has stated, New Hampshire doesn't have a sales tax. There is absolutely nothing fair about the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, especially for a State such as New Hampshire. It should be more appropriately named the Internet sales tax collection act, because that is what it is—the Internet sales tax collection act. I certainly appreciate the work I have done with my colleague, both of us fighting the Marketplace Fairness Act, because there is nothing fair about it for New Hampshire and, frankly, nothing fair about it for online businesses across this country.

This act would ask our online businesses that have been thriving and growing—many people have started these businesses from their homes and we have seen those businesses flourish in our home State of New Hampshire—to become tax collectors for States that are greedy for revenue, and it would trample on the decision of a State such as New Hampshire not to have a sales tax. What it would mean for online businesses is they would have to become the tax collector not just for the 50 States, but they would actually have to become a tax collector for over 9,000 taxed jurisdictions in this country. Talk about a bureaucratic nightmare for an online business. Talk about an act that is going to put onerous burdens on an area of commerce that we have seen such great growth in. Talk about an act that is totally misnamed because there is nothing fair about it; it really is an Internet sales tax collection act.

In my home State of New Hampshire I have had so many online businesses write me about how this act—this MFA act—is going to hurt their business and is going to place onerous requirements on our businesses. Not only would they be forced to collect taxes for these other jurisdictions—over 9,000—but can we imagine what will happen once one of those jurisdictions—a municipality that is allowed to tax—changes their tax amount? Then, suddenly, they have to update their collection method. Guess what. If they get it wrong, they are subject to being sued in some other State, some other jurisdiction.

This is going to hurt the development of more online businesses because it creates a big bureaucracy. It is totally inappropriate. Why are we asking these thriving online businesses to become the tax collectors for States? The reason we have over 9,000 jurisdictions they have to collect for is because it is not just States; in some States even the municipal level has its own sales tax that can be collected. What a mess.

Then we see what is happening in Washington. The majority leader rule XIV'd a bill, and what he did is he attached the Marketplace Fairness Act, which I prefer to call the Internet sales tax collection act, to what was just passed in the House of Representatives: the Internet Tax Freedom Act. Talk about ironic. The Internet Tax Freedom Act is legislation I strongly support. This legislation is going to prevent taxes over the Internet, taxing the Internet that could hit all of us in some way, so that we can protect the freedom of the Internet and the growth

we have seen on the Internet. It is widely supported on both sides of the aisle, as my colleague from New Hampshire said.

So the irony is that here we have an act that is so widely supported—the Internet Tax Freedom Act—providing a tax-free Internet—and the majority leader decides to attach to it the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, which is really the Internet sales tax collection act. That legislation creates new onerous burdens on online businesses to become the tax collectors for over 9,000 tax jurisdictions. We can see the irony of it. Here we have bipartisan support for freedom from taxes on the Internet that should be extended to allow the Internet to thrive and grow and continue to grow, and the majority leader, without a hearing—because when he rule XIV's it, there is no committee hearing. It doesn't go through the committee process where we can have hearings on the burdens this will place on online commerce and on online businesses not only in my home State of New Hampshire but in other businesses across the country. There was no hearing for this. It is an issue both sides of the aisle agree with: Let's keep the Internet tax-free. Then the majority leader attaches onto it with no hearing, under rule XIV, this onerous requirement which I like to call the Internet sales tax collection act. Of course, in Washington, they always name these acts to make us think it sounds good, so they call it the Marketplace Fairness Act. That is the irony. Only in Washington would we have rammed this through this process, without a committee hearing—legislation that protects Internet freedom, that has strong bipartisan support, attached with it new onerous burdens on Internet businesses to become the sales tax collectors for the Nation.

I join in what my colleague from New Hampshire just said. I think it is wrong that this bill is being pushed forward with the Internet Tax Freedom Act that has such strong support, that should be brought to this body as a stand-alone bill, not with these new burdensome requirements that are set forth in the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act, otherwise known as the Internet sales tax collection act. The people of this country deserve to have a free, tax-free Internet. The online businesses of this country that are thriving and growing shouldn't become the tax collectors for States and municipalities that are greedy for more revenue. It is their job to collect their taxes. It shouldn't be an online business's job to collect taxes for over 9,000 jurisdictions, because we can only imagine how many changes will happen and what kind of paperwork nightmare that will create for those businesses. I have heard it from our businesses firsthand.

I hope this body will oppose any effort to vote for a bill that connects Internet tax freedom with Internet sales tax collection, because the two are antithetical. One works against the other. One ensures the freedom of the Internet to be tax-free and the other one creates new burdensome requirements on online businesses and actually works against, in my view, the thriving commerce we see over the Internet and has resulted in more choice for all of us as consumers in this country.

MALAYSIAN AIRLINES CRASH

Madam President, we all learned today, very shockingly, that there was a Malaysian Airlines flight shot down over Eastern Ukraine and that, reportedly, 295 people lost their lives in that incident. Reportedly, 23 Americans were listed on the manifest. I wish to offer my thoughts and prayers to the families of the victims of that plane that went down over Eastern Ukraine, and I want them to know they are in our thoughts and in our prayers.

I wish to raise the issue as following: There is an investigation going on. We don't know yet who is responsible or if anyone is responsible. The facts will come forward as to why this plane went down. But it has been widely reported that the plane was, in fact, shot down. Some of the reports have said it was done by a medium-range surface-to-air missile system.

We know that most recently there has been tremendous violence in Eastern Ukraine. If the investigation of this plane going down reveals that either Russia or Russian agents are responsible or indirectly responsible for shooting down this civilian airliner, there should be serious consequences.

What we know is that Vladimir Putin and the Russians have been responsible in fomenting the situation that has occurred in Eastern Ukraine where there has been violence, there has been recruiting, training, and funding of Russians and Russian agents, sending them to Eastern Ukraine to fight the Ukrainian Government, interfering with the sovereignty of Ukraine. This was following the illegal invasion and annexation of Crimea, the territory of Ukraine, by the Russian Government, and the Russians have taken over that portion of Ukraine.

We will wait to see what the investigation reveals for the downing of this plane. Our prayers are with the families who have lost loved ones. But I believe there should be serious consequences if we find out it was either Russian agents, Russian equipment, or Russia directly that was responsible for this airliner going down.

Yesterday the administration announced it would impose and was imposing greater sanctions on Russia for their activities of fomenting violence in Eastern Ukraine.

I want to thank the administration for finally coming forward and putting forth more serious sanctions against Vladimir Putin, against the Russian Government, for what they have done to interfere with the sovereignty of Ukraine.

It is an important step forward, and I hope Vladimir Putin understands there are even greater sanctions that can be imposed if the sanctions that were announced yesterday by the administration that involve some sectoral sanctions against major industries in Russia and individuals—if they do not heed the warning that is coming from those sanctions, I hope Vladimir Putin and the Russian Government understand there are much tougher sanctions that can also be imposed if they do not heed the sanctions that were put in place yesterday and stop fueling the violence in Eastern Ukraine.

We need to understand the context of what we have seen happen in Eastern Ukraine. The separatists, the so-called separatists, in Eastern Ukraine are funded, equipped, and supported by the Kremlin. Vladimir Putin could end the violence in Eastern Ukraine tomorrow if he chose to. He essentially has operational control of what these violent separatists are doing to interfere with the sovereignty in Ukraine. He is responsible for the violence, and I would call on him to end that violence, to stop funding these separatists, to stop providing them with equipment that is being used against the Ukrainian people and the Ukrainian military, and to allow the people of Ukraine to determine their future. That is what they want.

I had the privilege of going to Ukraine for their Presidential election, and I was inspired by the people who went to the polls. I will never forget being there at the first polling station that day in the Presidential election and an older gentleman came to the polls and cast his ballot and said: For democracy.

The people of Ukraine want to determine their own future, just as we determine our future in this country. Vladimir Putin and Russia should allow the people of Ukraine to decide their future. They should stop interfering with the sovereignty of Ukraine.

This is not a Ukrainian uprising of disenfranchised Russian-speaking Ukrainians. What is happening in Eastern Ukraine is a Kremlin-instigated, armed, funded, trained, and fueled aggression against the people of Ukraine and their duly elected government.

This is cynical and blatant aggression by Putin against Ukraine, and Putin continues to undermine Ukrainian sovereignty and security by arming these separatist rebels, massing Russian troops at the border of Eastern Ukraine in a very threatening way, and also threatening to increase further coercive measures against Ukraine.

The people of Ukraine need our help. The Ukrainian people are willing to risk their lives and have been risking their lives to defend the sovereignty of their country against President Putin's aggression, but the Ukrainian Government desperately needs our assistance.

In particular, the prior administration of Ukraine that left—President Yanukovych was very aligned with Russia—gutted their military and much of the equipment they need to be able to defend themselves.

Let me say, they have gone there and bravely defended themselves, even without having some of the equipment they need that was really lost by their military because of the prior administration and neglect of the Ukrainian military.

Ukrainians need assistance—and not only the sanctions the administration has issued, which could get tougher but they need military assistance from our country.

We have to keep in mind the Ukrainians gave up their nuclear weapons under the Budapest Memorandum. In return—our country, the Russians, were signatories to the Budapest Memorandum—in return for security assurances, the least we can do for them is give them the means to defend themselves.

I know the Ukrainian Government has asked us for antitank weapons, antiaircraft weapons, small arms, the sharing of intelligence so they can defend their own border. It is the least we can do for them, given that they gave up their nuclear weapons.

What country is going to give up their nuclear weapons again if we will not even give them some basic military assistance so they can defend themselves? They are not asking us to send our troops in. They are not asking for things like that. They are willing to defend themselves and they need our help to do so.

Finally, President Obama said in his June 4 speech in Poland: ''Our free nations will stand united so that further Russian provocations will only mean more isolation and costs for Russia.'' I call on the President to continue to take action and to stand by those words. Those words meant a lot to the Ukrainian people, and it is important that we follow through on those words because it is in the national security interests of the United States to stand with the people of Ukraine and their legitimately elected government as they seek to protect their sovereignty.

If we are not willing in these circumstances to stand by giving them some basic military support they have asked for, after having given up their nuclear weapons, then what lessons will other actors in the region and around the world take from that?

I think lesson No. 1 is: Why would you ever give up your nuclear weapons? In a world where we are hoping to reduce proliferation, this is not a good message for us to send.

No. 2: What will our allies in the region think if we will not stand against Russian aggression under these circumstances?

You have already seen concerns, of course, by the countries in the region that can be impacted by Russian aggression, whether it is Georgia, Moldova—concerns we have seen for further support from Poland, important allies in the region.

To put it in perspective of why we need to give this military support—in addition, we do not know what happened, but we will find out, with the downing of this commercial passenger plane and the tragic loss of 295 individuals. Over the last month, we have seen that on June 14 pro-Russian separatists shot down a Ukrainian military transport, killing all 49 people on board; on June 16, Gazprom—Russia's giant state-controlled gas company—announced they are cutting off gas supplies to Ukraine.

Just this Monday, a Ukrainian cargo plane was shot down and Ukrainian officials believe it was shot down by missiles fired from Russia.

Last night, a Ukrainian fighter jet was shot down. Ukrainians also believe the Russians were involved in shooting down that fighter jet.

We will find out what happened to this passenger plane but it was in airspace where there have been instances of Russian agents directly involved in shooting down Ukrainian planes.

So it is important that we give the Ukrainian people the capacity to defend themselves under those circumstances. It is the least we can do, given that they are willing to stand up for their own sovereignty, that they are strong friends of the United States of America. If our allies in the region think we will not stand with the sovereignty of Ukraine under these situations, it is going to create a situation where our allies will not feel they can rely on the United States of America.

It also creates a situation where allies, friends, rivals, bullies, potential adversaries take the wrong message from it. For example, thinking about what is happening right now with the negotiations with Iran, if we are a country not willing to follow through to assist our friends—under circumstances where, for example, Ukraine gave up its nuclear weapons—with some basic military support, what kind of message will that send to the negotiations going on with Iran right now as to why they should give up their nuclear program?

So this is a very important moment for the United States of America. I again want to say that the steps the administration took to impose additional sanctions this week are a very important step. I support those. I hope Vladimir Putin and Russia heed what those sanctions mean. Those sanctions will have an impact on the Russian economy, but we can impose even stronger sanctions against Russia if they do not stop funding and causing the violence in Eastern Ukraine and interfering with the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people.

The people of Ukraine have our respect. They have stood for themselves. They had a free and fair election that I was able to observe. They elected their President, and now they want to determine their own future, and they want Russia to respect the sovereignty of their country—what any country in this world should be able to expect: that another country will respect their sovereignty.

Unfortunately, Vladimir Putin has been a bully in all of this and has not respected the sovereignty of Ukraine. He should understand the sanctions that were issued this week are a message to him to stop what he is doing in Eastern Ukraine, and we can issue even tougher sanctions—and should issue tougher sanctions—if he continues to act like a bully who thinks he can go into other countries, take their territory, and push people around in those countries, as we have seen in Ukraine.

This matters to the world because we cannot have people like Putin thinking they can invade another country without consequences.

Finally, I would hope we would provide more support to the Ukrainian military, given that they have been willing to stand for their own defense, to secure their own border, to stand for their own sovereignty, but it is very difficult for them to do so when they are facing Russian-supported separatists, Russian tanks, Russian antiaircraft equipment, and more sophisticated technology than they have at the moment.

We can help them by ensuring that they have the equipment to protect themselves, to protect their border, and to let Russia know there will be consequences if they continue to interfere with the sovereignty of Ukraine or any other country.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. WARREN). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STEM JOBS

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, three of our greatest 'masters of the universe'—as I like to refer to them—have joined in an op-ed in the New York Times just last week to share their wisdom from on high and to tell us in Congress how to do our business and to conduct immigration reform they think should be pleasing to them. I am sure other super billionaires would be glad to join with these three super billionaires and could agree on legislation that would be acceptable to them.

Sheldon Adelson, Las Vegas casino magnet and Republican supporter; Warren Buffett, the master investor; and Bill Gates, the master founder of Microsoft computer systems, all super billionaires, apparently aren't happy. They don't have much respect for Congress and, by indirection, the people who elect people to Congress, it appears from the tone of their article—you know, American people, that great unwashed group; nativists, narrow-minded patriots, possessors of middle-class values. They just don't understand as we know, we great executives and entrepreneurs.

So they declare we need to import more foreign workers in computer science, technology, and engineering, because the country is ''badly in need of their services.'' They say we are badly in need of importing large numbers of STEM graduates. That is something we have all heard and many of us have perhaps assumed is an accurate thing.

These three individuals, all generous men, have contributed to a lot of causes, and I am teasing them a lit bit. They didn't mind sticking it to Congress, so I just tease them and push back a little bit.

They particularly praised the Senate for its elimination of any limits on the number of work visas that could be awarded to immigrants who have a degree in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and have a job offer.

This is the op-ed in the New York Times last Thursday: ''Sheldon Adelson, Warren Buffett, and Bill Gates on Immigration Reform.''

What did we see in the newspaper today? News from Microsoft—was it that they are having to raise wages to try to get enough good, quality engineers to do the work? Are they expanding or are they hiring? No, that is not what the news was, unfortunately. Not at all.

This is the headline in USA Today: ''Microsoft to cut up to 18,000 jobs over next year.''

Microsoft confirmed it will cut up to 18,000 jobs over the next year, part of the tech titan's efforts to streamline its business under a new CEO . . .

That is a significant action. Indeed, Microsoft employs about 125,000 people, and they are laying off 18,000. The company laid off 5,000 in 2009. Yet their founder and former leader, Mr. Gates, says we have to have more and more people come into our country to take those kinds of jobs.

It is pretty interesting, really. We need to be thinking about what it all means and ask ourselves: What is the situation today for American graduates of STEM degrees and technology degrees? Do we have enough? And do we need to have people come to our country to take those jobs? Or, indeed, do we not have a shortage of workers, and do we have difficulty of people finding jobs?

These are some of the facts I think we should look at. President Obama, Senate Democrats, and House Democrats have endorsed a proposal, a bill that passed the Senate, that would double the H–1B foreign workers that come into America for one reason—not to be a citizen, not to stay indefinitely, but to take a job, double the number, to come to take a job for several years. The great majority of these guest workers are not farm workers. They take jobs throughout the economy.

So how should we think about this? The U.S. Census Bureau reports that three-fourths of American with STEM degrees—science, technology, engineering, mathematics—don't have jobs in STEM fields. According to a recent newspaper from the Economic Policy Institute:

''Guestworkers may be filling as many as half of all new information technology jobs each year.''

It goes on. ''IT workers earn the same today as they did, generally, 14 years ago.'' Wages aren't going up, and in many cases they are going down. That is an absolute refutation, I think—if you believe in the free market—of any contention that we have a shortage of engineering, science, and STEM graduates.

The paper further says: ''Currently, only one of every two STEM college graduates is hired in a STEM job each year.'' So only half of them find a job in the profession they trained for.

Another finding of the paper: ''Policies that expand the supply of guest workers will discourage U.S. students from going into STEM fields, and into IT in particular.''

Get that. Is that not common sense? If anybody would dispute that, I would like to hear it. The policies that expand the supply of eligible workers in any field will tend to discourage people, particularly in science and engineering, if they feel like they are going to have a difficult time finding a job. That is common sense, and that is what the paper found.

Now, Mr. Hal Salzman—I am familiar with his work. He is a professor at Rutgers University and a labor specialist. He has done a good bit of work in this area. And what do his findings show? He determined: ''For the 180,000 or so openings annually, U.S. colleges and universities supply 500,000 graduates.''

More than twice as many people graduate in STEM fields as jobs are available in America for them to take.

Bob Charette, at the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, writes: ''Wages for U.S. workers in computer and math fields have largely stagnated since 2000.''

That is 14 years ago.

Even as the Great Recession slowly recedes, STEM workers at every stage of the career pipeline, from freshly minted grads to mid- and late-career Ph.D.s, still struggle to find employment.

In total, Charette reports that there are more than 11 million Americans with STEM degrees who don't have STEM jobs.

Harvard Professor Michael Teitelbaum has recently written a book. He explained:

Far from offering expanding attractive career opportunities, it seems that many, but not all, science and engineering careers are headed in the opposite direction: unstable careers, slow-growing wages, and high risk of jobs moving offshore or being filled by temporary workers from abroad.

Michael Anft, with the Johns Hopkins Magazine, observed:

You're a biologist, chemist, electrical engineer, manufacturing worker, mechanical engineer, or physicist, you've most likely seen your paycheck remain flat at best. If you're a recent grad in those fields looking for a job, good luck. A National Academies report suggests a glut of life scientists, lab workers, and physical scientists, owing in part to over-recruitment of science-Ph.D. candidates by universities. And postdocs, many of whom are waiting longer for academic spots, are opting out of science careers at higher rates, according to the National Science Foundation.

This is serious. There is a policy question, and he questions whether Members of Congress who don't pass laws like he wants on immigration are honoring their duty to the 300 million Americans whom we collectively represent.

I feel a deep duty to the millions of Alabamians I represent and the whole country, and I do my best every day to ask what is in their interests. As far as I am concerned, so far as I can see, those three billionaires have three votes. An individual who works stocking the shelves at the grocery store, the barber, the doctor, the lawyer, the cleaners, the operator, and the person who picks up our garbage are every bit as valuable as they are. I know who I represent. I represent the citizens of the United States of America, and I am trying to do what is in their best interests. And just as it is not always true what is good for General Motors is good for America, likewise, what may be good for Mr. Adelson and Mr. Microsoft and Mr. Buffett is not always in accord with what is good for the American people. I know that. They are free to express their opinion, but I am going to push back.

How many people come into our country each year as guest workers? We have discussed that. The Senate bill which Senator REID maneuvered through the Senate not too many weeks ago would double the number of guest workers. How many is that? The Associated Press wrote:

Although no one tracks exactly how many H–1B guest workers come to take jobs these are visas for jobs in fields like computers and technology—how many of these are in the United States? The AP says ''experts estimate there are at least 600,000 at any one time.''

That is a lot. These are individuals not on a citizenship path. They are in addition to the 1 million who come to America each year lawfully to become citizens of America. They simply come in at the behest of some business to take a job for a limited period of time. That is important. There are other visas these businesses can get too, but H–1B is one of the largest. A paper for the Economic Policy Institute explained the annual inflow of guest workers for the computer industry in particular is massive.

We estimate that during fiscal 2011, 372,516 high-skill guest workers were issued visas to enter the U.S. labor market, and, of these workers, between 134,000 and 228,000 were available for IT employment.

That is information technology.

The supply of IT guest workers appears to be growing dramatically despite stagnant or even declining wages.

But Microsoft and its allies want more.

Here is an excerpt from a report issued by the Partnership for a New American Economy. This is the front group for the pro-immigration crowd. It is co-headed by Steve Ballmer, a recent Microsoft CEO. He left Microsoft in February, but he is the co-head of this group and is lobbying for more H–1B guest workers to come to take jobs. They say: ''In many STEM occupations, unemployment is virtually nonexistent.''

This is not so. They declare it to be so. They say:

There is no evidence that foreign-born STEM workers adversely affect the wages of American workers by providing a less expensive alternative source of labor.

What planet are they on? Wages are declining. Median income in America today—well, according to the Wall Street Journal, it was approximately $55,000 for a family in 2007. It is now closer to $50,000. It dropped roughly $5,000. Somebody needs to talk about that.

Is unemployment in these industries ''virtually non-existent''? That is what they are telling us. They are spending millions of dollars even running TV ads to promote bringing in more workers than the 600,000 we have today. They want to double that number. I am not talking about the 1 million who already come lawfully every year through immigration in America. We have one of the most generous immigration policies in the world. These guest workers are in addition to the 1 million we let in each year on a permanent basis.

Look at these recent headlines.

Today: ''Microsoft To Cut Workforce By 18,000 This Year, 'Moving Now' To Cut First 13,000.''

How about this headline: ''[Google-owned] Motorola To Cut 10% Of Workforce After Laying Off 20% Last Year.''

''Panasonic To Cut 10K More Workers In The Next 5 Months.''

''[Online media and advertising company] CityGrid Lays Off 15% Of Its Employees.''

''Hewlett-Packard: 27,000 Job Cuts to Save Up To $3.5B By 2014.''

I would say things aren't going as well as some would suggest, and the demand out there for workers ought to be met from our current supply.

Byron York, an excellent writer at the Washington Examiner, wrote about this late last year in the Washington Examiner. The headline is: ''Companies lay off thousands, then demand immigration reform for new labor.''

On Tuesday, the chief human resource officers of more than 100 large corporations sent a letter to House Speaker John Boehner and Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi urging quick passage of a comprehensive immigration reform bill.

Don't read it, don't worry about it, just pass it. It gives us more workers, and we need those workers, is essentially, what they have been saying. ''The officials who signed the letter represent companies with a vast array of business interests: General Electric, Marriott International, Hilton Worldwide, Hyatt Hotels Corporation, McDonald's, Wendy's, The Cheesecake Factory, Johnson & Johnson, Hewlett-Packard, General Mills, and many more.'' All of them ''want to see increases in immigration levels for low-skill as well as high-skill workers in addition to a path to full citizenship for the millions of immigrants in the United States currently illegally.'' That is their agenda.

The article goes on to say: ''a new immigration law, the corporate officers say, 'would be a long overdue step toward aligning our nation's immigration policies with its workforce needs at all skill levels . . . ' ''

I would say at a time of high unemployment we need to be careful. The article goes on to say, ''at the . . . time the corporate officers seek higher numbers of immigrants, both low-skill and high-skill, many of their companies are laying off thousands of workers.''

So he did a little research. All these companies in need of workers. What about Hewlett-Packard? They signed the letter demanding more workers. I will quote from the article.

For example, Hewlett-Packard, whose Executive Vice President for Human Resources Tracy Keogh signed the letter, laid off 29,000 employees in 2012. In August of this year, Cisco Systems, whose Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer Kathleen Weslock signed the letter, announced plans to lay off 4,000—in addition to 8,000 cut in the last two years. United Technologies, whose Senior Vice President for Human Resources and Organization Elizabeth B. Amato signed the letter, announced layoffs of 3,000 this year.

American Express, whose Chief Human Resources Officer L. Kevin Cox signed the letter, cut 5,400 jobs this year. Proctor & Gamble, whose Chief Human Resources Officer Mark F. Biegger signed the letter, announced plans to cut 5,700 jobs in 2012.

Those are a just few of the layoffs at companies, the article said, whose officers signed the letter.

A few more: T-Mobile announced 2,250 layoffs in 2012. Archer-Daniels-Midland laid off 1,200. Texas Instruments, nearly 2,000. Cigna 1,300. Verizon sought to cut 1,700 jobs . . . Marriott announced 'hundreds' of layoffs this year. International Paper has closed plants and laid off dozens.

—including an old, big plant with 1,000 workers or so in north Alabama—

And General Mills, in what the Minneapolis Star-Tribune called a 'rare mass layoff,' laid off 850 people last year.

''There are more still.'' I am quoting here from Mr. Byron York's article:

In all, it's fair to say a large number of corporate signers of the letter demanding more labor from abroad have actually laid off workers at home in recent years. Together their actions have a significant effect on the economy. According to a recent Reuters report, U.S. employers announced 50,462 layoffs in August, up 34 percent from the previous month and up 57 percent from August 2012.

This is last August. I am quoting from the article:

''It is difficult to understand how these companies can feel justified in demanding the importation of cheap labor with a straight face at a time when tens of millions of Americans are unemployed,'' writes the Center for Immigration Studies, which strongly opposes the Senate Gang of Eight bill. . . . The companies claim the bill is an ''opportunity to level the playing field for U.S. employers' but it is more of an effort to level the wages of American citizens.''

Mr. York goes on to say this in his next article. The next month, he writes another article on the subject.

This week, the pharmaceutical giant Merck announced it would cut 8,500 jobs in an effort to remain competitive in a rapidly changing drug industry. Earlier this year Merck announced plans to cut 7,500 jobs, bringing the total of workers let go to 16,000. In all, Merck intends to lay off one out of every five of its employees.

Well, what is Merck, this great corporation, doing politically about the situation?

I will quote from the article. This is what they are doing politically:

At the same time, top Merck officials are urging Congress to loosen the nation's immigration laws to allow more foreign workers into the United States. In a Sept. 10 letter—

—this is last September—

—to House Speaker John Boehner and Majority Leader Nancy Pelosi, Merck Executive Vice President for Human Resources Mirian Graddick-Weir urged that the U.S. admit more high- and low-skilled immigrants to ''address the reality that there is a global war for talent'' and to ''align our nation's immigration policies with its workforce needs at all skill levels to ensure U.S. global competitiveness.''

Well, we have too many people unemployed. The number of people unemployed in our country is not accurately reflected by the simple unemployment data we get. When you look at the number of people in the actual workforce, you find we have the lowest workplace participation, the lowest number of workers as a percentage of the population at any time since the 1970s. It has been declining steadily. It is a fact. Everybody knows it. It is not disputed. If anybody wants to dispute that, come to the floor and tell me where I am wrong. And they won't because it is well accepted and Democrats and Republicans are talking openly about it, because it is a serious challenge for America. We don't have enough people working. We have got too many people living off the government and relying on federal aid and assistance. We need to create jobs for Americans first before we bring in foreign workers to take those jobs. We are going to help our people sustain their life. We make sure they have food and housing and aid if they are unable to work and don't have enough to live on, and we provide health care for them and education for their children. But we need to help them find work first before we bring somebody else to the country.

I would say to my free market business friends, I don't think you can win the argument that we have a shortage of labor, because wages are down. I know you believe in free markets. I

know you believe that things will balance out in a competitive world. If wages are down, that indicates we have a loose labor market, not a tight labor market. Wages go up when there are not enough employees, and businesses have to pay more to get good employees. Family income has gone down from 2007, as I said, from approximately $55,000 median household income to $50,000, adjusted for inflation. This is a very unusual decline. I am not sure we have seen anything like quite this before, at least since the Great Depression. This is a matter we need to talk about. ''Watching firms fire American workers while appealing for more immigration is a disheartening spectacle'', Mr. Byron York says. And I think that is true.

This is another Associated Press article: ''Backlash Stirs in US Against Foreign Worker Visas.''

But amid calls for expanding the so-called H–1B visa program, there is a growing pushback from Americans who argue that the program has been hijacked by staffing companies that import cheaper, lower-level workers to replace more expensive U.S. workers—or keep them from being hired in the first place.

''It's getting pretty frustrating when you can't compete on salary for a skilled job,'' said Rich Hajinlian, a veteran computer programmer from the Boston area. ''You hear references all the time that these big companies . . . can't find skilled workers. I am a skilled worker.''

How about this? They say there is a STEM crisis—which is Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics. They say there are not enough STEM graduates to fill vacant jobs.

This article says: ''The STEM Crisis Is a Myth.'' This is a paper by Robert Charette, contributing editor for the Industrial Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers magazine. He says:

Companies would rather not pay STEM professionals high salaries with lavish benefits, offer them training on the job, or guarantee them decades of stable employment. So having an oversupply of workers, whether domestically educated or imported, is to their benefit.

That is in part because it helps keep wages in check.

Viewed another way, about 15 million U.S. residents hold at least a bachelor's degree in a STEM discipline, but three-fourths of them—11.4 million—work outside of STEM.

If there is in fact a STEM worker shortage, wouldn't you expect more workers with STEM degrees to be filling those jobs?''

I think that is correct.

What about the people who immigrate to America? They can't get a job because somebody else was brought in to take that job from them. What are they going to do?

The economy can absorb a certain number, but in this low job-wage low-job creation economy we are in today, and have been in for a number of years, you simply cannot justify these huge increases in the number of workers we have brought into the country, especially when wages are falling.

Here is another article: ''The Myth of the Science and Engineering Shortage.'' It is an op-ed by Michael Teitelbaum, a senior research associate at Harvard Law School.

A compelling body of research is now available, from many leading academic researchers and from respected research organizations such as the National Bureau of Economic Research, the RAND Corporation, and the Urban Institute.

No one has been able to find any evidence indicating current widespread labor market shortages or hiring difficulties in science and engineering occupations . . .

He goes on to write, as I read before:

From offering expanding attractive career opportunities, it seems that many, but not all science and engineering careers are headed in the opposite direction: unstable careers, slow-growing wages, and high risk of jobs moving offshore or being filled by temporary workers from abroad.

I am afraid that is the undisputed reality. I wish it were not so. I wish we had a growing economy that would create a lot of jobs and a lot more high-tech workers and that wages were going up. But it is just not so.

Here is an article from July 11, in CNNMoney. The headline is: ''Businesses Want Immigration Reform. Why? Because they can't find enough workers.'' That is what they say the answer is.

This article notes the complaints of various business lobbyists. For instance:

The tech industry faces a backlog of working visas for high skilled workers. The long wait for green cards at top universities means the U.S. is losing [talent]. . . . Microsoft founder Bill Gates and others CEOs like Yahoo's Marissa Mayer and Facebook's Mark Zuckerburg, have all pressed Washington leaders for an immigration [reform].

CNN also includes this statement from another group demanding Congress provide more workers:

Two-thirds of construction companies have reported labor shortages according to the Associated General Contractors of America, who is pushing for immigration reform.

So two-thirds of construction companies reported labor shortages. Well, what do we know about that?

Here is a May 5 article from Economic Policy Institute by Ross Eisenbrey. They cite an in-depth study about the labor market.

The headline says: ''There are Seven Unemployed Construction Workers for Every Job Opening.''

There is a chart showing the drop in wages. This isn't some promoter, some lobbyist or some media consultant putting out a self-serving statement claiming we have a shortage of workers. This is an academic study. Again, what does it say? ''No Sign of Labor Shortages in Construction: There are Seven Unemployed Construction Workers for Every Job Opening.''

That is where we are. What we need, as a Nation, is to construct an immigration policy that serves the interests of the American people.

Professor Borjas at Harvard is perhaps the most astute and renowned expert on labor and immigration of anybody in the entire world and has written a number of books on this. He did an comprehensive study using census data and Department of Labor data and concluded that from 1980 to 2000, as a result of America's high immigration levels, the wages of lower-skilled US workers declined by 7.4 percent.

The impact of this large flow of immigration from 1980 to 2000 reduced wages. We already bring in a million people a year, plus hundreds thousands more guest workers. I am not against immigration. What I am opposed to, however, is an immigration policy that fails to serve the needs of the people living here today. The myth is we have this great shortage of labor. It is just not so. If he allowed the labor market to tighten, wages would increase, more Americans would take some of these jobs and be able to raise a family, buy an automobile, and maybe even buy a house and educate their children.

Today I am going to issue a challenge to Majority Leader REID, and every single one of our 55 Senate Democrats, who voted unanimously for this Gang of 8 bill.

With Microsoft laying off 18,000 workers, come down to the Senate floor and tell me there is a shortage of qualified Americans to fill STEM jobs. Come down and tell us. Do you stand with Mr. Bill Gates or do you stand with our American constituents?

It is long past time we had an immigration policy that truly served the needs of the American people. That is the group to whom we owe our loyalty and duty and first responsibility. That is who elected us, and that is in our constitutional system, which ultimately judges us on our performance.

The United States let in 40 million new immigrants legal and illegal—since 1970. There are many wonderful people in that group. But Washington actually hurts both our immigrant workers and US-born workers alike when we continue to bring in record numbers of new workers to compete for jobs. The share of the population today that is foreign-born has quadrupled. It has gone up four-fold in forty years. After four decades of large-scale immigration, is it not time, colleagues, that we slow down a bit, allowed wages to rise, assimilation to occur, and the middle class to be restored?

I thank the chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

CELEBRATING GOVERNOR PHIL HOFF'S 90TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. Mr. President, we come to the floor oftentimes to discuss issues of portent to the Nation, but the

distinguished Senator from Vermont and I wish to speak about one of the most significant people Vermont has ever known.

I wish to yield to my distinguished colleague from Vermont and we will go back and forth.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank Senator LEAHY for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, every now and then there are figures who come along who play a profound and transformative role in the period in which they are living. Phil Hoff is one of those people. We are here to celebrate his 90th birthday and the work he has done in Vermont and around the country and the life he and his wife Joan have lived, both of whom have done so much for the people of the State of Vermont.

Phil Hoff was the 73rd Governor of the State of Vermont. He was in many ways the founder of progressive politics in our State. It is now recognized—and we say this proudly, although not everybody necessarily is as proud of it as we are—but Vermont is now one of the more progressive States in the United States of America. We have been a leader for the rights of working people, for the environment, for women's rights, for gay rights, for kids, and we are proud of that, but none of that would have happened—we would not be where we are today—if it had not been for the work of Phil Hoff, who has Governor of our State and was elected in 1962.

I am going to yield to my colleague Senator LEAHY now. I have a lot more I wish to say, but let me begin the discussion by saying that we in Vermont are extraordinarily fortunate that one of the great Governors of his time is a real visionary, a man who led the beginning of making profound changes in the State of Vermont.

I yield back to the senior Senator from Vermont, Mr. LEAHY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Vermont is absolutely right. Vermont changed remarkably when Governor Phil Hoff was elected. Prior to that time, the governorship of Vermont was basically a part-time office—seen now and then when the legislature was there but not so much otherwise—and things went along almost on autopilot. Governor Hoff changed that and brought Vermont into the 20th century. I think because the two are somewhat intertwined.

I was a volunteer for the Presidential campaign of then-Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960. I volunteered on his campaign, but I wasn't old enough to vote for him. But I remember the first election I was able to vote in was the Vermont Governor's race in 1962, and I cast my first vote for Philip Henderson Hoff. My family was thrilled when he won that election. He became the first Democratic Governor elected in Vermont in over a century.

My parents and Marcelle's parents were so fond of Phil Hoff and his wife Joan. They thought the world of them. I was happy the other day in seeing both Phil and Joan at his birthday celebration. They talked about my parents and Marcelle's parents, but I told them I wouldn't be where I am today without Governor Hoff.

I was a young lawyer in his office. There had been a real problem in the State's attorney's office in Chittenden County, VT, which is about one-quarter of our State's population. The State's attorney announced he was leaving and Governor Hoff called me to his home on Friday afternoon and said: I want you to be State's attorney on Monday morning.

I gulped, and I said: Yes, sir.

He said: Clean up the backlog of cases that have accumulated in the office.

I said: Yes, sir.

He said: Do that for 1 year and then come on back to our firm.

And I said: Yes, sir.

The one thing I didn't do is I didn't come back to the firm; I enjoyed being there so much, I stayed there. I stayed there, though, with admiration for Phil Hoff because he had changed the State of Vermont. He made it exciting to be in government in Vermont. He made it exciting to be part of the fabric of Vermont. I have always appreciated that. I have always appreciated my time with him but especially the mentoring he offered me. If it had not been for him, I can tell my colleagues, I would not be standing here today as the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate.

I yield back to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, way back in 1968 as a young man, I got a job at the Department of Taxation in a small building on State Street across the street from the statehouse, working for the administration, then-Governor Hoff, and that was a very important experience for me and helped me shape some of my views which I carry today.

Phil Hoff's career of public service began during World War II when he put his studies on hold and joined the Navy, eventually joining the submarine service. He served on the USS *Sea Dog* in the Pacific theater, going on a number of combat tours in the dangerous waters near the main islands of Japan.

While in naval training in New London, CT, a friend of his set up a blind date with a Connecticut college student. Her name was Joan Brower, and she and Phil would be married after the war—a marriage that was to last for six rich decades.

I know Senator LEAHY and his wife, as well as myself and my wife Jane, know the Hoffs very well. We know Joan and know of her years of dedication to the people of the State of Vermont, especially in the area of education. So she in her own right has been a very important figure in our State.

After Phil Hoff's graduation from Cornell Law School, he and Joan moved to Burlington, VT, in 1951. Deeply committed to social justice, he became involved in Democratic Party politics and did that despite the fact that he grew up in a Republican family.

Senator LEAHY will remember that way back then, there was a group of what they called the Young Turks—younger Democrats who came into a very conservative Republican legislature. Most of them were under 40. Many of them were veterans of World War II. They moved forward to try to bring about some long needed change in the State.

Their experience in the legislature motivated Phil Hoff to run for Governor in 1962. As Senator LEAHY indicated, if my memory is correct, he was the first Democrat elected Governor since the Civil War; is that right?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, my colleague is absolutely correct. It was a cataclysmic change in the political landscape of Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. For more than 100 years—I think many people don't know this—the Republican Party dominated Vermont politics, controlling both Houses of the legislature and the Governor's office.

This is a funny story. Even in the landslide Presidential election of 1936, when FDR—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—won a huge landslide victory, Vermont joined Maine as the only State in the country to vote against Roosevelt and vote for Alfred Landon, and thus came the well-known expression: ''As goes Maine, so goes Vermont.'' What Phil Hoff helped do is lead Vermont out of a one-party State, badly in need of reforms, and brought that State in many significant ways into the second half of the 20th century.

I yield back to the senior Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Vermont. He and I share so much affection for Phil and Joan Hoff, and I can tell hundreds of stories. He made a difference by enthusiastically bringing people together in our State, with the realization that we needed to catch up with the rest of the country in so many ways—such as bringing high-tech industry into Vermont and working so hard to make sure everybody had a good education no matter what part of the State they lived in.

Then there are the personal anecdotes. I was excited as a young State's attorney one day getting a call from the Governor's office that one of the old-line politicians in Burlington had died—a wonderful man of French Canadian descent. They were going to have a mass for him at the Cathedral, and the Governor wanted me to ride with him to the mass.

I got into the car, and I said, Governor, you know I have only been State's attorney for a very short while and I can't tell you what an honor it is to be with you. He said, An honor? Honor has nothing to do with it. He said, I am an Episcopalian, you are a Catholic. They put me in the front row. I never know when I am supposed to stand or where I am supposed to sit, so you are going to make sure I do it right. I had been an altar boy for years, and I was in sheer panic when I walked in the church that I might have the Governor do something wrong, but we made it through.

More importantly, Vermont had issues, and they became very serious, affecting the reputation of our State. Phil Hoff and great people together across the political spectrum would sit in his office and he would say, how do we make things better for Vermont—never for him, it was for Vermont.

I think of the changes in our State, and I remember my parents and Marcelle's parents talking about the amount of changes—changes for the better—and every time they would go back to one name: Phil Hoff.

I was so glad to hear Senator SANDERS speak of Joan Brower Hoff and their wonderful daughters. She truly was Vermont's First Lady. She was almost as recognizable—in fact, in many places, more recognizable than her husband—highly respected. People—men and women—wanted to be able to model their careers and their nature after her. I am glad the two are still together. They are still healthy, they are still the best of Vermont, and I feel honored to be able to speak of them here.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, Senator LEAHY talked about the influence Governor Hoff had on the State. Let me give some examples of what he did.

Senator LEAHY will remember in the early 1960s we had the situation in Vermont where the Vermont State House of Representatives, people were represented by every town. I lived for a while in the town of Stannard, VT, which has maybe 100, 150 people, and they had the same vote in the legislature as Burlington, VT, the largest city in the State, which has 40,000 people. Under Phil Hoff, what we moved to in the State—and with the Supreme Court ruling dealing with proper apportionment—was person, one vote, so the house began to reflect the population locations of the State and not just every town.

In addition to that, when Phil Hoff was Governor of the State, he successfully insisted on repealing Vermont's poll tax. Now we think that is ancient history. What the poll tax said is that in order to vote, you have to pay a certain amount of money, which, obviously, is discriminatory to lower income people. That was repealed under Hoff's era as Governor.

He understood and his wife understood the importance of education. What Governor Hoff did was he quadrupled State aid to public schools and organized the three State teachers colleges into a new, revitalized State college system that better met the needs of Vermont's students. That system endures to this day. We have a very strong system of State colleges in Vermont, and that began under the Hoff era.

Under Governor Hoff's leadership, Vermont's judicial system was modernized. Always a path breaker and an advocate for justice, Phil Hoff led the way to Vermont becoming one of the first States in the country to abolish the death penalty.

No aspect of State government was beneath his notice, and he took Vermont forward in many ways, including terminating the outdated ''overseer of the poor'' system. That was something he changed as well. He established the Vermont district court State court system, the Judicial Nominating Board, the Vermont State Housing Authority, and the Vermont Student Assistance Corporation—a program which today plays a very vital role in making sure young people in Vermont can get a college education.

What was also—and Senator LEAHY knows this better than I—rather extraordinary about Phil Hoff is he understood that positive change could not take place in Vermont unless change was taking place throughout the country. In that area, being the Governor of one of the smallest States in the country, this man showed extraordinary courage, and he said: Do you know what. That war in Vietnam is not good for Vermont, it is not good for America.

He was one of the first public officials, as I recall, I say to Senator LEAHY, to speak out. That took a whole lot of courage, to speak out against the war in Vietnam. He took it a step further. Here you had Lyndon Johnson at that time—who I think will go down in history, except for that war in Vietnam, as one of our great Presidents—and Phil Hoff said: Do you know what. Maybe we need a change in the White House, and maybe we should be looking at somebody like Bobby Kennedy rather than Lyndon Johnson.

But, I say to Senator LEAHY, I know he was involved in some of that as a young man.

Mr. LEAHY. I was. And I recall, when Phil Hoff came out against the war in Vietnam—and he was in the minority on that—no member of the Vermont congressional delegation had voted against the war in Vietnam. They voted for all the increases in it. He was in some ways a lonely voice, but he did come out against it. It angered Lyndon Johnson, who was then President. But then he supported Robert Kennedy, as did I.

I remember the two of us meeting Senator Edward Kennedy—one of the Presiding Officer's predecessors—on the runway at the airport in Burlington, VT. He and Governor Hoff and myself and others were going to speak to a group on behalf of Robert Kennedy, Bobby Kennedy. I remember the look of sorrow on Governor Hoff's face as he stood as one of the honorary pallbearers at Robert Kennedy's funeral. But even after that, he continued to push to make Vermont a better State.

I think—and I realize we have others waiting for the floor—but I just want to say again that Vermont is a wonderful State. It is a beautiful State. It is a progressive State. As Senator SANDERS and I have both said, it would not be what it is today were it not for Phil Hoff. We have all tried to follow in those footsteps, but he lit the way. That sometimes is an overused expression, but in this case I think every historian would agree with us.

Mr. SANDERS. Let me concur with Senator LEAHY. We take this opportunity to wish Governor Hoff a very happy 90th birthday. Jane and I see him quite often, and we just bumped into Phil and Joan recently. We look forward to continuing that relationship.

The bottom line is, as Senator LEAHY said, we are very proud that Vermont is a leader in so many areas in terms of social justice, in terms of environmental sanity, in terms of protecting the needs of ordinary people. That transformation and those efforts did not come about by accident, and certainly one of the great leaders in moving us in that direction was the man we honor today; that is, Philip H. Hoff. We wish him the very, very best in the years to come.

Mr. LEAHY. We wish a happy birthday to a true giant of our State.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on a bill I have introduced. It is S. 1596. It is the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act.

I wish to thank my cosponsors on this legislation. It is a bipartisan bill. Senator JOE MANCHIN and I have introduced this together, and I am grateful to Senators MCCONNELL and INHOFE for their cosponsorship.

This bill was inspired by a terrible story. It is the story of Jeremy Bell, and it begins at a school in Delaware County, PA. One of the schoolteachers molested several boys and raped one of them. Prosecutors decided they did not have enough evidence to bring a case, but the school was aware of what happened, so they dismissed the teacher for this outrageous behavior. But then, amazingly, the school also decided that they would help this teacher get another job at another school so they could be rid of him. And they did exactly that, in fact, passing along a letter of recommendation, helping this predator get a job at a school in West Virginia.

The story ends in 1997 when that teacher—by then a school principal—raped and murdered 12-year-old Jeremy Bell in West Virginia. Justice finally caught up with that teacher, and he is now in jail serving a life sentence for the murder, but for Jeremy Bell that justice came too late.

The very sad truth is that Jeremy Bell is not alone. Every day seems to bring a new report of a child robbed of his or her innocence by someone they should have been able to trust, someone their parents told them they should obey. The numbers are absolutely terrifying, and, worse still, the numbers are growing.

On April 10 of this year, I came to this floor and spoke about the need to pass this legislation to protect our kids from predators in the classroom. I explained then that since January 1 of this year, at that point, 130 teachers had been arrested across America for sexual misconduct with children. Well, here we are just over 3 months later and that number has more than doubled. Since January 1 of this year, 275 teachers have been arrested in America for sexual misconduct with children—275. These are teachers. That is more than one per day so far this year.

Let's be honest. These are the ones whom we have caught. These are the ones who have actually been arrested. These are the ones against whom there is enough evidence that they have actually been arrested. How many more are out there who have not been caught or for whom the evidence is not yet sufficiently clear?

The damage these predators are doing is enormous. It is far beyond what any numbers or my words can express. So I want to let some of the victims speak for themselves.

I will tell you a brief story from Shannon. Shannon is from Nevada. She was raped by a teacher. The teacher was later convicted of sexual assault and sentenced to life in prison. Nine years later, this is what Shannon wrote:

> When I was a senior in high school, Mr. Peterson approached me and said I would need to go to night school if I wanted enough credits to graduate on time. And, of course, he taught one of those courses—a computer class. I was 17, and he raped me 4 times over the course of a year. He said he would fail me if I ever told. He also hit me and made threats against me and my family. So I didn't. I held it in for a year and a half.
>
> In the end, 66 people offered to testify against Peterson. His first victim dated back to the year I was born. Some of those who spoke up were parents. Their daughters had complained at the time, but nothing was done. That made me very angry. It still does. I learned that a handful of teachers, and two principals, knew about him. And his teaching license had been revoked in Michigan years before, and no one knew why.
>
> I'm different [now] because of what happened. I have to watch people all the time, analyze them. I can't be carefree. Now I have a seven-year-old son and two daughters, ages three and one. I will home-school my girls.

So when you see the number 275, remember Shannon, and remember that so far this year there are 275 others like her.

Gary of South Carolina is one of at least 29 boys abused by a teacher named Mr. Fisher over that teacher's 37-year career. Now the teacher is serving 20 years in prison. Two school principals were sued for allegedly covering up the abuse. Here is what Gary wrote about his experience:

> I was nine when it started. The abuse was frequent and long-term—till I went to college. I knew there were others, too, but until it all came out, I never knew how many.
>
> You feel so guilty, so ashamed. It's frightening now to look back and see how calculating Fisher was. I did everything I could to get kicked out of school. I was in the guidance counselor's office all the time. Finally, in tenth grade, I got myself kicked out for cheating. By the time I want to college, I was drinking all the time. I was terrified to quit because then I'd have to feel. But I couldn't drink and do school, so I entered rehab. I was 18. It took me a year and a half, and I've been sober since.
>
> My life is good now, for the first time. You can survive it, but you have to deal with it. I always felt that what the school did was far worse than what Fisher did. Fisher was sick, an evil monster. But [the school] just calculated the damage to its public relations. We kids were disposable, which is a whole other category of evil.

So when you see the number 275, remember Gary, and remember that there are 275 others like him that we know of already this year alone.

So what can we do? Well, my bill is a first step at addressing this problem. It is called the Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act. It is pretty simple, really. It requires a mandatory background check for existing and prospective employees, and it requires that those checks be periodically repeated. There are five States that do no background checks.

The second thing my bill would do is it would apply to all employees of a school—employees or contractors who have unsupervised access to children, not just teachers. So it would include bus drivers and coaches. There are 12 States that currently do no checks at all on contractors.

The legislation would also require more thorough background checks. It would require that school districts check four major databases, both State and Federal. In my own State of Pennsylvania, for instance, if an employee has been a resident of my State for 2 years or more, then only the State database is checked. We just do not find out what this person might have done in another State at a different time.

The legislation also would prohibit what has—tragically, it has developed its own name; the name is ''passing the trash.'' This is the phenomenon of when a school knowingly recommends one of these predators to another school. As outrageous as that sounds, it actually happens. Some of these school and school districts so want to be rid of this problem, this embarrassment, that they actually facilitate the person moving on to some other place, where, of course, this predator just strikes again against some other children. That would be banned under this legislation.

In addition, there would be a prohibition against hiring these kinds of predators. Schools would not be able to hire a person who has ever been convicted of any violent or sexual crime against a child—if they were convicted of a violent or sexual crime against a child. There are a number of other felonies that would also preclude someone from being hired by a school if they are going to have access to children. Those would include homicide, child abuse or neglect, crimes against children, including pornography, rape, or sexual assault, kidnapping.

In addition, a person who has been convicted within the past 5 years of a felony physical assault or battery or a felony drug-related offense—for 5 years from the time at which those crimes were committed, the person would be precluded from being hired in a position, in a capacity where they would have supervisory responsibility over children.

The enforcement for all of this is the only way the Federal Government can or should enforce policies such as this on school districts and schools; that is, if a State refuses to adopt these provisions, then they would lose the funding they get from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That is one of many—but an important one—of the Federal Government funding streams for K–12 education. No State wants to lose that source of funding, so I think States would respond by adopting this very commonsense series of measures to protect their children.

I should say this is a bill with very broad support—so broad, in fact, that in the House the companion legislation passed unanimously. There was not a single dissenting vote. They voted last year, and it passed unanimously.

We have bipartisan support here in the Senate, as I mentioned. I am joined by Senators MANCHIN, MCCONNELL, and INHOFE.

It is supported by child advocacy groups. The National Children's Alliance, the Children's Defense Fund, and the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children all strongly support this legislation. I appreciate their support.

It is also supported by prosecutors—the Association of Prosecuting Attorneys, the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association. As a matter of fact, there were five district attorneys from southeastern Pennsylvania alone, from different political parties, who wrote an op-ed—a very persuasive op-ed—arguing why this bill is necessary based on what they see every day in their jobs as prosecutors. I wish to thank those district attorneys. Risa Ferman from Montgomery County, Seth Williams from Philadelphia County, Tom Hogan from Chester County, David Heckler from Bucks County, and Jack Whelan from Delaware County all weighed in in favor of this legislation.

Finally, there are teacher groups that support this as well. The American Federation of Teachers supports this legislation. The Pennsylvania School Boards Association does as well.

I do not think I would be going far out on a limb to suggest that probably a huge majority of Americans support this legislation because one thing I know for sure as a parent of three young kids—my kids are 14, 12, and 4. There is one thing that is most important to most parents I know; that is, that our children be safe and secure. When you put your kid on a schoolbus, you expect that child will be in a safe environment all day long—on the ride to school, while they are in school, and on the way back home. Frankly, we owe it to parents as well as to their children to do all we can to ensure that they do, in fact, have a safe environment—as safe as we can make it—for their kids.

Two hundred seventy-five is the number. That is the number that should give us all pause. It marks 275 tragedies that we know of already this year—275 childhoods that are shattered, 275 families torn by grief, betrayal, self-blame. It marks a failure on our part. This kind of child abuse can be prevented. We have the tools to prevent it and to prevent so many children from harm.

Again, last year the House acted unanimously to protect children from these sexual predators. This is something we could have done a long time ago. We certainly should not be letting a new school year begin—really in a matter of weeks—without doing something about this shameful number and without making sure this number does not continue to grow.

I hope we will be able to bring this bill to the Senate floor. I hope we will have very broad bipartisan support for it here in the Senate, as we already have in the House.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ISRAELI CONFLICT

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the fact that I believe the body has come to agreement on my resolution, along with Senator MENENDEZ, standing behind Israel in its conflict with Hamas.

As I speak, apparently there is a ground action going on by the Israelis in Gaza. From my point of view, do what you have to do to defend yourself.

I can't believe they have actually waited this long. I can't imagine what the American response would have been. If one rocket had come from our neighboring nations toward our country, we would not be so restrained.

A two-state solution seems to be a very reasonable approach. The problem is, as the Presiding Officer knows, Hamas doesn't recognize Israel as an entity. It is pretty hard to negotiate with somebody who doesn't recognize you exist and tells their schoolchildren you don't exist. The hatred that comes from Hamas in their schools toward Israel is not conducive to peace.

The resolution passed unanimously by the Senate the very night Israel decided to use ground force I think is appropriate and very symbolic. The Senate does not see a moral equivalency.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu said: Israel uses missiles, in collaboration with the United States, to produce the technology called Iron Dome to defend civilians. Hamas uses civilians to cover their missile program, making human shields of their own people.

That says all we need to know.

So I am pleased that in a bipartisan fashion, unanimous in nature, the U.S. Senate is on record supporting the State of Israel in this conflict, understanding their justification for defending themselves and that there is no moral equivalency here.

To my Israeli friends and allies, we wish you well. I expect that you will continue to defend yourselves against a terrorist organization.

To the Palestinians who have formed a unity government, you need to break away from Hamas. There will never be peace until you marginalize the terrorist organization called Hamas, until you reject what they stand for and the way they have behaved.

Finally, to those who wish for Israel to give up land and withdraw from territories, please remember, that is exactly what Israel did in Gaza. They withdrew all their forces, and what have they gotten in return? Tens of thousands of rockets.

So to those who are pushing a peace plan in the Middle East between the Palestinians and the Israelis, I hope you remember security for Israel has to be the centerpiece of any peace deal. How can you obtain peace when one of the members of the Palestinian Government—Hamas—has fired thousands of rockets, caring less where they fall? They couldn't care less if it falls on a kindergarten or a military base. They just care to kill Israelis. Israelis have killed civilians, but they go the extra mile in time of war and conflict to minimize casualties. They tell them: We are going to bomb you. They pass out leaflets. They tell people to leave. That says a lot about the Israelis.

So the Senate is in Israel's camp in a bipartisan fashion.

I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator withhold his request?

Mr. GRAHAM. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

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

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

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I wish to continue on this topic.

In the last few hours, we have now had word of the potential for ground operations occurring in Gaza.

This is addressed to those who are watching Florida or will watch this message in Florida about what has happened.

I know the world has become a messy place over the last few hours. We have an incident that occurred over the skies of Ukraine with the Malaysian aircraft, and we don't know all the details of what had occurred there. We should reserve judgment until we do. Suffice it to say, that may further complicate our view of the world in this Chamber over the next few weeks, but let me address for a moment what is happening in the Middle East.

When I was elected to the Senate, a few days later, the first trip I took was to Israel. It was a country I had long admired, with strong links to the United States and to Florida in particular. In fact, the current Israeli Ambassador to the United States is from Florida. His brother was the mayor of Miami Beach. So there are strong links between Florida and Israel. I was amazed on that trip by how far that country has come—a nation that doesn't have oil or the kind of massive resources from an energy perspective that other countries in the region do, yet a country that is flourishing because of their investment in technology and innovation.

There is a book called ''Start-Up Nation,'' which chronicles the amazing miracle of Israel and what they have achieved. The one thing that strikes you about Israel as you fly over is how narrow it is. At its narrowest point, it is only 9 miles wide.

This is a country that was forged, by the way, in the aftermath of the Holocaust, with the notion that never again will the Jewish people not have a place to go in the world to call their own. That still remains the guiding principle behind the country and behind its defense forces, and we should view it within that context as we view what is occurring now in that region and part of the world.

Literally, Israel is surrounded by enemies. Certainly they have had the stability in the last two decades of peace agreements with Jordan and Egypt. But look everywhere around Israel and you see them surrounded by people who are intent on their destruction. We know that is the case in Gaza. We know that is the case in Samaria and Judea or what is commonly called the West Bank by some. We know that is the case with Assad and Syria, and many of the elements fighting within Syria. We know that is the case with Hezbollah and Lebanon. We know that is the case with Iran and its weapons programs and its long-term ambitions. This is a country surrounded by elements that want to destroy it.

It is in that context, by the way, that this government in Israel was involved

in an intensive process of negotiation brokered and led by the United States with the Palestinian President Abbas regarding a potential peace deal, some way of forging a solution, an answer to the conundrum of what to do with Palestinian populations that would allow them to live peacefully, coexist side by side with a Jewish State. They entered into this conversation despite the fact that it was never clear that Abbas was able or had the power or the influence to make the sort of tough decisions that were going to be required for peace.

In fact, they entered into the negotiation knowing they would not even speak for all Palestinians, given the fact that Hamas controlled the Gaza Strip. They entered into this negotiation nonetheless. They entered into this negotiation despite the chaos surrounding them in Lebanon and Syria. Despite the fact that Iran continues to pursue nuclear weapons to destroy Israel, potentially, they entered into these negotiations. Because I say this to you unequivocally: I know of no nation on Earth that wants peace more than Israel. So they entered into these negotiations.

And what happened? What happens is what always happens with these negotiations. What happened is Abbas eventually withdrew. He once again took himself out of the talks and he tried once again to seek membership—Palestinian membership—into all these sorts of national organisms of the state, as a country of its own, knowing that was a deal breaker and knowing if that occurred, there could be no peace negotiation. That is the route he chose, nonetheless.

But then he did what I believe has triggered this latest round of violence against Israel, and that is deciding to form a power-sharing government with a terrorist group by the name of Hamas that to this day continues to deny Israel's right to even exist.

I want you to think about that for a moment. How could you possibly ever enter into a peace agreement with an organization with its very purpose being your destruction? And yet that is what Israel was being asked to do.

Tragically, within several weeks of that new government being formed, three teenagers, including an American citizen, were kidnapped and they were murdered. Then on July 7 Hamas once again started raining down rockets on Israel. Today more than 1,300 of them have been fired. The good news is that Israel has invested heavily in an air defense system which I was able to see during my second visit to Israel in the early part of 2013. But 1,300 rockets is an extraordinary number, and that is what Israel has faced.

As American policymakers, you ask what is our interest there? And I think it begins with the unique relationship that exists between the United States and Israel. It is the only vibrant democracy in that part of the world. Its alliance with the United States is unquestionable, not just in international forums but all over this planet. Israel is consistently on America's side time and again, in every one of our challenges. The cooperation between our countries is extraordinary, not to mention that Israel as a nation stands for everything that we as a nation believe in: freedom, the ability to speak out. They have a vibrant democratic process. Anyone who is familiar with Israeli politics knows how vibrant their democracy is and how much they engage in open and public debate in bringing their government together to govern the country. So we have this extraordinary alliance with Israel of incredible importance, and that is why we care. That is the political reason.

There is a moral reason behind it, and that is the right of the Jewish people to have a country they can live in peacefully; that truly never again will we face a time when Jews have nowhere to go. This is the commitment we have made to Israel and that we must keep.

I must say that I am and have been deeply troubled at the attitude this administration has adopted toward Israel. Let me be clear. I don't come here today to create this into a partisan issue. I don't want it to be a partisan issue. In fact, one of the great successes of American foreign policy with Israel has been the strong bipartisan support that Israel enjoys in the House and the Senate from almost every American President since Israel's founding at the conclusion of World War II.

But I am concerned about the position this administration is taking. I was concerned about the amount of pressure the Secretary of State was placing on the Israelis to enter into a negotiation with the Palestinian Authority which didn't have the authority or power to reach a peace agreement they could possibly enforce much less deliver on. I was concerned that pressure was being put on them at a time when Israel faced so many other challenges, No. 1 being the ambitions that Iran has to acquire nuclear weapons and long-range rockets that could strike Israel and eventually the mainland of the United States.

I think it is safe to say the relationship of the Israeli Government has never been worse toward an American President for more than 2 decades. And that has an impact on this region, and unfortunately it has had an impact here.

I have also been concerned about some of this moral equivalence that is going on in the press and some of the email I have been getting and some of the public statements I am hearing some make in some corridors—not in the Senate but some other places. The idea that both sides are to blame is an interesting concept, but it isn't true.

It is tragic, unfortunately, that civilians are dying in Gaza, but the reasons why civilians are dying is 100 percent Hamas's fault. This is an organization that puts rockets and military installations right next to nurseries and hospitals and civilian population centers. Why would they do that? Do you know why they do that? They do that because they know when they launch a rocket Israel will respond by hitting that rocket launcher, and when that rocket launcher is destroyed, so are the areas around it. Then they can get the cameras to go in there and say: ''Look what Israel did. They wiped out a nursery or apartment building.''

They do that on purpose. They know exactly what they are doing. They are doing it so they can get the kind of coverage that unfortunately even some American press outlets are buying into now.

Here is the bottom line—and Senator GRAHAM was alluding to this a moment ago. Israel does extraordinary things with regard to this. They drop leaflets into population centers warning: We are going to have to conduct a military operation in your region. Please evacuate. Please go elsewhere where you will be safe.

Hamas doesn't do that. In fact, Hamas deliberately targets population centers to terrorize the people of Israel, and we should condemn it for what it is. There is no moral equivalency.

So now the situation has continued to spiral out of control and it has reached a point where the news today now is that Israel has begun to conduct ground operations and these ground operations they are conducting as early as this morning have to do with a tunnel network in Gaza which was used by Hamas to try to infiltrate terrorists through those tunnels into Israel to conduct terrorist activity and kill Israelis.

Put yourself in the position of this country, small and geographically isolated, surrounded by terrorist groups and some unfriendly countries, threatened by the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon and being hit by 1,300 rockets in just the last week. They have no choice but to defend themselves using all the power at their disposal. They have no choice. Not only should no one here be criticizing that, but we should be supporting it and aligning ourselves 100 percent on their side, because what they are fighting for here is not some dispute over borders. This is not some geopolitical dispute about who owns what territory. Israel is fighting for its very survival.

On the other side of this conflict is a terrorist organization bent on their destruction. On the other side of this conflict is a terrorist organization in Hamas and, truth be told, the Palestinian Authority, whose schools teach children not just to hate Israel but to hate Jews.

How could you possibly say you are for peace when your schools are actively teaching your children to hate another people? That is what is on the other side of this conflict.

And so Israel has no choice. They are fighting for their very survival, and I

think that now more than ever what they need from this country is a President and a U.S. Government that aligns itself squarely on their side—no doubletalk, no fancy diplomatic language that you could read between the lines on—a very clear statement: In this conflict we are on Israel's side and we will support them with anything they need to ensure their stability and their survival—very clear language that makes it unequivocal.

Hamas is a terrorist organization, not a legitimate representative of the aspirations of the Palestinian people, but a terrorist organization designed for the very purpose of destroying the Jewish state. We need to make these things abundantly clear, because otherwise we are going to see more of this in the years to come.

If there is any daylight between the United States and Israel, it emboldens Israel's enemies. I would say as bad as this situation is—and it is terrible—the biggest danger facing Israel today is not just 1,300 rockets that have come over from Hamas, it is the threat of a nuclear Iran. It is interesting that while we are having this conversation here today about the attack Israel is under, this administration is trying to get an extension of these talks with the Iranian regime.

I hope you clearly understand. I said this before and I want to come here and reiterate: If Iran is allowed to retain the ability of enriching uranium or reprocessing plutonium, they will build a nuclear weapon with that capacity. Let me put it in plain English. If you let them keep the machines they use to reprocess and enrich, they may not reprocess and enrich to weapons grade right away, but the fact they have the ability to do it I guarantee you eventually means they will.

Do you know how I know that? One reason is all you have to do is hear the speeches they give. The second reason why we know that is the other issue no one is talking about: Iran isn't just spinning centrifuges, they are not just enriching uranium and reprocessing plutonium. Iran is building rockets—long-range rockets, intercontinental missiles. And there is only one purpose for those missiles. The only purpose they have is to put a warhead on them with a nuclear payload. That is the only reason why you build missiles such as that. These types of missiles are not built to deliver a conventional weapon; they are built for purposes of a nuclear capability.

Additionally, these rockets they want to build aren't just rockets that can reach Jerusalem or Tel Aviv. These are rockets that can reach Washington, DC, and my hometown of Miami, and New York City, and the mainland of the United States. So if they build these missiles with that range and they develop the ability to enrich and reprocess, they are one step away, a half step away from becoming a nuclear power, able to hold our country hostage and to carry out their ambitions of destroying Israel. That is the single greatest threat. As great as this threat is with Hamas, and needs to be dealt with decisively, that is the single greatest security threat facing Israel.

It is ironic to me that even as we are focused on this issue and what is happening, this administration is off in Geneva trying to cut a deal with Iran that allows them to retain an acknowledged right to enrich and reprocess, and that is going to prove to be disastrous.

It is my opinion those negotiations will lead to nothing, because Iran has entered into these negotiations believing they entered from a position of strength. They believe this President so badly wants a deal that they don't have to give on anything. By the way, I don't know how you do a meaningful deal with Iran on nuclear weapons that doesn't involve a conversation about these long-range rockets. Yet that is exactly what they are doing with little to no consultation with the Senate or any other policymakers.

I came to the floor to reiterate my personal support for Israel but to also reiterate how strongly I believe virtually every Member of this body supports the State of Israel, supports Israel's right to defend itself, supports the United States alliance with Israel, supports everything we must and can do to help Israel defend herself. I think that is an important message to send out.

Finally, I would say this: I would ask those who have watched this speech or who will hear these words later to take the time over the next few days to pray for Israel. They need our support there as well, that God will provide her the safety and security of her people, now and in the years to come.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that following the vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 849, Carnes, on Monday, July 21, the Senate remain in executive session to consider Calendar No. 789, Lawson, and Calendar No. 537, Reddick; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees prior to each vote; that upon the use or yielding back of time the Senate proceed to vote, without intervening action or debate, on the nominations in the order listed; that any rollcall votes, following the first in the series, be 10 minutes in length; the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

Mr. REID. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, we expect nominations considered in this agreement to be confirmed by voice vote.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding Rule XXII, on Tuesday, July 22, at 10:45 a.m., the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the motions to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar Nos. 851, Birotte, 852, Rosenberg, and 854, deGravelles, in the order listed; further, that if cloture is invoked on any of these nominations, that on Tuesday, July 22, 2014, at 2:15 p.m., all postcloture time be expired and the Senate proceed to vote on confirmation of the nominations in the order upon which cloture was invoked; that all rollcall votes after the first in each sequence be 10 minutes in length; further, that there be 2 minutes for debate prior to each vote; that if any nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

CONGRATULATING CHARLIE SEEMANN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Charlie Seemann. Mr. Seemann is a talented folklorist who is dedicated to sharing western arts and culture with communities throughout Nevada. At the end of the month, he will be retiring from his position as executive director of the Western Folklife Center in Elko, NV.

After serving as the deputy director of the Country Music Foundation in Nashville, TN, for 12 years, and later working as the program director at the Fund for Folk Culture in Santa Fe, NM, Nevada was fortunate to have Mr. Seemann dedicate his efforts to sharing the cultural heritage of the American West with communities throughout our great State.

In 1998, Mr. Seemann brought his masters of folklife studies, decades of experience, and his accomplished musical knowledge to the Western Folklife

Center in Nevada. During his 16-year tenure, he has strengthened the arts throughout his community by investing in literary and scholarship programs that have helped foster artistic development and brought new artists to Western Folklife's most notable event, the National Cowboy Poetry Gathering. Since 1986, Mr. Seemann participated in the annual National Cowboy Poetry Gathering, formerly the Elko Cowboy Poetry Gathering. This event was renamed in 2000, after Mr. Seemann worked with Members of Congress to pass a United States Senate Resolution designating the poetry gathering in Elko as a nationally recognized event.

Mr. Seeman is not only a strong advocate for western arts and culture, but he is a nationally renowned folklorist. Prior to coming to the Western Folklife Center, he received the Western Heritage Wrangler Award from the National Cowboy and Western Heritage Museum, as well as a Grammy nomination for the New World Records anthology Back in the Saddle Again: American Cowboy Songs. Mr. Seemann also received a Wrangler Award in 2003, for his production work on a joint project between the Western Folklife Center and Smithsonian Folkways Recordings, Buck Ramsey: Hittin' the Trail. In 2006, Mr. Seeman was appointed by Congress to the Board of Trustees for the American Folklife Center. This Center is housed at the Library of Congress and works to archive and preserve American's unique culture. It was a tribute to Mr. Seeman's reputation that he was selected for this Federal board, and he represented Nevada well in this role.

Mr. Seemann will be missed by the many individuals he works with at the Western Folklife Center, but his contributions to western folklore will continue. I wish him well in his retirement and all the best in his future endeavors.

BORDER CRISIS

Mr. NELSON. The administration sent several Cabinet Secretaries and high-ranking appointees to brief all Senators last evening on the crisis of the children on the border, and it appears they are getting their arms around addressing the problem of the children and the humanitarian crisis on the border. However, it is the opinion of this Senator that they do not recognize the root cause of the problem. If the administration would listen to their four-star general, the head of the United States Southern Command, General Kelly, and the testimony he has already given to the Armed Services Committee of what is the problem, then we could get to the root cause of the problem and stop these future humanitarian crises.

The problem simply is that we are not devoting the time and the resources—the money—to the interdiction of the big drug shipments coming out of South America into Central America. They come in big shipments from Colombia through Venezuela by air or sea on the eastern side, from Colombia through Ecuador or originating in Ecuador out on the western side, coming into three Central American countries—Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador. As a result, their drug lords have completely taken over those countries. As a result, the violence is the highest. Honduras is now the murder capital of the world. As a result of that drug violence—and there is very little law and order—the whole system is corrupted. For parents with children, it is logical that they would want to send their children to a safer environment.

The administration has to address this issue with regard to going back to what we did so successfully in Plan Colombia—interdict the drug traffic before it gets to those Central American countries because once it does in the big shipments, they then break it down into smaller packages and it goes north.

CYPRUS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of Turkey's invasion of the island of Cyprus. Today, Cyprus remains a divided island, with a third of the territory still occupied by Turkish forces.

I am proud to stand with the people of Cyprus and call for an immediate end to the Turkish occupation of their country. On numerous occasions, United Nations resolutions have called for the respect of the sovereignty and independence of the Republic of Cyprus and for an immediate end to the Turkish occupation. The Republic of Cyprus continues to demonstrate full commitment to a peaceful process that will reunify the island in accordance with these resolutions.

Over the past year, the Republic of Cyprus has taken significant steps to lay the groundwork for peaceful negotiations, including proposals that would bring the two sides together to build confidence, strengthen ties, and integrate the Turkish-Cypriot community. It is clear that the government and people of Cyprus stand ready to make the hard decisions needed to achieve peace.

Continued unrest that threatens the security and stability of the region further underscores the importance of supporting the Republic of Cyprus. A peaceful agreement that reunifies Cyprus would signal that just and fair resolutions can be achieved to end decades long confrontations. We must continue to stand with them to fight for a fair and responsible agreement—one that safeguards basic freedoms and human rights for all Cypriots. During his visit in May of this year, Vice President BIDEN reiterated the need for Cyprus to be reunited.

The Republic of Cyprus is a strong and trusted friend of the United States. I am proud of the strategic partnership we have developed over the years. The Government of Cyprus currently hosts the joint mission responsible for carrying out the removal and destruction of Syria's chemical weapons as well as providing maritime cooperation to facilitate the process. The role of Cyprus demonstrates the island's important strategic location and critical international engagement efforts.

I am encouraged by renewed efforts to reach a comprehensive and fair solution to reunify Cyprus. I urge the government of Turkey to cooperate with negotiations and I applaud the people of Cyprus for their steadfast commitment to securing a peaceful and prosperous future.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 40th anniversary of the division of Cyprus, which began on July 20, 1974.

On July 20, 1974, Turkey began its brutal invasion of the island of Cyprus. By August 25, 1974, Turkish forces controlled more than one-third of the island. To this day, Cyprus remains divided.

Forty years later, it is long past time for a permanent solution that results in a free and unified Cyprus.

For decades, numerous rounds of negotiations have attempted to achieve a settlement. For too long, these efforts have failed to yield meaningful progress. However, a new round of talks began in February of this year. I am deeply hopeful that these negotiations will result in a fair and durable solution for all Cypriots.

A secure and stable Republic of Cyprus will strengthen the friendship and alliance between the United States and Cyprus. This relationship is based on our long history and our mutual goals and values, including a commitment to democracy, opportunity for all, and human rights.

Lasting peace in Cyprus will also reinforce Cyprus's role as a force for peace, prosperity, and stability in the region.

That is why we must continue to do everything possible to help Cyprus resolve the decades-long illegal occupation of Northern Cyprus by Turkey.

As Vice President BIDEN said in May during his historic visit to Cyprus, ''For the sake of the boys and girls born on this island who deserve the possibility that only peace can bring, let's finally make hope and history rhyme together.''

HONORING OUR ARMED FORCES

SERGEANT ANDREW R. LOONEY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I wish to remember the life and sacrifice of Army SGT Andrew R. Looney who died on June 21, 2010 serving our Nation in Lar Sholtan Village, Afghanistan. Sergeant Looney and Army PFC David T. Miller died of wounds sustained when a suicide bomber attacked their traffic control checkpoint.

Andrew was born June 26, 1987 and grew up in Owasso, OK where he graduated from Owasso High School in 2005.

His father, Richard, said as a teen his son developed an avid interest in the military, and he was further inspired by military movies, in particular the HBO series ''Band of Brothers.'' He grew up respecting authority, was ''very compliable'' and took things in stride which made military life a good fit for him. Therefore, it was a natural for him to enlist in the Army immediately after high school.

While deployed to Iraq in August 2007, he was severely wounded from an improvised explosive device and lost part of his right foot. After nearly a year of grueling rehabilitation and receiving a prosthetic at Brooke Army Medical Center in San Antonio, TX he felt a deep sense of patriotism and a burning desire to serve and get back to where he felt he was needed. In 2009 he was assigned to 2nd Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY where on April 24, 2010 he deployed to Afghanistan.

The last time the family saw him in April 2009 ''he was looking forward to his assignment in Afghanistan,'' his father said. He thought he ''was making a difference in the war, and was much needed.''

On June 28, 2010, with hundreds of friends in attendance, the family remembered Andrew at Owasso Public School's Mary Glass Performing Arts Center. Before and throughout the service, hundreds of people lined the streets holding up flags in solemn tribute to Andrew.

In 2012, Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin signed Senate Bill 1320 designating the section of highway from 96th Street North to 106th Street North as ''Sergeant Andrew R. Looney Memorial Highway.''

Andrew was posthumously promoted to Sergeant and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery in Arlington, VA.

SGT Looney is survived by his parents Martha and Cleo Looney, sister Joanna, and brother, Steven who completed a tour in the Navy in December 2009.

Today we remember Army SGT Andrew R. Looney, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

SPECIALIST JARED C. PLUNK

Mr. President, I also wish to remember a true American hero, Army SPC Jared C. Plunk who died on June 25, 2010 serving our Nation in Konar, Afghanistan. SPC Plunk and Army SPC Blair D. Thompson died of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked their unit using rocket-propelled grenades and small-arms fire.

Jared was born August 26, 1982 in Liberal, KS. He grew up in the Oklahoma Panhandle town of Turpin where he played football and graduated high school in 2001 before taking college classes at Seward County Community College.

After relocating to Stillwater, OK, Jared and his brother Justin enlisted in the Army in August 2006 where they were bunkmates once again in basic military training. After graduation, he married his wife Lindsay and was assigned to 1st Battalion, 327th Infantry Regiment, 1st Brigade Combat Team, 101st Airborne Division, Air Assault, Fort Campbell, KY.

Jared's funeral was held July 4, 2010 at the Turpin High School auditorium. Reverend Stan Lehnart remembered him saying ''He was not the valedictorian of Turpin. He was not the star of the football team. He was not the boy the girls wanted to sit next to at assemblies in this auditorium. He is the one who gave his life for us to sit here today. He is the one that served his country. He is a hero.''

Interment was in the Liberal City Cemetery in Liberal, KS.

Preceded in death by his father, Glen ''Tiny'' Plunk, Jared is survived by his wife Lindsay, and two sons, 5-year-old Noah and baby Kason, mother Glenda Willard and her husband Gerald of Maryville, TN, brother Justin Plunk and his wife Caitlin of Norman, Oklahoma, brother Jordan Plunk of Maryville, TN, sister Ranee Massoni and her husband Jordon and their son Gavin of Maryville, TN, and sister Michelle Plunk of Maryville, TN.

Today we remember Army SPC Jared C. Plunk, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

ARMY STAFF SERGEANT TRAVIS M. TOMPKINS

Mr. President, I would also like to pay tribute to Army SSG Travis M. Tompkins. Travis tragically died on March 16, 2011 of wounds sustained when insurgents attacked his unit with a rocket propelled grenade in Logar Province, Afghanistan.

Travis was born November 26, 1979 at Fort Sill, OK to Leland and Vickie Tompkins. An active Boy Scout, he graduated from MacArthur High School in 1999 and enlisted in the Army in January 2000.

He was carrying on a tradition of service in his family that dates back to World War I. His father, Leland Tompkins served for more than two decades in an Army career that began during the Vietnam war and ended in the closing days of the Cold War. ''He was a working soldier,'' Leland said. ''He was a working leader. He cared about his soldiers. He volunteered for everything.''

Moving frequently, Travis' assignments included Fort Sill, OK, Fort Leonardwood, MO, Fort Carson, CO, and Allied Joint Force Command in Brunssum, the Netherlands. He married Candice Brown on March 1, 2001 at Fort Carson, CO and was quickly deployed to Saudi Arabia from September 2001 to March 2002.

He arrived at Fort Polk, LA in June 2009 and was assigned to Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division. In October 2011 he deployed to Afghanistan with his unit as a military policeman with the Brigade Special Troops Battalion, 4th Brigade Combat Team, 10th Mountain Division.

The couple had recently renewed their vows on their 10th anniversary when he was home on leave. ''It was the most perfect day,'' Candy wrote. ''He was a wonderful man, an excellent soldier and above all the best father and husband and son and brother. I don't know how I'll ever live without him. He was our world.''

A loving husband, father and son, Travis is survived by his wife Candice, two children, Madison and Gianna, parents Leland and Vickie Tompkins of Lawton, OK, sister Jenny Meek and her husband Troy of Fletcher, OK, niece and nephew Megan Meek and Dillon Meek, and his mother and father-in-law Wendy and Tim Brown of Lawton, OK.

His mother Vickie said that the main thing she wanted people who never met him to know is what a great son he was to her and what a wonderful husband he was to his wife Candy, and their children.

Private family funeral services and interment with full military honors were conducted at the Fort Sill National Cemetery, Elgin, OK. Travis was posthumously promoted to Staff Sergeant.

Today we remember Army SSG Travis M. Tompkins, a young man who loved his family and country, and gave his life as a sacrifice for freedom.

TRIBUTE TO TRAVIS MOLLOHAN

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I want to thank a longtime and dedicated member of my staff, Travis Mollohan, and to wish him the best on his next professional venture—as director of State, corporate and community relations for West Virginia University.

Raised by caring parents, Todd and Brenda Mollohan, in the geographic heart of our State, Braxton County, Travis learned from a young age the value of being involved in his community and the importance of being a team player. As a proud Braxton County Eagle, Travis was a member of the high school's award-winning band, speech and debate team and president of the National Honor Society. Travis even volunteered for me during my unsuccessful 1996 gubernatorial run.

Travis graduated from Braxton County High School in 2000 and then attended college at West Virginia University. There, he was treasurer of the WVU Young Democrats, head of the Student Government Association's campus safety committee and studied abroad at Dublin City University in Ireland. Travis volunteered during my successful campaign for Governor in 2004 and began working for me in 2005 as deputy scheduler.

From my first days as the 34th Governor of the great State of West Virginia, my top priority was to deliver excellent customer service to our fellow West Virginians. Travis was ideally suited for my team—he was hardworking, smart and always there to lend a helping hand to those in need.

Travis served my gubernatorial administration in various capacities, and whether it was through tragedy or triumph, Travis represented my office with the utmost distinction.

After winning the unexpired term for the U.S. Senate in 2010, I asked Travis to help me bring our commonsense West Virginia values to Washington. He served as my director of scheduling in 2011, before returning to my State operations as director of outreach. He did an amazing job visiting the beautiful communities of the Mountain State and listening to our citizens' ideas and concerns.

Recently, I asked Travis to serve as my director of constituent services. I was confident yet again that he could do the job because Travis truly understands what West Virginians need—someone who is compassionate, thoughtful and knowledgeable about our state and the complexities of government.

Not a day passes that Travis is not dedicated to making West Virginia a better place to live, work and raise a family.

I am sad to see Travis leave my office, but I am so excited for his future. He has accepted a position with his alma mater, West Virginia University—our State's flagship university. No one is better suited for the task ahead of him than Travis.

WVU has made a significant and positive impact on the Mountain State. It offers a first-class learning experience and its graduates are spread around the world making a difference. But it is more than just an incredible institution of higher learning. WVU's programs and services improve the lives of our citizens and our communities. In our daily lives, we can always do more, and I am so proud to know that Travis will be helping WVU reach the next level.

It is very difficult to imagine my office without Travis, but I know he will bring the same level of excitement, energy, and dedication to his new position as he brought to my office for more than 9 years. He is a responsive, critical thinker who truly cares about our State and fellow citizens. He is a West Virginian through and through and a proud Mountaineer.

Travis has a bright future ahead of him, and I am pleased to say that very soon he will be marrying the love of his life, Lindsey Bennett—from my hometown of Fairmont—who is a beautiful and intelligent young lady. I know that they will have a long and happy life together, and I am proud to say that they will always remain a part of the Manchin family.

THE FIGHT AGAINST ALS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this Fourth of July marked the 75th anniversary of the muggy summer afternoon the great Henry Louis Gehrig bid farewell to baseball and introduced Americans to the illness that would become known as Lou Gehrig's disease.

Lou Gehrig was the only surviving child of a sheet metal worker and a maid—immigrants from Germany. Gehrig brought his family's humble work ethic and steadfastness to his own job, playing first base for the New York Yankees. His career was one that even a Red Sox fan can admire. On June 1, 1925, 4 days before his 20th birthday, he pinch-hit for Pee Wee Wanninger. On June 2, he broke into the starting lineup for good. He would play every single regular and postseason Yankees game until May 2, 1939—2,130 in a row.

''The Iron Horse,'' as Gehrig was known, didn't just play a lot of baseball, he played superb baseball. He racked up more than 2,700 hits, for a lifetime batting average of .340 and close to 2,000 runs batted in. He had 493 career home runs. His No. 4 jersey, known as ''the Hard Number'' by the American League pitchers who had to try to get the ball past him, was the first ever retired from Major League Baseball.

Despite his exceptional play, Gehrig was happy to leave the spotlight to teammate Babe Ruth, or later, Joe DiMaggio. ''I'm not a headline guy,'' he once said. ''As long as I was following Ruth to the plate, I could have stood on my head and no one would have known the difference.''

Lou Gehrig wasn't just great. He was always great. And his competitive spirit inspired Americans during the long years of the Great Depression. But for some unknown reason, his numbers fell off sharply in the 1938 season. He had trouble gripping the bat, running, even walking and sitting. So on the first Tuesday of May 1939, eight games into the season, the Yankee captain took his name off the lineup card. ''I'm benching myself, Joe,'' he told manager Joe McCarthy, ''for the good of the team.''

A series of tests at the Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN, would reveal that amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, a disease that causes nerve cells to stop working and die, was robbing Gehrig's swing of its fabled power.

ALS attacks neurons responsible for controlling voluntary muscles and progresses rapidly. The brain and spinal cord lose the ability to send messages to the muscles of the body, which weaken and atrophy. ALS can impair speaking, swallowing, and breathing. As Gehrig biographer Jonathan Eig explains, the progression of ALS is like ''shutting down the body's functions one by one, like a night watchman switching off the factory-floor lights.''

Yet on that humid 1939 Independence Day, between the legs of a doubleheader against the Washington Senators, Lou Gehrig stood before a tangle of microphones at homeplate, bowed more by humility at the adulation of 62,000 Yankee fans, teammates, ball boys, and groundskeepers than by his disease. Clenching his cap in two hands, the man sportswriter Jim Murray once described as a ''Gibraltar in cleats'' spoke 278 simple words that still echo in the ears of those of us not even born at the time they were uttered.

''Fans,'' he began, ''for the past two weeks you have been reading about a bad break I got. Yet today I consider myself the luckiest man on the face of the earth.''

Although there is still much we have to learn about the causes of ALS, we have made great strides in research and treatment since Lou Gehrig took himself out of the game. With the help of Federal grants, advances in genetic research have opened the door to insights about the disease's hereditary nature, and drugs and assistive technology are improving dramatically.

Kreg Palko of Barrington, RI, recently underwent a pioneering surgery to transplant millions of stem cells into his spinal cord, in hopes of undoing the paralyzing effects of his ALS. Until Kreg discovered he had ALS just last year, he was always on the move—as a speedy defensive back at the Air Force Academy, Gulf War pilot—or active skier and surfer. ALS has dampened his mobility but not his competitive spirit. Kreg has volunteered for every clinical trial he can, and whether or not these treatments heal Kreg, he and his wife Elizabeth know this research will benefit future patients.

The heart of the movement for a cure is the dedicated community of advocates, researchers, physicians, and ALS patients. When members of the Rhode Island chapter of the ALS Association visited my office this May, they brought along baseball cards featuring Rhode Islanders living with ALS. I saw in each face courage and dignity equal to Lou Gehrig's.

Senator Jacob Javits of New York, who worked for years after his 1979 ALS diagnosis to improve long-term care and end-of-life policies, said:

> Life does not stop with terminal illness. Only the patient stops if he doesn't have the will to go forward with life.

Brian Dickinson refused to let ALS stop him. Editor of the Providence Journal's editorial page and a prize-winning columnist, he had an indomitable spirit. This was the man who once sang ''The Battle Hymn of the Republic'' outside KGB headquarters on a tour of Soviet Moscow. And although ALS silenced his voice, Brian continued to tap out his column for a number of years, with the help of a special computer in his home. His profound, optimistic observations inspired his readers. ''I do believe,'' he once assured us, ''that the capacity for hope can help us meet stiff challenges.''

Brian finally lost his battle with ALS in 2002. Last month, the ALS Association Rhode Island Chapter presented the Brian Dickinson Courage Award to Kreg Palko.

As we look back to the day Lou Gehrig reminded us he had ''an awful lot to live for,'' we should renew our

own will to go forward, with workmanlike determination, toward a cure.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING HAROLD LEONARD ''LENNY'' KAUFER

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I recognize the life and legacy of New Jerseyan Lenny Kaufer, who passed away on July 13 at the age of 92. Lenny was a dear friend and inspiration to me at the very dawn of my career in public service. He will be greatly missed by all who knew him.

Harold Leonard Kaufer was born on August 25, 1921, in Newark, NJ, where he was raised with his 10 siblings in the Roseville neighborhood by his parents, Abraham and Gussie. As a son of Newark, a graduate of its schools, and a New Jersey small business owner, Lenny cared passionately about New Jersey and its future, cheering the revival of its largest city and keeping track of the news ''back home.'' He considered Newark and New Jersey to be at the very core of his identity, and even though his retirement took him to California, he kept a book of historic photos of Newark on his bedside table until the day he died. Lenny never forgot where he came from.

I had the great fortune to get to know Lenny during my time on the Newark City Council and as mayor. I consider him to have been one of the more gentle, kind souls I have ever met, and I appreciated his sound perspective and sage advice. I treasure the conversations we shared, as well as his undeterred love of Newark, and I will miss his wisdom.

Above all else, Lenny was devoted to his family. In 2012, he and his wife Shirley celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary, and they found great pleasure in the time spent with their daughter, three grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. Lenny always gave loved ones a kiss for the road. As a man of faith, after moving to California, he maintained a membership at his temple in New Jersey, just so he could ensure that his family there would always have a home for the High Holidays.

Lenny is mourned by his wife Shirley, his daughter Jacqueline, sisters Madeline and Helga, brother Irwin, three grandchildren, two great-grandchildren, a large extended family, and his many friends and neighbors. Lenny touched so many lives over his 92 years. He was an American treasure. He demonstrated the truth that so often the biggest thing you can do in any day is a small act of kindness, decency, or love. Lenny lived every day with constant kindness, unyielding decency, and a remarkable love for others. I ask that the Senate join me in honoring him and remembering his extraordinary life.•

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL MARIAMNE R. M. OKRZESIK

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to honor and pay tribute to an exceptional leader, Col. Mariamne R. Okrzesik. After a lifetime of service to our Nation, Colonel Okrzesik is retiring from the U.S. Air Force and her current position as Director of the Office of Legislative Affairs, United States Central Command, at MacDill Air Force Base in Tampa, FL. On this occasion I believe it is fitting to recognize Colonel Okrzesik's extraordinary dedication to duty and selfless service to the United States of America.

Colonel Okrzesik has served at all levels in the Air Force. Her career began when she received her commission in 1986 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at the University of Maryland. Colonel Okrzesik's distinguished military service has taken her all over the world in defense of our Nation. Her career has included assignments and duties across a wide variety of command, intelligence, and staff positions throughout Europe, the Pacific, and the United States. Colonel Okrzesik has served as an intelligence flight commander; director of operations; executive officer; Major Command; Headquarters Air Force and Secretary of the Air Force staff officer; squadron commander; and Joint Combatant Command staff officer. Colonel Okrzesik has received numerous awards during her career, including the Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Meritorious Service Medal with six oak leaf clusters, the Joint Commendation Medal, and Air Force Commendation Medal.

It is a pleasure to recognize Colonel Okrzesik's long and decorated career today and also the great benefit to the Nation she has provided as a senior leader for the U.S. Air Force and Department of Defense. Colonel Okrzesik has always achieved excellence during her career. On behalf of a grateful nation, I join my colleagues today in recognizing and commending Colonel Okrzesik for a lifetime of service to her country. For all she has given and continues to give to our country we are in her debt. As Colonel Okrzesik retires to Lothian, MD, we express our gratitude for her faithful and dedicated service and wish her our sincerest best wishes upon her retirement.•

REMEMBERING JOHN V. EVANS

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to honor the life of former Idaho Governor John Victor Evans. Governor Evans will be missed, but his impact on Idaho and his legacy of dedicated service will endure.

Governor Evans and his family were Idaho pioneers. He was born and raised in Malad, ID. He attended Idaho State University, and like so many of his generation, he went to serve as an infantryman in World War II. After returning from the war, he earned a degree in business and economics from Stanford University.

John dedicated much of his life to public service. He served in the Idaho State Senate where he rose to the positions of majority leader and minority leader. He was mayor of Malad, the town he grew up in. In 1974, he was elected Lieutenant Governor before his terms as Idaho's 27th Governor from 1977 to 1987. He led Idaho through a number of challenging times: the historic settlement of water rights, the closure of the Bunker Hill Mine, and the difficult economic times much of the Nation saw in the 1980s. He also contributed to the national dialogue, having served in leadership positions in the Western Governors Association and National Governor's Association.

He was dedicated to community service and supported numerous efforts and organizations. He was a member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, and the Rotary Club, and he was a Mason. He also held a number of leadership positions for the Independent Community Bankers Association.

Following his retirement from public office in 1987, he became president of D.L. Evans Bank in Burley, ID. During his tenure, the bank grew from two banks to 21 banks, assisting thousands of Idaho residents and businesses.

Idahoans benefited greatly from his steady leadership in public office and in business. He was known for his open-door policy, strong work ethic and always taking the time to meet with fellow Idahoans. I extend my condolences to his wife Lola, brother Don, children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren and many other family members and friends. He will be greatly missed.•

WINNEBAGO COUNTY, IOWA

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and

residents of Winnebago County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to secure funding in Winnebago County worth over $1.2 million and successfully acquired financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $28 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the success that the county has had in securing over $9.4 million funds for the Heartland Power Cooperative through programs I fought for at the Federal Emergency Management Agency and in past farm bills.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Winnebago County has received $1,083,026 in Harkin grants.

Disaster mitigation and prevention: In 1993, when historic floods ripped through Iowa, it became clear to me that the national emergency-response infrastructure was woefully inadequate to meet the needs of Iowans in flood-ravaged communities. I went to work dramatically expanding the Federal Emergency Management Agency's hazard mitigation program, which helps communities reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and enables mitigation measures to be implemented during the immediate recovery period. Disaster relief means more than helping people and businesses get back on their feet after a disaster, it means doing our best to prevent the same predictable flood or other catastrophe from recurring in the future. The hazard mitigation program that I helped create in 1993 provided critical support to Iowa communities impacted by the devastating floods of 2008. Winnebago County has received over $8.2 million to remediate and prevent widespread destruction from natural disasters.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Winnebago County has received more than $19 million from a variety of farm bill loan and grant programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Winnebago County's fire departments have received over $623,971 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Wellness and health care: Improving the health and wellness of all Americans has been something I have been passionate about for decades. That is why I fought to dramatically increase funding for disease prevention, innovative medical research, and a whole range of initiatives to improve the health of individuals and families not only at the doctor's office but also in our communities, schools, and workplaces. I am so proud that Americans have better access to clinical preventive services, nutritious food, smoke-free environments, safe places to engage in physical activity, and information to make healthy decisions for themselves and their families. These efforts not only save lives, they will also save money for generations to come thanks to the prevention of costly chronic diseases, which account for a whopping 75 percent of annual health care costs. I am pleased that Winnebago County has recognized this important issue by securing $120,000 for community wellness activities.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Winnebago County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Winnebago County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Winnebago County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

ALLAMAKEE COUNTY, IOWA

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, the strength of my State of Iowa lies in its vibrant local communities, where citizens come together to foster economic development, make smart investments to expand opportunity, and take the initiative to improve the health and well-being of residents. Over the decades, I have witnessed the growth and revitalization of so many communities across my State. And it has been deeply gratifying to see how my work in Congress has supported these local efforts.

I have always believed in accountability for public officials, and this, my final year in the Senate, is an appropriate time to give an accounting of my work across four decades representing Iowa in Congress. I take pride in accomplishments that have been national in scope—for instance, passing the Americans with Disabilities Act and spearheading successful farm bills. But I take a very special pride in projects that have made a big difference in local communities across my State.

Today, I would like to give an accounting of my work with leaders and residents of Allamakee County to build a legacy of a stronger local economy, better schools and educational opportunities, and a healthier, safer community.

Between 2001 and 2013, the creative leadership in your community has worked with me to successfully acquire financial assistance from programs I have fought hard to support, which have provided more than $26 million to the local economy.

Of course my favorite memory of working together has to be the community's success in obtaining funding for school construction, fire safety, technology, and other improvements through Harkin school construction grants, the Star Schools program, and

American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 funds.

Among the highlights:

School grants: Every child in Iowa deserves to be educated in a classroom that is safe, accessible, and modern. That is why, for the past decade and a half, I have secured funding for the innovative Iowa Demonstration Construction Grant Program—better known among educators in Iowa as Harkin grants for public schools construction and renovation. Across 15 years, Harkin grants worth more than $132 million have helped school districts to fund a range of renovation and repair efforts—everything from updating fire safety systems to building new schools. In many cases, these Federal dollars have served as the needed incentive to leverage local public and private dollars, so it often has a tremendous multiplier effect within a school district. Over the years, Allamakee County has received $1,792,068 in Harkin grants. Similarly, schools in Allamakee County have received funds that I designated for Iowa Star Schools for technology totaling $59,494. Finally, Allamakee schools received more than $280,000 through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 for academic and learning support.

Agricultural and rural development: Because I grew up in a small town in rural Iowa, I have always been a loyal friend and fierce advocate for family farmers and rural communities. I have been a member of the House or Senate Agriculture Committee for 40 years—including more than 10 years as chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee. Across the decades, I have championed farm policies for Iowans that include effective farm income protection and commodity programs; strong, progressive conservation assistance for agricultural producers; renewable energy opportunities; and robust economic development in our rural communities. Since 1991, through various programs authorized through the farm bill, Allamakee County has received more than $1.3 million from a variety of farm bill programs.

Keeping Iowa communities safe: I also firmly believe that our first responders need to be appropriately trained and equipped, able to respond to both local emergencies and to statewide challenges such as, for instance, the methamphetamine epidemic. Since 2001, Allamakee County's fire departments have received over $900,000 for firefighter safety and operations equipment.

Disability rights: Growing up, I loved and admired my brother Frank, who was deaf. But I was deeply disturbed by the discrimination and obstacles he faced every day. That is why I have always been a passionate advocate for full equality for people with disabilities. As the primary author of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA, and the ADA Amendments Act, I have had four guiding goals for our fellow citizens with disabilities: equal opportunity, full participation, independent living and economic self-sufficiency. Nearly a quarter century since passage of the ADA, I see remarkable changes in communities everywhere I go in Iowa—not just in curb cuts or closed captioned television, but in the full participation of people with disabilities in our society and economy, folks who at long last have the opportunity to contribute their talents and to be fully included. These changes have increased economic opportunities for all citizens of Allamakee County, both those with and without disabilities. And they make us proud to be a part of a community and country that respects the worth and civil rights of all of our citizens.

This is at least a partial accounting of my work on behalf of Iowa, and specifically Allamakee County, during my time in Congress. In every case, this work has been about partnerships, cooperation, and empowering folks at the State and local level, including in Allamakee County, to fulfill their own dreams and initiatives. And, of course, this work is never complete. Even after I retire from the Senate, I have no intention of retiring from the fight for a better, fairer, richer Iowa. I will always be profoundly grateful for the opportunity to serve the people of Iowa as their Senator.●

CONGRATULATING COLONEL JAMES WALKER

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate COL James Walker of Las Vegas, Nevada on his upcoming retirement from the Nevada Army National Guard. I am proud to honor a Nevadan who has dedicated his life to serving our country.

Born and raised in Las Vegas, NV, Colonel Walker's desire to serve came when he was studying psychology in college. On scholarship for soccer at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, he decided he wanted to enlist and become a combat medic. Upon joining the Army in 1979, Colonel Walker rose through the ranks and eventually became the highest ranking African-American Army National Guard officer in Nevada history. Colonel Walker's career from private to colonel over the course of 35 years is both commendable and admirable.

Throughout his career, Colonel Walker continued to pursue all of the educational training that the Army National Guard had to offer. With the support of his wife Doris Colonel Walker decided to pursue three NCO professional development schools, earning him the prestigious NCO Ribbon. Colonel Walker also participated in an Officer Candidate School at Clear Creek near Carson City and was a pioneering student in the Nevada primary leadership development course, graduating at the top of his class with honors. After his success there, he served as a training officer for the next graduating class. His ability to give back to the National Guard and his community was also exemplified during his 3 years of teaching ROTC at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Upon his retirement from the National Guard, Colonel Walker plans to continue working for National Security Technologies as the company's facility manager at Nellis Air Force Base in Las Vegas.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Colonel Walker for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery and dedication earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

Throughout his tenure, Colonel Walker has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Army National Guard. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing COL James Walker for all of his accomplishments and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

USS ''NEVADA'' CENTENNIAL

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 100th Anniversary of the commissioning of the USS *Nevada* Battleship. I am proud to be able to honor Nevada's namesake battleship today and all of the Americans that served aboard her.

The anniversary of the battleship USS *Nevada* comes on the heels of Nevada celebrating its 150th year of statehood. Through her years of service, the *Nevada* suffered many blows and casualties, but remained dedicated to defending her country. The crew that served aboard her have all earned a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our Nation. I, along with my fellow Nevadans, feel a great sense of pride that our State has been chosen as the namesake for this ship that is arguably one of the greatest of our navy or of any Navy.

Launched on July 11, 1914, at the Fore River Shipbuilding Corporation in Quincy, MA, the USS *Nevada* was the most-advanced battleship in the U.S. Navy at the time. The USS *Nevada* saw both World Wars during her time in active service. During the final months of World War I, she was based in Bantry Bay, County Cork, Ireland, to ensure that the supply convoys that were sailing to and from Great Britain were protected. In World War II, she was the

only ship to get underway during the Japanese attack at Pearl Harbor. After receiving one torpedo hit and several bomb hits, the USS *Nevada* had to be beached, but after vigorous salvage work, repairs and improvements, she was able to return to combat. Highly decorated for the numerous battles that she was a part of, the USS *Nevada* was present at the Attu landings against the Japanese, fired against German defenses during the Normandy landings, and supported operations in Iwo Jima and Okinawa. After over 30 years of service, the USS *Nevada* was deemed too old for retention and was assigned to serve as a target in the atomic bomb tests at Bikini Atoll. The experience left her radioactive and badly damaged, leading to her being decommissioned and eventually sunk during naval gunfire practice.

It is an honor to be able to commemorate this day on behalf of my fellow Nevadans as we remember those who have risked their lives to defend freedom. Our Navy's commitment to this country, as well as their dedication to their families and communities, exemplified why the legacy of all veterans must be preserved for generations to come. These heroes selflessly served not for recognition, but because it was the right thing to do. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals, but to ensure they are cared for after their return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation.

I ask that we recognize the commissioning of the USS *Nevada* and honor all that sailed aboard her. I am both humbled and honored to commemorate the brave men and women who dedicated their lives to serving our country and recognize them here today. May we never forget the legacy of this great battleship and her gallant crew.●

REMEMBERING MATTIE STEPANEK

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the life of Matthew Joseph Thaddeus Stepanek, best known as Mattie, who passed away 10 years ago at the age of 13 from complications due to his rare form of muscular dystrophy. Though his death was a tragedy, his life was a triumph. He was a gifted author and noted peacemaker. He took a personal challenge and turned it into a tool of inspiration for all of us. Mattie once said, ''I want my message to live beyond me,'' and it does. His message of peace and hope has reached millions around the world.

When Mattie was born in 1990 in Upper Marlboro, MD, doctors did not expect him to live longer than 24 hours. Mattie suffered from the same rare form of muscular dystrophy as his mother, his two brothers, and sister. His siblings all died before the age of 4. Though the disease eventually rendered him unable to walk and breathe on his own, Mattie was a survivor. He began writing poetry at the age of 3. He wrote poems about hope and peace. His philosophy was, ''Remember to play after every storm,'' and he did.

Mattie believed that wishes can come true. He had three. The first was to talk peace with Jimmy Carter. They spoke several times through email correspondence. His second was to have his poems published in a book. He wrote the most successful volumes of poetry in the last 30 years and became a seven-time New York Times best-selling author. His last was to see his poetry read on Oprah. He appeared on Oprah's show several times and became her good friend.

In September 2001, Mattie faced a setback. He was so sick that his doctors warned a laugh could cause his damaged windpipe to collapse. But that did not stop Mattie from a spectacular recovery. His doctors could not explain his comeback from this brush with death, but Mattie knew what it was. It was hope, prayer, and just one in a series of miracles in a miraculous life.

After the chaos and confusion of September 11 and the anthrax attacks on the Capitol, I was very grief stricken. I saw a little boy on TV reading poetry, offering hope and healing. Mattie comforted me and lifted my spirits. I contacted him through his hospital and visited with him and his mother in his home. In 2002, I presented Mattie with the Children's Hope Medal of Honor. This medal is given to young heroes who have shown valiant effort and courage in facing life's daily challenges. No one was more deserving of that medal than Mattie Stepanek.

Today we must also remember Mattie's mother Jeni Stepanek. Like Mattie, she suffers physical challenges, but her heart, mind, and spirit remain strong. Without Jeni, Mattie would never have been able to share his beautiful, inspiring words with us. Mattie got his knack for public speaking from his mom. She writes and talks about children with disabilities. He also got his love of life from her. Jeni continues to inspire us all with her life, with Mattie's words, and most importantly, a message of peace and hope.

In his poem entitled ''The Daily Gift,'' Mattie wrote:

You know what?
Tomorrow is a new day.
And today is a new day.
Actually, every day is a new day.
Thank you, God,
For all of these special and new days.

This is how Mattie Stepanek lived his life—with appreciation, inspiration, and energy. That is why I wish to say: Thank you, God, for blessing us with the gift of Mattie Stepanek and his heart of songs.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5016. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes.

At 3:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 108. Concurrent resolution providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 5021.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5016. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 4870. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–211).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 517, a bill to promote consumer choice and wireless competition by permitting consumers to unlock mobile wireless devices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 113–212).

By Mr. LEAHY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S.J. Res. 19. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to contributions and expenditures intended to affect elections.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LEAHY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Pamela Pepper, of Wisconsin, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Wisconsin.

Pamela Harris, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Brenda K. Sannes, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Patricia M. McCarthy, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Jeri Kaylene Somers, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES—WEDNESDAY, JULY 16, 2014

The following material was omitted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 16, 2014 on page S4557:

Financial Campaign Contributions Report for Leslie Ann Bassett:

Nominee: Leslie Bassett.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Paraguay.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:

1. Self: 0.

2. Spouse: N/A

3. Children and Spouses: Nadia Jean Bassett (minor-no spouse): 0.

4. Parents: Carole G. Bassett (deceased), Kimbrough Stone Bassett: 0.

5. Grandparents : Albert E. Bassett (deceased), Elizabeth Stone Bassett (deceased), Mabel Moran Gilchrist (deceased), Gen. John R. Gilchrist (deceased).

6. Brothers and Spouses: Kimbrough Stone Bassett (brother): 9/30/09, Alan Grayson, Congress/House, $40.00, ActBlue.com; 2010, Jack Conway, Congress/Senate, $20.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date; 2012, Elizabeth Warren, Congress/Senate, $40.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date; 11/2/12, Barack Obama, President, $100.00, Obama For America; 11/3/12, Carol Shea-Porter, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Betty Sue Sutton, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Ami Bera, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12 Ann McLane Kuster, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Manan Trivedi, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Patrick Murphy, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Pat Kreitlow, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Lois Frankel, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Mark Takano, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, David Gill, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Rick Nolan, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Jose Hernandez, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Alan Lowenthal, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Kathryn Boockvar, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Sean Patrick Maloney, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Joe Garcia, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/3/12, Jim Graves, Congress/House, $3.00, ActBlue.com; 11/12/12, Barack Obama, President, $100.00, Obama For America; 2013, Elizabeth Colbert Busch, Congress/House, $20.00, Estimate, I'm unable to locate the original donation amount or date.

Zan Sterling (sister-in-law): 6/3/2010, 100, Friends of Barbara, Barbara Boxer; 8/21/2010, 105, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 8/22/2010, 25, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 10/1/2010, 50, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 10/8/2010, 100, DNC, Barack Obama; 10/8/2010, 50, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 10/29/2010, 35, Actblue, Barbara Boxer; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Nancy Pelosi; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Jerry McNerney; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Debra Bowen; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Bill Hedrick; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Beth Krom; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Dave Jones; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Steve Pougnet; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Jerry Brown; 10/29/2010, 9.09, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 4/27/2011, 25, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 8/17/2011, 25, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 7/29/2011, 5, Dem Sen Cmp Dirct; 8/26/2011, 5, direct payment, Al Franken; 2/18/2012, 22, Actblue; 5/19/2012, 20, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 8/1/2012, 26, Actblue; 8/8/2012, 26, Actblue; 9/6/2012, 35, Obama for America, Barack Obama; 10/9/2012, 26, Actblue; 10/9/2012, 26, Actblue; 9/30/2013, 5, Actblue, Gavin Newsom; 9/30/2013, 5, Actblue, Terry McAuliffe; 10/7/2013, 3, Actblue, DCCC; 11/9/2013, 15, Organizing for Action; 11/14/2013, 15, Organizing for Action.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Diane Moran Bassett (sister), 0, Dennis Murray, (brother-in-law) 0.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE—TREATIES

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Treaty Doc. 113–4: The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain (Ex. Rept. 113–10); and

Treaty Doc. 113–5: Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland (Ex. Rept. 113–11)

The text of the committee-recommended resolutions of advice and consent to ratification are as follows:

[Treaty Doc. 113–4 The Protocol Amending the Tax Convention with Spain]

Section 1. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and the Kingdom of Spain for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion With Respect to Taxes on Income and its Protocol, signed at Madrid on February 22, 1990, and a related Memorandum of Understanding signed on January 14, 2013, at Madrid, together with correcting notes dated July 23, 2013, and January 31, 2014 (the ''Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 113–4), subject to the declaration of section 2 and the conditions of section 3.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Protocol is self-executing.

Section 3. Conditions

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following conditions:

(1) Not later than 2 years after the Protocol enters into force and prior to the first arbitration conducted pursuant to the binding arbitration mechanism provided for in the Protocol, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transmit to the Committees on Finance and Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Joint Committee on Taxation the text of the rules of procedure applicable to arbitration panels, including conflict of interest rules to be applied to members of the arbitration panel.

(2)(A) Not later than 60 days after a determination has been reached by an arbitration panel in the tenth arbitration proceeding conducted pursuant to the Protocol or any of the treaties described in subparagraph (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, subject to laws relating to taxpayer confidentiality, a detailed report regarding the operation and application of the arbitration mechanism contained in the Protocol and such treaties. The report shall include the following information:

(i) For the Protocol and each such treaty, the aggregate number of cases pending on the respective dates of entry into force of the Protocol and each treaty, including the following information:

(I) The number of such cases by treaty article or articles at issue.

(II) The number of such cases that have been resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement as of the date of the report.

(III) The number of such cases for which arbitration proceedings have commenced as of the date of the report.

(ii) A list of every case presented to the competent authorities after the entry into force of the Protocol and each such treaty, including the following information regarding each case:

(I) The commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(II) Whether the adjustment triggering the case, if any, was made by the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(III) Which treaty the case relates to.

(IV) The treaty article or articles at issue in the case.

(V) The date the case was resolved by the competent authorities through a mutual agreement, if so resolved.

(VI) The date on which an arbitration proceeding commenced, if an arbitration proceeding commenced.

(VII) The date on which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel, if a IN determination was reached, and an indication as to whether the panel found in favor of the United States or the relevant treaty partner.

(iii) With respect to each dispute submitted to arbitration and for which a determination was reached by the arbitration panel pursuant to the Protocol or any such treaty, the following information:

(I) In the case of a dispute submitted under the Protocol, an indication as to whether the presenter of the case to the competent authority of a Contracting State submitted a Position Paper for consideration by the arbitration panel.

(II) An indication as to whether the determination of the arbitration panel was accepted by each concerned person.

(III) The amount of income, expense, or taxation at issue in the case as determined by reference to the filings that were sufficient to set the commencement date of the case for purposes of determining when arbitration is available.

(IV) The proposed resolutions (income, expense, or taxation) submitted by each competent authority to the arbitration panel.

(B) The treaties referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

(i) the 2006 Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America

and the Federal Republic of Germany for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital and to Certain Other Taxes, done at Berlin June 1, 2006 (Treaty Doc. 109–20) (the ''2006 German Protocol'');

(ii) the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, and accompanying protocol, done at Brussels July 9, 1970 (the ''Belgium Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 110–3);

(iii) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Canada with Respect to Taxes on Income and on Capital, signed at Washington September 26, 1980 (the ''2007 Canada Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 110–15); or

(iv) the Protocol Amending the Convention between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the French Republic for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, signed at Paris August 31, 1994 (the ''2009 France Protocol'') (Treaty Doc. 111–4).

(3) The Secretary of the Treasury shall prepare and submit the detailed report required under paragraph (2) on March 1 of the year following the year in which the first report is submitted to the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and on an annual basis thereafter for a period of five years. In each such report, disputes that were resolved, either by a mutual agreement between the relevant competent authorities or by a determination of an arbitration panel, and noted as such in prior reports may be omitted.

(4) The reporting requirements referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3) supersede the reporting requirements contained in paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 3 of the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the 2009 France Protocol, approved by the Senate on December 3, 2009.

[Treaty Doc. 113–5 Convention on Taxes with the Republic of Poland]

Section I. Senate Advice and Consent Subject to a Declaration

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Convention between the United States of America and the Republic of Poland for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income, signed on February 13, 2013, at Warsaw (the ''Convention'') (Treaty Doc. 113–5), subject to the declaration of section 2.

Section 2. Declaration

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declaration:

The Convention is self-executing.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. McCAIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2619. A bill to prevent organized human smuggling, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. McCASKILL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 2620. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the reliability of the electric transmission grid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2621. A bill to amend the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamp Act to increase the price of Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Stamps to fund the acquisition of conservation easements for migratory birds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2622. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2623. A bill to prohibit land management modifications relating to the Lesser Prairie Chicken; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. McCAIN):

S. 2624. A bill to provide additional visas for the Afghan Special Immigrant Visa Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2625. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2626. A bill to amend chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code, to expand the payment in lieu of taxes program to include payments for secure rural schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 2627. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit to employers who provide paid family and medical leave; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHANNS:

S. 2628. A bill to require notification of a Governor of a State if an unaccompanied alien child is placed in a facility or with a sponsor in the State and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2629. A bill to require employers to notify employees and prospective employees of exemptions from otherwise required coverage of health services under group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2630. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to require disclosure to States of the basis of determinations under such Act, to ensure use of information provided by State, tribal, and county governments in decisionmaking under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. SESSIONS):

S. 2631. A bill to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2632. A bill to provide for the expedited processing of unaccompanied alien children illegally entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 505. A resolution congratulating the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff (GLASS) Caucus association on the 10-year anniversary of the association; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BURR):

S. Res. 506. A resolution recognizing the patriotism and contributions of auxiliaries of veterans service organizations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 507. A resolution designating August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. Res. 508. A resolution commemorating the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 489

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 489, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to increase and adjust for inflation the maximum value of articles that may be imported duty-free by one person on one day, and for other purposes.

S. 759

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 759, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. NELSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to amend the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 to confirm that a customer's net equity claim is based on the customer's last statement and that certain recoveries

are prohibited, to change how trustees are appointed, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to confirm the scope of the authority of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to deny or restrict the use of defined areas as disposal sites.

S. 2182

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2182, a bill to expand and improve care provided to veterans and members of the Armed Forces with mental health disorders or at risk of suicide, to review the terms or characterization of the discharge or separation of certain individuals from the Armed Forces, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 2234

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. WALSH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs.

S. 2254

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2254, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to enhance the COPS ON THE BEAT grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2440

At the request of Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2440, a bill to expand and extend the program to improve permit coordination by the Bureau of Land Management, and for other purposes.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the Medicare hospital readmissions reduction program.

S. 2529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2529, a bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 399O of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2545

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2545, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to revoke bonuses paid to employees involved in electronic wait list manipulations, and for other purposes.

S. 2569

At the request of Mr. WALSH, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2569, a bill to provide an incentive for businesses to bring jobs back to America.

S. 2570

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2570, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to recognize Indian tribal governments for purposes of determining under the adoption credit whether a child has special needs.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2593, a bill to amend the FLAME Act of 2009 to provide for additional wildfire suppression activities, to provide for the conduct of certain forest treatment projects, and for other purposes.

S. 2608

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2608, a bill to provide for congressional approval of national monuments and restrictions on the use of national monuments, to establish requirements for the declaration of marine national monuments, and for other purposes.

S. 2611

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. JOHANNS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2611, a bill to facilitate the expedited processing of minors entering the United States across the southern border and for other purposes.

S. RES. 498

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 498, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

S. RES. 500

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 500, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate with respect to enhanced relations with the Republic of Moldova and support for the Republic of Moldova's territorial integrity.

AMENDMENT NO. 3552

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3552 proposed to S. 2244, a bill to extend the termination date of the Terrorism Insurance Program established under the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 2622. A bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, despite significant progress in the diagnosis and treatment of breast cancer, this continues to be the second leading cause of cancer death for women, affecting one of every 8 women in the United States.

Women with dense breast tissue may receive a normal mammogram report even if cancer is present. Dense breast tissue makes it harder to catch cancer early because it can obscure cancer in the mammogram image. This is why, for some women, additional screening is so important in catching breast cancer early.

Despite this risk for cancer being missed, when women receive their mammogram report there is no Federal standard for them to be told if they have dense tissue—even though this is already noted by the radiologist reading their mammogram.

This bill simply requires that women be informed if they have dense tissue, and that they may want to talk with their doctor if they have questions and to find out if they might benefit from additional screening. Early detection is the key to survival. Withholding this kind of information from women just doesn't make sense.

This bill sets a minimum Federal standard, so any state that wants to have additional reporting requirements may do so. The bill also requires the Department of Health and Human Services to focus on research regarding dense breast tissue, and better screening tools. Early detection is the key to beating cancer and patients deserve access to information that might just save their life.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator AYOTTE and me in supporting the Breast Density and Mammography Reporting Act. This commonsense bill increases transparency in medicine by

improving patients' access to their own health information and is supported by organizations including the American Cancer Society Cancer Action Network, Are You Dense Advocacy, Breast Cancer Fund, and Susan G. Komen for the Cure.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important issue.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BEGICH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2625. A bill to establish certain duties for pharmacies to ensure provision of Food and Drug Administration-approved contraception, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce with nineteen of my colleagues the Access to Birth Control Act of 2014, ABC Act, which protects an individual's right to birth control by requiring pharmacies to fill a valid prescription for birth control in a timely manner.

Family planning is central to women's basic health care. Studies show that 99 percent of women will use contraception at some point in their lives. Yet, despite the prevalence of contraceptive use, women in at least 24 States across the country have reported incidents where pharmacists have refused to fill prescriptions for birth control or provide emergency contraception to individuals who do not require a prescription. Furthermore, 6 States permit refusals without patient protections, such as requirements to refer or transfer prescriptions, and 7 States allow refusals but prohibit pharmacists from obstructing patient access to medication. It is Unbelievable to me that in 2014 we are still debating a woman's right to make responsible and personal decisions about her own health.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, insurance plans are required to cover preventive services, including birth control without a copay. Congress has an obligation to see that the intent of the Affordable Care Act to make preventive health care affordable and accessible comes to fruition and act to make sure that the pharmacy counter does not come between women and timely access to contraception.

The ABC Act would ensure women's timely access to basic, preventative health care and ensures that women of age will not be denied birth control or emergency contraception by their pharmacist. The bill requires pharmacies to help a woman obtain medication by her preferred method if the requested product is not in stock and protects women from being intimidated when requesting contraception.

Denying contraception to women represents an erosion of a woman's right to access to contraception and a threat to women's access to basic health care. Access is especially important for low-income women who may lack the resources to find an alternative pharmacy in the appropriate time frame and women living in rural areas who may not have multiple pharmacies near them. When women are seeking emergency contraception, a pharmacist's denial can be an unsurmountable obstacle to access within the limited timeframe.

Under the ABC Act, if a requested product is not in stock, but the pharmacy stocks other forms of contraception, the pharmacy must help the woman obtain the medication without delay by the method of her preference: order, referral, or a transferred prescription. By placing the burden on the pharmacy—not the individual pharmacist—the ABC Act strikes a balance between the rights of individual pharmacists who might have personal religious objections to contraception and the rights of women to receive their validly prescribed medication.

The idea that women would still have to fight for access to birth control is astonishing. It should be clear: personal health care decisions should be between women and their doctors. I'm proud to join with my colleagues in putting forward this legislation that will protect woman's right to access contraception throughout the country. A woman's rights must not be dependent on her zip code or State.

I also want to acknowledge the late Senator Frank R. Lautenberg, who introduced a version of this legislation 5 times in the past. I am proud to build on Senator Lautenberg's leadership in defending a woman's right to make responsible and personal decisions about her own health.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to build support for this bill.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2629. A bill to require employers to notify employees and prospective employees of exemptions from otherwise required coverage of health services under group health plans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Preventive Care Coverage Notification Act''.

SEC. 2. PROVIDING INFORMATION TO EMPLOYEES AND PROSPECTIVE EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS.—With respect to an employer (other than an organization that is organized and operates as a nonprofit entity and is referred to in section 6033(a)(3)(A)(i) or (iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) that establishes or maintains a group health plan (other than a grandfathered health plan as defined in section 1251 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18011)) for its employees, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Labor, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall jointly develop standards that require the employer to provide notice to current and prospective employees if the employer is exempted or excepted from covering health services otherwise required to be covered pursuant to title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act (including preventive health services required under section 2713 of such Act). Such notice shall include a description of the specific items and services that are not covered under such plan as a result of such exemption or exception. Such standards shall require that any notice provided under this subsection be provided by the employer to employees and prospective employees in a timely and easily understandable manner.

(b) INFORMING EMPLOYEES OF LIMITATIONS ON COVERAGE.—With respect to the notice required under subsection (a), an employer shall be deemed to be in compliance with the requirements of such section if the employer is an eligible organization as defined in, and provides for the notice in accordance with, regulations issued pursuant to section 2713 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–13).

(c) ENFORCEMENT.—The provisions of this section shall apply to employers acting as plan sponsors, group health plans, and health insurance issuers as if enacted in the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.), the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201 et seq.), and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986. Any failure by an employer acting as a plan sponsor, a group health plan, or a health insurance issuer to comply with the provisions of this Act shall be subject to enforcement through part 5 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), section 2723 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg–22), and section 4980D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(d) APPLICATION.—This section shall apply to plan years beginning on or after July 1, 2014.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 505—CONGRATULATING THE GAY, LESBIAN, AND ALLIES SENATE STAFF (GLASS) CAUCUS ASSOCIATION ON THE 10-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE ASSOCIATION

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 505

Whereas on April 23, 2004, several Senate staffers joined to form a first-of-its-kind staff association for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this preamble as ''LGBT'') Senate staff and their allies;

Whereas the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff Caucus association (referred to in this preamble as the ''GLASS Caucus association'') continues to serve the Senate community by raising awareness of issues affecting the LGBT community;

Whereas the GLASS Caucus association continues to promote the welfare and dignity of LGBT Senate employees; and

Whereas the GLASS Caucus association continues to provide a safe environment for social interaction and professional development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Gay, Lesbian, and Allies Senate Staff Caucus association (referred to in this resolution as the ''GLASS Caucus association'') on the momentous occasion of the association's 10th anniversary;

(2) commends the late Senator Frank Raleigh Lautenberg of New Jersey for the critical role he played in the formation of the GLASS Caucus association and for his stalwart support for equality; and

(3) recognizes inaugural GLASS Caucus Steering Committee members Lynden Armstrong, Brett Bearce, Jeffrey Levensaler, Josh Brekenfeld, Jason Knapp, John Fossum, Kelsey Phipps, and Mat Young for their vision and hard work in establishing the GLASS Caucus association.

SENATE RESOLUTION 506—RECOGNIZING THE PATRIOTISM AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUXILIARIES OF VETERANS SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mr. BURR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs:

S. RES. 506

Whereas, for nearly a century, auxiliaries have served as a complementary and integral part of veterans service organizations, supporting members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families;

Whereas, since their inception, auxiliary units have proudly supported members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and the families of those who have served, volunteering hundreds of thousands of hours and raising billions of dollars;

Whereas auxiliaries have representatives in all 50 States and abroad;

Whereas auxiliaries have more than 1,000,000 members and are composed of wives, widows, mothers, grandmothers, daughters, and granddaughters of veterans, as well as veterans themselves;

Whereas auxiliary units have raised money to aid and enhance the lives of members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families through financial support—providing assistance with essentials such as rent, child care, utilities, and food;

Whereas auxiliary units host ''stand-downs'' that focus on providing vital health and support services to homeless veterans;

Whereas auxiliary units strengthen their local communities by conducting food drives, visiting hospitals, and providing scholarships to youth;

Whereas auxiliary units serve as advocates for veterans and their families;

Whereas auxiliary units conduct welcome home and send-off events for members of the Armed Forces;

Whereas members of auxiliaries selflessly volunteer their services at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs throughout the country to enhance the lives of veterans and their families; and

Whereas, each year, auxiliary units raise millions of dollars for cancer research: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the patriotism and countless contributions to the United States by generations of women in the auxiliaries of veterans service organizations;

(2) commends members of auxiliaries in the United States and abroad for their dedicated service to and support of members of the Armed Forces and veterans as well as their families and communities;

(3) encourages the people of the United States to promote awareness of the contributions and dedication of members of auxiliaries to members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their families; and

(4) calls on the people of the United States to follow the noble example of the auxiliaries of veterans service organizations and volunteer support and services to those who have selflessly served the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 507—DESIGNATING AUGUST 7, 2014, AS ''NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY''

Mr. KING (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SCHUMER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 507

Whereas August 7, 2014, marks the 225th anniversary of the signing by President George Washington of the Act entitled ''An Act for the establishment and support of lighthouses, beacons, buoys, and public piers'', approved August 7, 1789 (commonly known as the ''Lighthouse Act of 1789'') (1 Stat. 53, chapter 9);

Whereas in 1789, the ninth Act of the first Congress, established a Federal role in the support, maintenance, and repair of all lighthouses, beacon buoys, and public piers necessary for safe navigation, commissioned the first Federal lighthouse, and represented the first public works act in the young United States;

Whereas the establishment of the United States system of navigational aids set the United States on a path to the forefront of international maritime prominence and established lighthouses that played an integral role in the rich maritime history of the United States, as that history spread from the Atlantic coast through the Great Lakes and the Gulf coast and Pacific States;

Whereas those iconic structures, standing at the margins of land and water, sometimes for as long as 2 centuries, have symbolized safety, security, heroism, duty, and faithfulness;

Whereas architects, designers, engineers, builders, and keepers devoted, and in some cases jeopardized, their lives for the safety of others during centuries of light tending by the United States Lighthouse Service and the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas the automation of the light system exposed the historic lighthouse towers to the ravages of time and vandalism and yet, at the same time, opened an opportunity for citizen involvement in efforts to save and restore those beacons that mark the evolving maritime history of the United States and its coastal communities;

Whereas the national lighthouse preservation movement has gained momentum over the past half century and is making major contributions to the preservation of maritime history and heritage and, through the development and enhancement of cultural tourism, to the economies of coastal communities in the United States;

Whereas the National Historic Lighthouse Preservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 470w-7 et seq.), enacted on October 24, 2000, with the aid of the lighthouse preservation community, provides an effective process administered by the General Services Administration and the National Park Service for transferring lighthouses to the best possible stewardship groups;

Whereas 2014 is the 200th anniversary of the August 24, 1814, rescue of the original copies of the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the United States Constitution, and many irreplaceable original government documents and books from destruction when the British burned Washington, D.C. during the War of 1812 by Stephen Pleasonton, who later served as General Superintendent of Lighthouses for 32 years;

Whereas 2014 is also the 75th anniversary of when Congress dissolved the United States Lighthouse Service and turned all of its duties over to the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas although the United States Coast Guard was created in 1915 with the merger of the United States Life Saving Service and the United States Revenue Marine Service, the United States Coast Guard uses the United States Revenue Marine founding date of 1790 as its anniversary year, and thus, August 7, 2014, is also the 225th anniversary of the United States Coast Guard;

Whereas 2014 also marks the 250th anniversary of the Sandy Hook Lighthouse in New Jersey, the oldest standing lighthouse tower in the United States, which was built before the United States was a country and was still part of the British colonies;

Whereas for the past several decades, regional and national groups have formed within the lighthouse preservation community to promote lighthouse heritage through research, education, tourism, and publications;

Whereas despite progress, many lighthouses in the United States remain threatened by erosion, neglect, vandalism, and deterioration by the elements; and

Whereas the many completed, ongoing, or planned private and public efforts to preserve lighthouses demonstrate the public support for those historic structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day'';

(2) encourages lighthouse grounds to be opened to the general public to the extent feasible; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 508—COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

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

S. RES. 508

Whereas, in 1914, Congress recognized the need for greater assistance and established a reference unit within the Library of Congress to support an informed and independent legislature;

Whereas the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 (2 U.S.C. 28 et seq.) transformed

the Legislative Reference Service into the Congressional Research Service, expanding its size and analytic capacity;

Whereas the Congressional Research Service is housed within the Library of Congress and benefits from the unparalleled collections of the Library of Congress to complete research and analysis and to disseminate information and materials to assist Congress;

Whereas Congressional Research Service products are the result of collaboration between a diverse workforce consisting of analysts, attorneys, information professionals, and support staff;

Whereas the Congressional Research Service strives to provide accurate and objective assistance to all members and committees at all stages of the legislative process, and in a timely, confidential, and non-partisan manner; and

Whereas the Congressional Research Service provides Congress with analysis and information on legislative and oversight issues in reports, memoranda, seminars, and briefings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service and commends the employees of the Congressional Research Service for their service to Congress and the people of the United States; and

(2) respectfully requests the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Librarian of Congress; and

(B) the Director of the Congressional Research Service.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3564. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3565. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3566. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3567. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3568. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3569. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3564. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title I, add the following:

SEC. 10___. EMERGENCY EXEMPTIONS.

Any road, highway, or bridge that is damaged by an emergency that is declared by the Governor of the State and concurred in by the Secretary of Homeland Security or declared as an emergency by the President pursuant to the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.) and that is in operation or under construction on the date on which the emergency occurs—

(1) may be reconstructed in the same location with the same capacity, dimensions, and design as before the emergency; and

(2) shall be exempt from any environmental reviews, approvals, licensing, and permit requirements under—

(A) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.);

(B) sections 402 and 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1342, 1344);

(C) the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.);

(D) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(E) the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271 et seq.);

(F) the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.);

(G) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), except when the reconstruction occurs in designated critical habitat for threatened and endangered species;

(H) Executive Order 11990 (42 U.S.C. 4321 note; relating to the protection of wetland); and

(I) any Federal law (including regulations) requiring no net loss of wetland.

SA 3565. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MODIFICATION AND PERMANENT EXTENSION OF THE INCENTIVES TO REINVEST FOREIGN EARNINGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) REPATRIATION SUBJECT TO 5 PERCENT TAX RATE.—Subsection (a)(1) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''85 percent'' and inserting ''85.7 percent''.

(2) PERMANENT EXTENSION TO ELECT REPATRIATION.—Subsection (f) of section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(f) ELECTION.—The taxpayer may elect to apply this section to any taxable year only if made on or before the due date (including extensions) for filing the return of tax for such taxable year.''.

(3) REPATRIATION INCLUDES CURRENT AND ACCUMULATED FOREIGN EARNINGS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 965(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of dividends taken into account under subsection (a) shall not exceed the sum of the current and accumulated earnings and profits described in section 959(c)(3) for the year a deduction is claimed under subsection (a), without diminution by reason of any distributions made during the election year, for all controlled foreign corporations of the United States shareholder.''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 965(b) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (2) and (4) and by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(ii) Section 965(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraphs (1) and (2) and by redesignating paragraphs (3), (4), and (5) as paragraphs (1), (2), and (3), respectively.

(iii) Paragraph (3) of section 965(c) of such Code, as redesignated by clause (ii), is amended to read as follows:

''(3) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—All United States shareholders which are members of an affiliated group filing a consolidated return under section 1501 shall be treated as one United States shareholder.''.

(4) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The heading for section 965 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''**TEMPORARY**''.

(B) The table of sections for subpart F of part III of subchapter N of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by striking ''Temporary dividends'' and inserting ''Dividends''.

(b) TRANSFERS OF REVENUE TO HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.—Section 9503(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) REVENUES ATTRIBUTABLE TO DIVIDENDS RECEIVED DEDUCTIONS .—There are hereby appropriated to the Highway Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the revenue derived from the amendments made by section _____(a) of the Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3566. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5021, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MULTI-STATE TRANSPORTATION PRIORITIES.

(a) LIST.—The Secretary of Transportation (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary''), in consultation with representative sample of State and local government transportation officials, shall compile a prioritized list of transportation projects, which shall guide the allocation of funding to States for multi-State transportation projects.

(b) CRITERIA.—In compiling the list under subsection (a), the Secretary, in addition to other criteria established by the Secretary, shall rank priorities in descending order, beginning with—

(1) the extent of the positive impact the project will have on 1 or more interstate highways;

(2) whether the project will repair or replace a road or bridge that—

(A) has been determined to be structurally or functionally obsolete; and

(B) poses a risk to public safety;

(3) the extent of the positive impact of the project on interstate commerce, as demonstrated by an examination of economic indicators, including—

(A) the impact of the project on shipping and trucking commerce;

(B) the nexus of the project to other States; and

(C) the availability of alternative routes;

(4) the difference between—

(A) the estimated volume of traffic that uses the road or bridge after the project is completed; and

(B) the volume of traffic that the existing road or bridge was designed to accommodate;

(5) the national significance (rather than the regional significance) of the project; and

(6) the ability of the applicable State or local government to provide additional funding for the project.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) a prioritized list of multi-State transportation projects; and

(2) a description of the criteria used to establish the list referred to in paragraph (1).

(d) QUARTERLY UPDATES.—Not less frequently than 4 times each year, the Secretary shall—

(1) update the report submitted pursuant to subsection (c);

(2) transmit a copy of the report to Congress; and

(3) make copy of the report available to the public through the Department of Transportation website.

SA 3567. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert after section 101 the following:

Subtitle B—Army Programs

SEC. 111. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON UH–72 LIGHT UTILITY HELICOPTER HEALTH AND USAGE MONITORING SYSTEM.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a health and usage monitoring system for the UH–72 Lakota Light Utility Helicopter (LUH) that provides early warning for failing systems may reduce costly emergency maintenance, improve maintenance schedules, and increase fleet readiness; and

(2) the Department of the Army should consider establishing LUH health and usage monitoring system requirements that comply with Federal Aviation Administration standards for certification and are based on the condition-based maintenance needs of the Army, provided that any decision to proceed with a program of record will be done using full and open competition in accordance with the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

SA 3568. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I, add the following:

Subtitle E—Defense-wide, Joint, and Multiservice Matters

SEC. 151. PLAN FOR MODERNIZATION OR REPLACEMENT OF DIGITAL AVIONIC EQUIPMENT.

(a) PLAN REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a plan for the modernization or replacement of digital avionics equipment, including use of commercial-off-the-shelf digital avionics equipment, to meet the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The plan required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of the requirements imposed on Department of Defense aircraft by the FAA transition to the NextGen program, including—

(A) an identification of the type and number of aircraft that the Department will need to upgrade;

(B) a definition of the upgrades needed for such aircraft; and

(C) the schedule required for the Department to make such upgrades in time to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(2) A description of options for—

(A) acquiring new equipment, including—

(i) new procurement; and

(ii) leasing equipment and installation and other services, including the use of public-private partnerships; and

(B) modernizing existing equipment.

(3) An evaluation of the ability of each option to meet future operational requirements and to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

(4) Estimated timeline to modernize or replace the digital avionics equipment across the Department of Defense.

(5) Estimated costs of options to modernize or replace the avionics equipment across the Department in order to meet FAA NextGen Equipage Program requirements.

SA 3569. Mr. INHOFE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2410, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2015 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1069. REPORT ON PHYSICAL SECURITY AT DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACILITIES.

(a) FINDING.—Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense reviewed security standards at Department of Defense facilities following both the November 2009 shootings at Fort Hood, Texas, and the September 2013 shootings at the Washington Navy Yard, District of Columbia, which included an assessment of the ability of the Department to detect, prevent, and respond to future incidents at such facilities.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 30, 2015, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth a summary of the actions taken by the Department of Defense to respond to the recommendations resulting from the reviews of security standards described in subsection (a).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report shall include the following:

(A) Summary of the recommendations described in paragraph (1).

(B) A description of the actions taken on each recommendation.

(C) An assessment of current and planned physical security capabilities at Department facilities, and their ability to meet Department physical security requirements.

(D) An identification and assessment of known and potential physical security shortfalls at Department facilities.

(E) An assessment of the ability of the Department to eliminate or mitigate shortfalls in physical security at Department facilities, including recommendations on means to increase physical security at such facilities and the funding required to implement such means.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on July 22, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''Coal Miners' Struggle for Justice: How Unethical Legal and Medical Practices Stack the Deck Against Black Lung Claimants.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Sindey Holcomb of the committee staff on (202) 228–1455.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Wednesday, July 23, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark up H.R. 2083, Protecting Students from Sexual and Violent Predators Act; S. 315, Paul D. Wellstone Muscular Dystrophy Community Assistance, Research and Education, MD–CARE, Amendments of 2013; S. 2154, Emergency Medical Services for Children Reauthorization Act of 2014; S. 531, Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans Act; S. 2405, Trauma Systems and Regionalization of Emergency Care Reauthorization Act; S. 2406, Improving Trauma Care Act of 2014; S. 2539, Traumatic Brain Injury Reauthorization Act of 2014; S. 2511, A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224–5375.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet on July 24, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled ''The Role of States in Higher Education.''

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Aissa Canchola of the committee staff on (202) 224–2009.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''Examining Accountability and Corporate Culture in Wake of the GM Recalls.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2 p.m. in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Federal Research Portfolio: Capitalizing on Investments in R&D.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m. in room SD–215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Role of Trade and Technology in 21st Century Manufacturing.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Dangerous Passage: Central America in Crisis and the Exodus of Unaccompanied Minors.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2 p.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 10 a.m., in room SD–430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''More Than 1,000 Preventable Deaths a Day Is Too Many: The Need to Improve Patient Safety.''

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD–226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 17, 2014, at 2:30 p.m.

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

REGARDING U.S. SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to Calendar No. 469, S. Res. 498.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 498) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United States support for the State of Israel as it defends itself against unprovoked rocket attacks from the Hamas terrorist organization.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 498) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of Wednesday, July 16, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL DAY OF THE AMERICAN COWBOY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 488.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 488) designating July 26, 2014, as ''National Day of the American Cowboy.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 488) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 26, 2014, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL LIGHTHOUSE AND LIGHTHOUSE PRESERVATION DAY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 507.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 507) designating August 7, 2014, as ''National Lighthouse and Lighthouse Preservation Day.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 507) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

COMMEMORATING THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) commemorating the centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Congressional Research Service.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this Wednesday—July 16, 2014—marks the centennial of the Congressional Research Service, CRS. On this exact date 100 years ago, our oldest legislative support agency was created. But the idea for such an organization to provide objective information and analysis to legislators goes back to the start of our Republic. As Thomas Jefferson said 200 years ago, ''There is, in fact, no subject to which a member of Congress may not have occasion to refer.'' Jefferson's view gained adherents over time, especially at the State level first and then during the progressive era. Two Members of Congress during that early 1900s era—Senator Robert

LaFollette and Representative John Nelson, both of Wisconsin—both championed legislation that authorized the Librarian of Congress to establish a legislative reference service composed of ''competent persons to prepare such indexes, digests and compilations of law as may be required for Congress and other official use.'' President Woodrow Wilson signed the legislation—the fiscal year 1915 appropriations bill for the Library of Congress—into law on July 16, 1914. Librarian of Congress Herbert Putnam established the Legislative Reference Service, LRS, in the Library of Congress by administrative order on July 18, 1914. The reference service's location in the Library of Congress—the library both of Congress and the American people—provided researchers then and now with a treasure trove of books, materials, and collections of various sorts to answer and address the questions and inquiries that emanate from the legislative branch. The LRS was renamed the CRS in 1970.

Today, the responsibilities and roles of CRS have grown enormously. To meet the hundreds of thousands of requests made annually by Members and staff of the legislative branch, CRS employs over 600 total staff. Among the occupations represented at CRS are reference librarians, lawyers, political scientists, economists, budget analysts, scientists, engineers, and public administrators. The titles of its five interdisciplinary research divisions underscore the wide range of expertise housed in CRS: American Law; Domestic Social Policy; Foreign Affairs, Defense & Trade; Government & Finance; and Resources, Science & Industry. In addition, CRS has a Knowledge Services Group made up of research and information specialists who provide support services to CRS analysts and attorneys. In fiscal year 2013, Members and committees received information and analysis from CRS in more than 636,000 responses that took the form of 67,000 requests for custom analysis and research, 9,000 congressional participations in 350 seminars, and over half a million instances of Web site services.

At the heart of CRS's charter is that it serves both the majority and minority parties and Members of Congress elected as Independents or with a third-party affiliation. This bedrock nonpartisan principle suffuses all of CRS's endeavors, which makes it unlike the many partisan interest groups and ''think tanks'' that populate the Nation's capital. CRS's straightforward mission statement says it all: ''The Congressional Research Service serves the Congress throughout the legislative process by providing comprehensive and reliable legislative research and analysis that are timely, objective, authoritative, and confidential, thereby contributing to an informed national legislature.''

Former Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan said: ''People are entitled to their own opinions, but not their own facts.'' CRS provides the facts. Providing unbiased, objective facts is an invaluable service not just to Congress but to the Nation. In my considered judgment, CRS has served Congress exceptionally well during the past 100 years and I am confident that it will continue to perform at the highest level in the years and decades ahead. No one can fully predict the challenges we will face. But I am confident that the in-depth knowledge and expertise housed in CRS will enable Members of Congress and their staff to better understand and address an increasingly complex array of domestic and global issues. I congratulate CRS and its outstanding and dedicated staff on the occasion of its 100th birthday.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I was honored today to join my colleague, Senator CARDIN, in submitting a resolution to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Congressional Research Service, CRS. This is a historic milestone for CRS and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter I recently wrote to Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and Dr. Mary Mazanec, the Director of the Congressional Research Service, be printed the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JULY 16, 2014.

Hon. JAMES H. BILLINGTON,
Librarian of Congress,
Dr. MARY B. MAZANEC,
Director of the Congressional Research Service.

DEAR DRS. BILLINGTON AND MAZANEC: On behalf of the Joint Committee on the Library and a grateful Congress, I'd like to congratulate you, the dedicated public servants of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), and the entire extended CRS family on this historic 100th Anniversary. You have a great deal to celebrate today at your ''The First Branch: Challenges of Governance in a Global Era'' symposium.

For a century now, CRS professionals have made enormous contributions to our public discourse and provided invaluable expertise to lawmakers challenged with developing legislation and policies to guide our nation in times of increasing complexity and rapid change.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude to all of you and to those legislators, led by Senator Robert M. La Follette and Representative John M. Nelson, who foresaw a need for your skills at the beginning of the 20th Century. As a New Yorker, I'm also proud that the legislation to create CRS was partly inspired by efforts in the Empire State undertaken by the New York State Library in addition to reforms carried out in Wisconsin, the home of Senator La Follette and Representative Nelson.

In 1914, no one could have envisioned the breadth of the challenges that would confront Congress over the following 100 years—issues of war and peace, profound social change and challenge, and revolutionary scientific and technological advancement. Yet through it all, CRS helped Congress make more informed decisions to the benefit of the American people and libraries all over the world.

We may have little idea today what Congress will be facing in the decades to come, but we know beyond any doubt that the Congressional Research Service will be there, providing Congress with the very best information possible on legislative, policy, and oversight matters, every step of the way.

Congratulations on this historic milestone, and we're looking forward to the next 100 years.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCHUMER.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Committee on Rules and Administration with oversight of the Congressional Research Service, I offer my congratulations on the occasion of its centennial.

While it began in 1914 as a modest reference service, today it is an organization of nearly 600 analysts, attorneys, information professionals, and support staff with the core mission of providing timely and authoritative research and analysis on legislative issues of interest to Congress.

These highly trained and professional experts are dedicated to supporting the work of the Congress in an objective, unbiased, and nonpartisan manner.

Congratulations to the Congressional Research Service for 100 years of excellent service to the Congress.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2631

Mr. REID. Mr. President, S. 2631 is at the desk and due for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2631) to prevent the expansion of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program unlawfully created by Executive memorandum on August 15, 2012.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask for a second reading but object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive a second reading on the next legislative day.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate from Thursday, July 17, through Monday, July 21, Senators REED of Rhode Island and ROCKEFELLER be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m. on Monday, July 21, 2014; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following any leader remarks, the Senate proceed to a period of morning business until 5:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the time equally divided and controlled between the two leaders or their designees; that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 849 as provided under the previous order.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, there will be votes on the confirmation of the following nominations: Carnes, Lawson, and Reddick. We expect rollcall votes on the Carnes nomination and voice votes on the Lawson and Reddick nominations.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 21, 2014, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it adjourn under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:12 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 21, 2014, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

CHARLES C. ADAMS, JR., OF MARYLAND, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF FINLAND.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

MATTHEW VINCENT MASTERSON, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2017, VICE GINEEN BRESSO BEACH, TERM EXPIRED.

CHRISTY A. MCCORMICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2015, VICE DONETTA DAVIDSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. CLARENCE ERVIN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. CHARLES L. GABLE

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN L. DANNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL PATRICIA M. ANSLOW
BRIGADIER GENERAL ELIZABETH D. AUSTIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL MATTHEW P. BEEVERS
BRIGADIER GENERAL ERIC C. BUSH
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER E. FOUNTAIN
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD J. GALLANT
BRIGADIER GENERAL SCOTT A. GRONEWALD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JEFFREY H. HOLMES
BRIGADIER GENERAL WALTER T. LORD
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOHNNY R. MILLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL GLEN E. MOORE
BRIGADIER GENERAL LESTER SIMPSON
BRIGADIER GENERAL REX A. SPITLER
BRIGADIER GENERAL ROY S. WEBB
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID E. WILMOT
BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID C. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK W. PALZER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 1211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. NEAL G. LOIDOLT

To be brigadier general

COL. THOMAS P. BUMP
COL. MARTA CARCANA
COL. JEFFREY E. IRELAND
COL. ISABELO RIVERA
COL. WALLACE N. TURNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. ULSES

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY S. PAUL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. GLENN A. GODDARD

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL GREGREY C. BACON
COLONEL DARYL D. JASCHEN
COLONEL DAVID S. WERNER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ROBERT J. HOWELL, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) KERRY M. METZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GENE F. PRICE
CAPT. LINNEA J. SOMMERWEDDINGTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAWN E. CUTLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JONATHAN ACKLEY
THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD
BRADLEY A. AMYS
BRYANT OWEN BAIR
GRAHAM H. BERNSTEIN
DAVID CHARLES BLOMGREN
JOHN H. BONE
ELIJAH FRANCIS BROWN
MARK CLIFFORD BRUEGGER
TANIA C. M. BRYANT
BRIAN CHARLES CALL
SARAH WILLIAMS CARLSON
SARA JOY CARRASCO
RICHARD PIN CHEN
DAVID L. CHEWNING
JONATHAN ROY COMPTON
ELIZABETH ANNA CRANE
JEFFREY ALLAN DAVIS
BERTHA A. DIAZ
EVAN ALLEN EPSTEIN
CHAD THOMAS EVANS
JAVIER A. FARFAN
KENITRA I. FEWELL
ELIZABETH ANNA FITZGERALD
JASON E. GAMMONS
JEFFREY BEVAN GARBER
SEAN THOMAS GARNER
TIMOTHY GOINES
MARK ANDREW GOLDEN
DUSTIN L. GRANT
DAVID R. GROENDYK
JASON H. GUNNELL
GRETHE KRISTINA HAHN
BENJAMIN RUSSELL HENLEY
NATHANIEL GLENN HIMERT
IAN S. HOLZHAUER
ELGIN D. HORNE
DAPHNE LASALLE JACKSON
ISAAC C. KENNEN
WILLIAM JESSE LADUKE
TEAH LAMBRIGHT
JUSTIN PAUL LONERGAN
MARC PHILLIP MALLONE
GEORGE MATHEW
NATHAN H. MAYENSCHEIN
ERIC M. MCCUTCHEN
BRETT RICHARD MILLBURN
JENNIFER DELL MULLINS
MATTHEW JOSHUA NEIL
JOSHUA BRYAN NETTINGA
MIKAL CARL NUHN
ADAM NICHOLAS OLSEN
SALEEM SYED RAZVI
NICKLAUS JAMES REED
KEVIN YAMASHITA REINHOLZ
BRETT A. ROBINSON
MEGAN N. SCHMID
AMY KATE SIAK
THOMAS ANDREW SMITH
JOHN ROBERTS SOKOHL
MEREDITH LAURALINDLE STEER
DUSTIN MARCELLUS TIPLING
NICHOLE MARIE TORRES
KENNETH LEWIS VAUGHT
ANNA ELEANOR VIRDELL
LEAH ECCLES WATSON
BRANT FREDERICK WHIPPLE
JOSHUA CURTIS WILLIAMS
AARON ALLEN WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

RICHARD EDWARD ALFORD
TAMONA L. BRIGHT
KEVIN D. CATRON
LINDSAY E. CONTOVEROS
ROYAL A. DAVIS
WILLIAM D. DEITCH
JAMES R. DORMAN
SHELLY M. FRANK
LANCE E. FREEMAN
ANDREW D. GILLMAN
PATRICIA A. GRUEN
CHARLES J. HEBNER
JENNIFER C. HOLMES
MATTHEW T. KING
ERIKA E. LYNCH
CHARLTON J. MEGINLEY
ETIENNE J. MISZCZAK
TIAUNDRA D. MONCRIEF
LISA D. MOSELEY
AIRON A. MOTHERSHED
SONDRA BELL NENSALA
GARY MATTHEW OSBORN
BRENT F. OSGOOD
STERLING C. PENDLETON
KEIRA A. POELLET
MICHELLE A. QUITUGUA
DREW G. ROBERTS
DAVID F.X. ROUTHIER
LEE F. SANDERSON
MATTHEW G. SCHWARTZ
DAMON P. SCOTT
MULGHETTA A. SIUM
DARRIN M. SKOUSEN
TIFFANY M. WAGNER
PAUL E. WELLING

ROBERT C. WILDER
DYLAN B. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

WILLIAM J. ANNEXSTAD
THOMAS L. CLUFF, JR.
GAIL E. CRAWFORD
ANDREA M. DECAMARA
PATRICK J. DOLAN
PATRICK W. FRANZESE
KYLE W. GREEN
BRANDON L. HART
JAMES H. KENNEDY III
JAMES E. KEY III
AMY L. MOMBER
KATHERINE E. OLER
THOMAS M. RODRIGUES
ELIZABETH L. SCHUCHSGOPAUL
MICHAEL W. TAYLOR
OWEN W. TULLOS
JEREMY S. WEBER
DAVID J. WESTERN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

ALEKSANDR BARON
DMITRY BARON
TED M. BEAUCHAMP
IVETTE BLANCOPADILLA
JAROM R. BURBANK
TYLER R. BURNINGHAM
JONATHAN D. CASO
SACHIYO K. CHAMBERS
HYUNSEOK C. CHI
VU H. DO
KATIE A. EGBERT
KONRAD D. FERGUSON
ANDREW A. GUTIERREZ
MITCHELL J. HERNANDEZ
SERGIO HERNANDEZ
KENNETH M. HUSSEY
HANANE JAMGHILI
JUSTIN JARISCH
MICHAEL L. JOHNSON
KEVIN C. JOHNSTUN
JAE H. KIM
JASON KIM
JEREMY J. KOPPENHAVER
JOHN C. LAKE, JR.
PHILLIP O. LANCE
JONATHAN Y. LEE
TIFFANY C. LOVELACE
TROY K. LUNDELL
STEVEN K. MARK
ANDRES M. MENDOZA
MORGAN K. MONCAYO
SERGIO MUNOZ
FRANCIS S. NAHM
JENNA M. NAKANISHI
JESSE B. NORRIS
MEGHAN K. OCONNELL
SONNY R. PORTER
SAMUEL PYO
DONALD G. RICE
CORY D. RICHARDS
GIOVANNI A. SAFDARI
BRIAN C. SLIGHLY
RYAN D. SWISS
ISAO F. TAKII
SHANI O. THOMPSON
JORGE E. VALDES
RODGER I. VOLTIN
ERIK P. WATZ
KYLE A. WILSON
JOHN D. WISE
RYAN D. ZIMMERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

CARLO J. ALPHONSO
RYAN J. ALTENBURG
ROHUL AMIN
WILLIAM C. ARNETT
MICHAEL I. ARNOLD
MARIA C. ARTIGAS
JEFFERY C. ASHBURN
WESLEY L. BABER
JONATHAN D. BAILEY
JOSHUA R. BAKER
BRAD R. BALLARD
WAGNER BAPTISTE
ANTHONY M. BARCIA
HARRISON B. BAUCOM
ANDREW B. BEEGHLY
JENNIFER A. BENINCASA
SCOTT E. BEVANS
HUSAIN M. BHARMAL
NATHAN J. BORDEN
CHAD P. BOUCHARD
JAMES D. BOWSHER
DANIEL B. BRILLHART
MICHAEL V. BROWN
PATRICK J. BROWN
SIDNEY D. BRUCE
HEATHER J. BURCH
PAMELA L. BURGESS
DANIELLE E. CAFASSO
BARRETT H. CAMPBELL
ELIZABETH A. CAMPBELL
RONALD J. CARAS
TERRI L. CARLSON
STEPHEN M. CARROLL
JOSEPH D. CARUSO
BRIAN S. CHEN
RYAN M. CHIARELLA
DANIEL P. CHILES
JOSEPH S. CHRISTIANSEN
SOYEUN CHU
JESSIKA S. CHUMAK
JONATHAN D. CLAASSEN
STEPHANIE L. CLAASSEN
PAUL A. CLARK
JOHN P. CODY
SARAH S. COLE
JOANIE M. COLUMBIA
JAY B. COOK
JENNIFER A. COOPER
JUSTIN L. COSTA
JENNIFER L. CREAMER
SCOTT E. CUNNINGHAM
SHAUNETTE DAVEY
BENJAMIN T. DAXON
ERIC C. DELACRUZ
HEATHER D. DELUCA
BRADLEY A. DENGLER
JEANNIE S. DIAS
CHRISTOPHER M. DIPIRO
JENNIFER S. DOMINGO
MICHAEL J. DONOFRIO
KEVIN J. DOWNING
NICHOLAS D. P. DRAKOS
JASON R. DUTTON
JAMES S. EBERTOWSKI
JUSTIN C. EISENMAN
DAVID M. EVANS
AARON R. FARMER
JAMES S. FARRELL
MICHAEL G. FAZIO
DAMON A. FORBES
SHANNON N. FOSTER
BRIAN C. FULLER
JESSE V. GABRIEL
WENDRA J. GALFAND
JOSEPH W. GALVIN
EDWIN GANDIA
ALISSA R. GARCIA
JADE V. GAREEDEXTER
ANNELIESE GERMAIN
LAUREN M. GIULITTO
GEOFFREY P. GLEBUS
JEREMY D. GOINS
GENS P. GOODMAN
COLIN M. GRANT
ROLAND H. GREEN
BRENDAN D. GRIFFIS
RHIANON M. GROOM
CHRISTOPHER J. HAGEN
GREGORY C. HAHN
PAUL S. HAHN
DIANE F. HALE
ROBERT D. HALES
PATRICK S. HALL
SAMUEL J. HAN
JAMES A. HARRIS
MONIQUE O. HASSAN
EMILY N. HATHAWAY
ELISABETH M. HESSE
RICHARD W. HILLIARD, JR.
SHANA L. HIRCHERT
GALE J. HOBSON
ANDREW J. HOLDAWAY
SAMUEL L. HOLMES
STEVEN S. HONG
KRISTOPHER G. HOOTEN
MOLLY D. HOUSE
JEFFERSON T. HUNT
AARON M. JACKSON
CATHERINE JACOB
MARK D. JEFFORDS
CHRISTOPHER K. JENSEN
TODD E. JENSEN
ANTHONY W. JONES
CHRISTINA L. JONES
JAMES P. JONES
JOSEPH S. JONES
KYLE R. JUDKINS
MATTHEW C. KASPRENSKI
CHRISTOPHER D. KENNY
MARY E. KERN
SEAN Q. KERN
ROBERT G. KIRTLEY
KRISTEN E. KOENIG
KRISTIN D. KREIDER
CHAD A. KRUEGER
KEVIN P. KRUL
KELLY L. LANGAN
JUSTIN J. LAPOLLO
GARY L. LEGAULT
KEITH P. LEITZEN
ADAM B. LEWIS
DAVID L. LINDEMANN
THERESA M. LORKOWSKI
JOSEPH G. LOUDEN
DAVID R. LOWERY
MARESA LUGO
CORY A. LUNDBERG
RYAN J. MACDONALD
HOWARD W. MACLENNAN
JASON J. MADEY
JOHN R. MAGERA
CARLOS G. MALAVEMARRERO
MONICA J. S. MANN
DANIEL J. MARINO
HEATHER M. MASCIO
CHRISTOPHER R. MATTSON
CALEB M. MAY
KASEY J. MAYCLIN
KRISTA Z. L. MCBAYNE
JILL A. MCCAULLEY
DANIEL P. MCGUIRE
BRANDON W. MCNALLY
DEREK P. MCVAY
CODY D. MEAD
JEFFERY M. MEADOWS
CRAIG D. MEGGITT
ARTHUR R. MIELKE
CHRISTOPHER J. MIEREK
JESS R. MILLER
KYONG S. MIN
MELANIE A. S. MINALGA
RAUL A. MIRZA
HEATHER S. MITCHELL
EDWIN E. MORALES
MACKENZIE K. MORGAN
RYAN P. MORTON
COREY M. MOSSOP
AMY J. MOYER
HAPU T. MSONDA
CHRISTOPHER J. MULDER
BECKY T. MULDOON
ERICA L. MURRAY
MATTHEW A. NAPIERALA
DANIEL W. NELSON
JAMES H. NELSON
PATRICIA C. NELSON
STEPHANIE B. W. NG
LONG T. NGUYENDO
MELODY R. NOLAN
MICHAEL J. NORTON
YULIYA A. OGAI
CHRISTINA S. OHARA
STEPHEN M. OVERHOLSER
MATTHEW H. PARK
SAMIT A. PATEL
RACHAEL A. PAZ
BRET K. PEARCE
ERIKA PETRIK
SARAH K. PETTEYS
ELIZABETH M. POLFER
CHRISTOPHER R. PORTA
MATTHEW T. PORTER
TASHA R. POWELL
AARON W. PUMERANTZ
ELIZABETH A. PUNTENNEY
JOHN G. QUILES
DANIEL P. RABOIN
CIARA N. RAKESTRAW
SAMUEL A. RALSTON
NESTOR R. RAMOS
SEAN S. RAY
DAVID E. REECE
CHRISTOPHER J. RENAUD
CHRISTINA M. RIOJAS
PRESTON W. ROBERTS
JACQUELINE F. ROSENTHAL
JENNIFER L. ROWLAND
DOUGLAS S. RUHL
TITUS J. RUND
DANIEL H. RUSSELL
ABRAHAM E. SABERSKY
JENNIFER M. SABINO
SAW K. SAN
ADAM R. SASSO
KEVIN E. SCHLICKSUP
MARK N. SCHWENDIMAN
JOSHUA A. SCOTT
WITZARD SEIDE
JOSE A. SERRANO
BRIAN T. SHAHAN
REBECCA L. G. SHERIDAN
CREIGHTON E. SHUTE
ERIC R. SIGMON
JOSHUA R. SIMMONS
ABHAY A. SINGH
NICKLESH N. SINGH
LEIGHANNE L. SLACK
ASHLEY E. SMITH
CARIN J. SMITH
MICHAEL P. SMITH
BRIAN L. SNYDER
PRESTON J. SPARKS
RYAN W. SPEIR
GREGORY M. SPROWL
ANDREW R. STEIN
BRIAN J. STOUT
AMY N. STRATTON
TYLER E. STRATTON
STEPHEN B. STRINGHAM
CANDACE R. M. TALCOTT
PAMELA S. TIPLER
JOSEPH J. TRIPLET
ADAM M. TRITSCH
DAVID T. UM
CHARLES J. USSERY
VANEESHA VALLABHPATEL
DAVID W. VANWYCK
JAVIER M. VAZQUEZORTIZ
LUIS X. VELEZCOLON
HUMBERTO G. VILLARREAL
DIANA L. VILLAZANAKRETZER
KELLEY A. VONELTEN
TIMOTHY J. VREELAND
VANYA D. WAGLER
KEVIN B. WALDREP
AVERY S. WALKER
JESSICA L. WALSH
RYAN M. WALSH
KYLE C. WARD

WENDY S. WARREN
EZELLA N. WASHINGTON
BRIT C. D. WATERS
ROBERT E. WATTS
DEWAYNE L. WEAVER
DOUGLAS R. WEBER
JENNIFER M. WELTY
DAVID J. WILSON
WILLIAM R. WILSON, JR.
JONATHAN R. WOOD
EKAPHOL WOODEN
JINSONG WU
CHRISTOPHER G. YHEULON
JORDAN E. YOKLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DESIREE S. DIRIGE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOHN I. ACTKINSON
IAN P. ADAMS
ORENTHAL G. ADDERSON
ALLEN M. AGOR
BRANDON S. ALAMO
MATTHEW R. ALBRIGHT
TRAVIS M. ALEXANDER
NICHOLAS E. ALFANO
EDDIE C. ALLEN
JOHN R. ALLEN
EMILY C. ALLERT
MIKAEL M. ALLERT
TRAVIS S. AMERINE
ANGELA C. ANDERSON
ROBERT W. ANDERSON IV
TRAVIS S. ANDERSON
GIEORAG M. ANDREWS
ALEXANDER S. ANGELO
KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI
AARON S. ARKY
SERGIO A. ARMAS, JR.
ALYSSA B. Y. ARMSTRONG
ROBERT H. ARNDT III
ALBERT E. ARNOLD IV
ROBERT J. BAGLEY
MICHAEL BAILEY
KATHLEEN R. BALL
COREY D. BARKSDALE
ROBERT C. BARNETT
DAVID H. BARNHILL
JESSICA M. BARRIENTOS
CHARLES S. BARRS III
JOHN G. BARRY
CHAD D. BARTKUS
MICHAEL J. BARTOLF
JEREMY D. BARTOWITZ
WILLIAM T. BAUER
MATTHEW E. BAYER
DAVID R. BEAM
JOHN M. BEAR
BENJAMIN M. BEARMAN
CLAYTON C. BEAS
JAMES R. BEATY
DIANA L. BEAUFORD
JOHN P. BECKER
MATTHEW A. BECKER
TIMOTHY J. BEEBE
MICHAEL J. BEER
JUSTIN J. BENCH
CHRISTOPHER L. BENTON
AARON G. BERGER
MARK A. BERGLUND
DANIEL J. BERRY
MASON W. BERRY
MATTHEW T. BERRY
ALEXA J. BESTOSO
DYLAN C. BEYER
BRENDA W. BEZNOSKA
TIMOTHY W. BIERBACH
RYAN L. BIRKELBACH
ZACHARY A. BITTNER
JONATHAN M. BLACK
CYNTHIA BLACKMAN
ROBERT C. BLACKWOOD
GARTH J. BLAKELY
CHRISTOPHER H. BLAND
CHRISTIAN W. BLASY
MARK A. BLASZCZYK
CARL R. BLAZEK
NIKOLAUS J. BOCHETTE
THOMAS R. BOCK
DUSTIN L. BOEDING
BRETT A. BOOTHE
ROBERT H. BOWER
MATTHEW D. BOYCE
MARSHALL T. BOYD
SAMUEL C. BOYD
EDWARD H. BOYDSTON
JASON M. BRADLEY
RICHARD T. BRANNEN
JEREMY D. BRAUN
DOUGLAS A. BRAYTON
WALTER R. BRINKLEY, JR.
KYLE T. BRIZAN
JOSHUA L. BROADBENT
RYAN P. BRODERICK
MATTHEW P. BROUILLARD
ANDREW M. BROWN
DAVID M. BROWN
LUKE A. BROWN
RYAN A. BROWN
NATHAN J. BROWNE
AMANDA G. BROWNING
ADAM L. BRYAN
GRANT T. BRYAN
JOSEPH BUBULKA
RALPH T. BUCKLES
MICHAEL J. BUCKLEY
PETER M. BUGLER
WILLIAM W. BUHL
JAMES A. BURKETT III
BENJAMIN J. BURNHAM
CLINTON F. BURR
STEVEN M. BURROWS
ADAM R. BUSH
ZACHARY D. BUTALA
ADAM R. CADOVIUS
ADAM M. CALHOUN
JOSHUA C. CALHOUN
KYLE F. CALTON
ALBERT F. CALUAG
LEONARD CALVERT IV
TIMOTHY L. CAMPBELL
DAVID B. CANNADY
BENJAMIN R. CANTU
BENJAMIN C. CARLSON
AIDAN CARRIGG
WILLIAM J. CARROLL
CHRISTOPHER B. CARSON
GRANT F. CARTER
KEVIN J. CARTER
MARIO G. CASTELLANOS
MICHAEL O. CASTILLO
AARON J. CHANDLER
MATTHEW E. CHANG
JAMES M. CHARAPICH
NATHANIEL J. CHASE
MICHAEL R. CHESNUT
JEFFREY T. CHEWNING
SCOTT F. CHIRGWIN
SVEN R. CHRISMAN
ADAM K. CHRISTENSEN
CLINTON J. CHRISTOFK
JONATHAN D. CIRILLO
ROBERT A. CIZEK
JOHN P. CLARK
MATTHEW R. CLARK
MICHAEL R. CLEES
SCOTT W. CLEVELAND
CHRISTOPHER W. CLEVENGER
JOSEPH M. CLUNIE
JASON E. COATES
BRANDON J. COBB
ADAM COHEN
JORDAN M. COHEN
MATTHEW D. COLLINSWORTH
RANDY S. CONANT
BRIAN X. CONLAN
JASON A. CONLEY
ERIN N. CONNOR
BRADLEY M. CONROY
JOHN M. COOMBS
CHARLES T. COOPER
SEAN N. COOPER
WILLIAM R. COOPER
PETER E. CORNETT
LESLIE E. CORNWALL, JR.
LAUREN B. COSGRAVE
WILLIAM G. COULTER
BENJAMEN L. COVERT
SHAUN A. COX
KELLY N. CRAFT
FREDERICK D. CRAYTON
JASON C. CREWS
MATTHEW T. CRONAUER
ANDREW C. CROUSE
EDWARD L. CRUZMATOS
JEFFREY K. CUMMINGS
CHARLES M. CUNNINGHAM II
GABRIELLE D. CUNNINGHAM
LUCIAN J. CZARNECKI II
JOSHUA W. DAFFRON
RYAN S. DAHLMAN
JASON H. DAO
DAVID L. DAUPHINAIS
BENJAMIN S. DAVIDSON
AARON B. DAVIS
KEVIN J. DAVIS
CONSTANCIA A. DEAN
MATTHEW B. DEBAUN
JOHN P. DEBBINK
BRANT N. DEBOER
MATTHEW H. DECOITO
CHRISTOPHER T. DELAGRANGE
LUCAS D. DENNISON
CHRISTOPHER M. DESCOVICH
GREGORY L. DESCOVICH
JAMES P. DEWITT
MATTHEW T. DIEDERICH
GRAIG T. DIEFENDERFER
THOMAS E. DIGAN, JR.
CHRISTOPHER C. DIKE
RYAN F. DILLON
MICHAEL F. DIMMITT
EMIL D. DINNOCENZO
SETH DINOLA
THOMAS T. DIXON
DANIEL B. DOLAN
MANUEL J. DOMINGUEZ
MATTHEW S. DOMINICK
CONOR P. DONAHUE
JAMES J. DONCHEZ
KEVIN M. DORE
RICHARD A. DORSEY II
SEAN W. DOUGHERTY
CAMERON A. DOUGLAS
RYAN R. DOWNING
JAMES E. DRENNAN
JOSEPH M. DUGAN
JARRETT P. DUNN
PATRICK M. DURNIN
JAMES W. DUVALL
FRANCIS E. ECLEVIA, JR.
JOHN H. EDWARDS
LUCAS R. EDWARDS
BRANDON S. ELLIOTT
NICHOLAS D. ELLIOTT
ERIN L. ELLIOTTCARRICO
CARL A. ELLSWORTH, JR.
EVERETTE T. ERVIN
HENRY P. ESHENOUR
FREDERICK K. ESPY
ERIC M. ETHERTON
RIAN Q. EVERETT
BRADLEY W. FAIRFAX
ROBERT S. FAIRLIE
JEFFREY C. FALLAT
CHARLES R. FARLOW III
BILLIE J. FARRELL
DAVID E. FARRELL
LUKE P. FARRELL
JACQUELYN M. FELBER
MICHAEL R. FELBER
JESS B. FELDON
JACOB D. FERRARI
LEE R. FIKE
SEAN D. FINNER
KELLY J. FITZPATRICK
JASON A. FLANAGAN
CHRISTIANA M. FLOECK
CHRISTOPHER D. FLORES
PETER C. FLYNN
WARREN H. FOGLER
NICKOLAS R. FORAN
ALEXA O. FORSYTH
JOSEPH M. FOSTER
LANDON B. FOSTER
TIMOTHY A. FOX
ALEXANDER J. FRANZ
DANIEL R. FREE
WINDSOR S. H. FRINELL
JEFFREY R. FROST
CAMERON L. FULRATH
RITARSHA Y. FURQAN
AARON J. GALL
NICHOLAS J. GALL
BRYAN M. GALLANT
ROWDY A. GARCIA
JEFFREY A. GARDNER
SCOTT A. GARLINGTON
JONATHAN R. GARNER
PHILIP M. GARROW
BRANDON B. GASSER
SHAFER B. GASTON
KENT A. GEBICKE
BENJAMIN C. GEIB
TOMMY J. GETTY
ZACHARY J. GIBBONS
WILLIAM A. GIBSON
BRANDON R. GILESSUMMERS
GRAHAM C. GILL
MEGAN H. GILL
ROBERT A. GILL
ROBERT J. GILLIS, JR.
BENJAMIN J. GLASER
CARL R. GLASS
JOHN M. GLEASON
DEREK M. GOEBEL
JUSTIN L. GOLSON
ANGELA D. GONZALES
JOSHUA P. GOODIN
JASON A. GORDAN
JAMES J. GORMLEY III
IAN W. GORSKI
ERICH E. GRAWUNDER
DARBY R. GRAY
JOHN E. GRAY
JAMES N. GROSE
JUSTIN R. GROVER
JEFFREY M. GRZEBIN
LEIF E. GUNDERSON
ERIK H. GUSTAFSON
ALEJANDRO L. GUTIERREZ
CHRISTIAN X. GUTIERREZ
SOPHIA M. HABERMAN
DOUGLAS G. HAGENBUCH
STEPHEN L. HAGGARD
JAMES H. HAISLOP
JAMES A. HALL
STACEY L. HALL
STEVEN A. HALLE
ERIK L. HALVORSON
JOSEPH S. HAMILTON
JUSTIN C. HAMILTON
JAMES T. HANNIFY
JUSTIN R. HARDY
NICHOLAS J. HARGRAVES
HENRY D. HARGROVE
DANIEL W. HARKINS, JR.
NATHAN A. HARRELL
KEVIN M. HARRINGTON
RYAN N. HARRIS
TRAVIS J. HARTMAN
NATHAN L. HARVEY
STEFANIE J. HASEMAN
KARL HASSENFRATZ
CHRISTOPHER S. HATHAWAY
JOSHUA R. HATTERY
JOSHUA A. HAUSBACH
JOHN E. HEDRICK
CONOR L. HEELY
JOSHUA B. HEISLER

ADAM R. HELLER
BENJAMIN N. HERRING
GRIFFIN HETRICK
JOSEPH A. HEYNE
LAWRENCE HEYWORTH IV
KYLE R. HICKMAN
DAVID P. HICKS
JONATHAN T. HINES
MARC W. HINES
KYLE W. HISCOCK
JOSHUA J. HODGE
NICHOLAS C. HODGE
ROBERT H. HODGES, JR.
NICHOLAS A. HOFFMANN
JEFFREY R. HOGAN
JEREMY D. HOLCOMB
MATTHEW P. HOLLADAY
CHRISTOPHER D. HOLLAND
DANIEL K. HOLLINGSHEAD
BRADLEY C. HOLMES
DEVIN M. HOLMES
RICHARD J. HOLT
JOHN E. HOLTHAUS
BENJAMIN J. HORN
GARETT T. HOUSTON
WILLIAM J. HOWEY III
MICHAEL J. HUBER
SCOTT T. HUCHTON
CLAYTON J. HUGHEY
BRIAN A. HUMPHREYS
CHRISTINA L. HUMPHRIES
ERIC W. HUNG
JAMES P. HUNT
MICHAEL A. HURBAN
DAVID T. HURST
DREW A. HUSTON
LUKE J. HUSTON
IAN P. HUTTER
KATHERINE A. HUTTER
JOSEPH A. HYDE
KENJI IGAWA
LEWIS S. IM
LUKE H. I. IM
PATRICK J. IMHOFF
ELY O. INFANTE
ISAIABENETTE E. INFANTE
KENNETH C. INGLE
CAMERON A. INGRAM
ROBERT B. INMAN
ROBERT D. IRELAND
BRIAN M. IRISH
JERRY W. IRONS
JAMES J. IRRGANG, JR.
JUSTIN E. IVANCIC
JOHN C. IVEY
MATTHEW J. IWANCZUK
DOMINIQUE A. JACKSON
JOHN R. JACKSON
MICHAEL JACKSON
ALLEN W. JACOB
JOEL W. JACOBS
CARL D. JAPPERT
TIMOTHY N. JENSEN
ALLAN JESPERSEN
JOSEPH G. JINDRICH
BJORN A. JOHNSON
BRETT P. JOHNSON
KEITH A. JOHNSON
LAUREN M. JOHNSON
MATTHEW P. JOHNSON, JR.
PHILLIP C. JOLLEY
BRANDON K. JONES
JARAD T. JONES
KEVIN A. JONES
PHILLIP J. JONES
RUSSELL W. JONES
WILLIAM P. JONES
KACEE L. JOSSIS
KRISTOFER W. KALSTAD
BRAD W. KASENBERG
THERESA L. KAYLOR
JOHN W. KEEFE
MATTHEW T. KEEFE
CHRISTOPHER J. KEEN
CHRISTOPHER J. KEITHLEY
TROY L. KELLY
WILLIAM R. KELLY
LUKE E. KELVINGTON
MICHAEL L. KENDEL
HENRY J. KENNEDY
KEVIN J. KENNEDY
WESLEY G. KENNERLY
PAUL M. KEPNER
JAMES H. KEPPER IV
KRISTEN M. KERNS
JOSHUA M. KERSTING
MICHAEL W. KESSLER
SAMEER KHANNA
SCOTT O. KILGORE
LUCIAN D. KINS
DAVID E. KISER
LEANDRA N. KISSINGER
REED A. KITCHEN
RYAN J. KLAMPER
KEITH F. KLOSTERMAN
BRYAN J. KNICK
MICHAEL A. KNICKERBOCKER
NICHOLAS J. KOETTER
LUCAS R. KORAN
MICHAEL J. KOS
JASON N. KRAHNKE
DOMINIC J. KRAMER
BRYAN W. KRONCKE
MARK K. KROZEL
SETH R. KRUEGER
DANIEL L. KURATKO
GAIL A. LAMPING
ANDREW A. LAMSON
NICKOLAS LANCASTER
GEORGE A. LANE
NATHAN J. LASSAS
STEPHANIE E. LATHAM
AARON J. LEE
DAVID J. LEISENRING
BRANDON S. LENHART
CLIFTON G. LENNON
RANDALL J. LESLIE
TROY A. LEVERON
CHARLES A. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER J. LEWIS
CALEB A. LINDH
SCOTT D. LIPPINCOTT
CARNE M. LIVINGSTON
ALFRED W. LONG, JR.
WILLIS M. LONG
JOSEPH O. LOPICCOLO
JUNIOR C. LORAH
CORRY W. LOUGEE
STEPHEN C. LOVELACE
ROBERT A. LOW
JOHN J. LOWERY
MICHAEL R. LUEBKERT
RALPH P. LUFKIN
KATIE J. LUNSER
MAXCY C. LYNN III
BLAKE A. LYON
ANTHONY D. MACALUSO
JARAD W. MAHANNA
DAVID D. MAHONEY
PATRICK T. MAHONEY
PAUL J. MAHONEY
KERRY M. MAJOR
ZUBIN J. MAJOR
WILLIAM G. MANGAN
LUDWIG MANN III
RYAN B. MANN
MATTHEW P. MAPLES
MICHAEL C. MARSH
BENJAMIN L. MARTINEZ
NATHAN W. MARTINEZ
JAMES G. MASSIE III
JORDAN A. MAYO
KRISTOPHER M. MCABEE
FRANK A. MCBRIDE
CASEY D. MCCAIN
JARED B. MCCALEB
PATRICK A. MCCARTHY
KEVIN K. MCCLELLAN
JOHN P. MCCRAY
CHRISTOPHER J. MCDONALD
SEAN R. MCELHANNON
ROBERT P. MCFALL
JASON R. MCKAY
KENT M. MCLAUGHLIN
JAMES R. MCMILLAN III
SEAN E. MCMULLEN
KYLE S. MCVAY
JEREMY C. MEDLIN
JON F. MEGAHY
KRISTINA N. MELENDEZ
CHRISTOPHER J. MERGEN
SEAN M. MERRITT
DAVID S. MICELI
NATHANIEL D. MICHAEL
DREW R. MICKLETHWAIT
JUSTIN L. MIDDLEBROOK
ADAM S. MILLER
MICHAEL J. MILLER
TRAVIS W. MILLER
SAMUEL C. MILLS
ELIJAH MOJICA
DOMENICO MONACO
BRANDON R. MONAGHAN
JAMES J. MOORE
RYAN S. MOORE
CHRISTOPHER C. MORAN
MICHAEL G. MORAN II
DOUGLAS M. MOREA
MARCUS V. MORELAND
LAWRENCE A. MORIARITY
JOHN D. MORRIS IV
KENNETH E. MORRIS
THOMAS J. MORRIS
DANIEL P. MORRISON
BRIAN M. MOWRY
LIAM F. MULCAHY
SCOTTY L. MURPHY
KARL N. MURRAY
BRAD W. MUSKOPF
SHAWN M. NAVINSKEY
JONATHAN D. NEW
MITCHELL A. NEWTON
DONALD NICHOLS, JR.
JUSTIN A. NIXON
DAVID L. NOBLES, JR.
MACK T. NOLEN, JR.
JONATHAN I. NORRIS
WILL A. NUSE
DAVIN C. OBRIEN
KYLE N. ODONOHOE
DAVID A. OECHSLEIN
KWAME K. OFORI
LUKE D. OLINGER
ANTHONY OLIPHANT
CHRISTIAN L. OLSEN
SAMANTHA A. ONEIL
SEAN T. ONEILL
BENJAMIN S. ORLOFF
FRANK J. ORNELAS II
DANIEL L. OSBOURN
MATTHEW J. OSTRYE
KENNETH C. PACKARD
JOHN J. PARMA
DANIEL C. PATRICK
NATHAN J. PECK
DANIEL PEEL
FELIX PEREZ
IGNACIO S. PEREZ
ROBERT I. PESIK
DANIEL J. PETERS
CAROLYN K. PETERSON
KORY S. PETERSON
DENNIS R. PHILLIPS
JONATHAN P. PHILLIPS
CHRISTOPHER L. PICKEN
RYAN D. PIERCE
RYAN Z. PINEDA
JEFFREY R. PINKERTON
NICHOLAS R. PINKSTON
RONALD M. PIRAMIDE
ANDREW W. PITTMAN
ANTHONY M. PIUNNO III
ALEXANDER S. PLUMER
MARK K. POBLETE
CHRISTOPHER L. POLNASZEK
CHRISTOPHER P. POLSON
JOSEPH W. POPE
MICAH A. W. PORTER
DANA R. POTAK
JARED D. POWELL
SETH K. POWELL
TRAVIS B. POWELL
EDMUND J. POYNTON
CHRISTOPHER N. PRATT
MATTHEW G. PRATT
COLIN E. PREMDAS
JOSEPH F. PRESTON
JOHN E. PRITCHETT
SARA E. PULLIAM
SEAN E. PURDY
CHRISTOPHER W. PUTRE
NICHOLAS R. QUIHUIS
JOHNNY M. QUILENDERINO
LUKE RADLOWSKI
LIDA P. RAFFEL
ROBERT T. RAGON
TREVIS L. RAINEY
EMORY A. RANK
JEFFREY W. RANSOM
RICHARD A. RASCO
KEVIN M. RAY
TRAVIS J. REAM
JOSEPH F. REARDON
TIMOTHY L. REEDER
JUSTIN D. REEVES
ELAINE D. REID
CURTIS A. REISS
JERARDO J. REYNA
JEREMY B. REYNARD
ERIK S. REYNOLDS
BRANDON L. RICE
PATRICK M. RICE
JASON M. RICHTER
KERRY N. RICKERT
WILLIAM M. RIETVELD
MATTHEW F. RIGLER
TIMOTHY M. RIGLER
MICHAEL P. RILEY
SUZANNE A. RITTER
CHRISTIAN A. RIVERA
NICHOLAS A. ROA
DOUGLAS A. ROBB
TAD J. ROBBINS
DWIGHT D. ROBERTS
JEFFREY R. ROBERTS, JR.
JOHN N. ROBERTS
THOMAS M. ROBERTS
JEREMY D. ROBERTSON
WILLIAM J. ROBESCH
AARON A. ROBINSON
BRENT K. ROBINSON
DAVID A. ROBINSON
MARY H. ROBINSON
CHRISTOPHER W. ROBISON
ALAN M. ROCHE
TIMOTHY W. ROCHHOLZ
MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ
CHRISTOPHER J. ROGERS
JUSTIN A. ROGERS
JASON R. ROGGE
RUSSELL M. ROHRING
ERIC K. ROLFS
PATRICK K. ROLLO
DANIEL C. ROLNICK
NIKOLAS G. RONGERS
CHAD S. RORSTROM
DANIEL E. ROSBOROUGH
CHRISTOPHER W. ROSE
ELI J. ROSENBERGER
RICHARD C. ROSENBUSCH
ADRIENNE L. ROSETI
BRIAN A. ROSS
JOHN H. ROSS
ARON M. ROTKLEIN
CAREY D. ROUSE
KARL K. ROYSTON
ANDREW T. RUCKER
NICHOLAS A. RUEDA
THADDEUS RUSINEK
JOSEPH A. RUSSO
CRAIG T. RYAN
NICHOLAS W. RYAN
ERIC M. RYZIW
SETH D. SAALFELD
JOSEPH H. SANDOVAL
JAMES R. SANTYMIRE
CRYSTAL L. SARGENT
ANDREW D. SCHAAF
MARK M. SCHAFF
BLADE A. SCHALLENBERGER
ZACHARY P. SCHEETZ

BENJAMIN A. SCHEIDEMAN
TIMOTHY R. SCHEIDLER
DAVID M. SCHERR
NATHAN D. SCHILLING
JOSEPH R. SCHIPPERT
RORY J. SCHNEIDER
NICHOLAS J. SCHNETTLER
JASON A. SCHRIMP
ADAM A. SCHROETER
AARON D. SCHUTTE
ERIC M. SCHWAB
STEVEN R. SCHWARZER
JONATHAN P. SCOBO
VANCE D. SCOTT
KAI C. SEGLEM
EDWIN S. SELLERS
MATTHEW L. SEVIER
KEVIN P. SHANNON
MATTHEW S. SHAW
JOHNATHAN E. SHEATER
JASON D. SHELL
DANIAL L. SHERMAN
ANTONIA K. SHEY
RICHARD P. SHIELS
JACK L. SHIS
JAMES E. SHULER
SCOTT J. SIDES
MICHAEL J. SIEDSMA
GREGORY T. SIEGERT
JACKSON M. SIEGLINGER
TYSON K. SILENGO
JASON S. SILTMANN
MICHAEL J. SIMMONS
BRETT A. SIMPSON
JOSEPH B. SIMS
RICHARD W. SKINNELL
GABRIEL M. SLATER
ADAM L. SLONE
RICHARD D. SLYE
ROBERT F. SMAIL, JR.
GLENN J. SMITH
GREGORY L. SMITH
JOHANNES SMITH
JONATHAN D. SMITH
JOSHUA D. SMITH
JUSTIN B. SMITH
KELLEN L. SMITH
JOSEPH P. SNELGROVE
PARINA SOMNHOT
JAVED P. SONDHI
DIRK C. SONNENBERG
CHARLES N. SOUTHARD
CHRISTOPHER J. SPEICHER
JASON W. SPRAY
IAN P. SPRENGER
RANDY M. STACK
DAVID L. STANFORD, JR.
JOHN T. STANLEY
JOSHUA C. STARR
STEVEN P. STASHWICK
PHILLIP A. STASO
DAVID T. STAUBIN
JAMES A. STEELE
JEREMY R. STEFFEN
ADAM M. STEIN
BENJAMIN F. STEIN
STEVEN L. STEINMETZ
MATTHEW R. STENDER
MICHAEL STENGEL
JONATHAN R. STEPHENS
GABRIEL T. STEVENS
TIMOTHY S. STEVENS
MARK P. STINES
ROBERT P. STOCHEL
JEFFREY W. STODOLA
MIRCEA D. STOICA
JEFFREY C. STORER
KALE B. STREETER
JASON M. STROBEL
DAVID R. STROMAN, JR.
NATHAN C. STUHLMACHER
JIMMY J. SUH
JAMES F. SULLIVAN IV
MICHAEL C. SULLIVAN
MARK T. SUMMERLIN
MARK A. SWARTZ
THAD D. TASSO
KEITH J. TATE
DAVID L. TAYLOR
JONATHAN A. TAYLOR
MARK A. TEDROW
DAVID R. TERRY
ANDREW M. THOM
BRADLEY R. THOMPSON
CASEY S. THOMPSON
MATTHEW G. THOMPSON
TREVOR C. THOMPSON
GALEN M. THORP
REEVES THURMAN
FREEMAN B. TIDABACK
JONATHAN D. TIGHE
DAVID K. TIREY
FRANCISCO TOBIO, JR.
DILLON J. TOLMIE
NEIL J. TOOHEY, JR.
CHRISTOPHER A. TORRES
DALE R. TOURTELOTTE
SAMUEL K. TRAIN
PAUL R. TRANBARGER
ARTURO TREJO
MICHAEL Q. TREMEL
SEAN H. TROMBLY
BRIAN TRUONG
STEVEN J. TSCHANZ
TERRY L. TURNER II
MICHAEL G. TYREE
TODD P. URKOWITZ
GREGORY M. VALDEZ
CHRISTOPHER W. VANLOENEN
SEANN M. VANOSDEL
GREGORY T. VASILOFF
PAUL VELAZQUEZ
JOSLYN M. VENEY
FRANK P. VERDUCCI III
CHRISTOPHER A. VICTOR
ROBERT W. VILLARREAL
DANIEL J. VIRGETS
DAVID J. VITOLLO
ALEXANDER C. VOELLER
CHRISTOPHER M. VONDERHEIDE
SHAWN M. VRABEL
WILLIAM M. VUILLET
ABRAHAM N. WADSWORTH
NICHOLAS W. WAGNER
BRIAN M. WALINSKI
DESMOND K. WALKER
JAMES A. WALKER
JOHN D. WALKER III
KRISTOPHER WALKER
NATHAN D. WALKER
ADAM P. WALTERS
KENNETH A. WARFORD
JOHN F. WARNER III
HUNTER D. WASHBURN
CHRISTOPHER F. WASKEY
GEORGE B. WATKINS
JAMES N. WATTS
JEREMY M. WEATHERS
JASON J. WEHMEYER
BENJAMIN R. WEISS
JOSHUA D. WEISS
RAYMOND M. WERNIG, JR.
ANDREW P. WHALEY
JONATHAN M. WHELAN
VES W. WHITTEMORE
MICHEAL A. WICKHAM
ANDREW G. WILCOX
GEORGE A. WILKENING
DIMETRI G. WILKER
JAMES T. WILLIAMS
NATHAN M. WILLIAMS
STEPHEN P. WILLIAMS
STEPHEN V. WILLIAMS
MICHAEL J. WILLIS
JARED M. WOLCOTT
MATTHEW W. WOLF
KURTIS K. WONG
TRAVIS L. WOOD
MATTHEW D. WOODS
MICHAEL D. WORRELL
JOSHUA L. WRIGHT
JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR.
DAVID J. WRIGLEY
KARI E. YAKUBISIN
THOMAS F. YALE
CHRISTOPHER P. YOST
TIMOTHY C. YUHAS
ROBERT M. ZABOROWSKI
ANDREA J. ZENN
PETER J. ZETTEL
REBECCA A. ZIAJA
STEVEN ZIELECHOWSKI
ERIC R. ZILBERMAN
KENNETH W. ZILKA
ROBERT E. ZUBECK II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER W. ACOR
ERIK A. ADAMS
BRADLEY W. ADORADOR
THOMAS N. AMANO
MICHAEL J. ANDERSON
URIES S. ANDERSON, JR.
ISIDRO J. C. AQUINO
RAVEN G. ATKINS, JR.
KEVIN M. BACON
WILLIAM M. BARKSDALE
MARK J. BECKER
AARON T. BEHNE
JOHN R. BELCHER
WILLIAM R. BLACKMAN
LARRY D. BLOODSAW, JR.
CLARENCE R. BOSWELL II
SHELLEY E. BRANCH
JOHN J. BURKE
TRAVIS C. BURNETTE
JERRY L. CANNON
ADRIAN C. CASTER
PHILIP A. CASWELL
BRAD A. CLOUSE
JOSEPH T. COCKEREL
WADE A. CONAWAY
ERIC K. CONRAD
VERNON R. COOK
PATRICK G. CORTEZ
WINSTON A. COTTERELL
BRENT E. DILLOW
MICHAEL J. DISCH
CHAD D. DIXON
DOUGLAS A. EVANS
MICHAEL R. FASANO
HOWARD C. FICHTEL
MICHAEL W. FISHER
RYAN A. FISHER
DIEGO L. FLORES
TERRANCE FLOURNOY
LEONARDO R. FRANKLIN
DANIEL D. FUGETT
RODNEY B. FULLINGIM
JAMES B. GALLAGHER
BRIAN T. GARDLER
KEVIN L. GARNER
SEAN M. C. GARRETT
TODD M. GEORGE
EDWIN S. GIBSON, JR.
JOSEPH D. GODWIN
KREGG T. GOSE
EDWARD A. GRANT
JOHNNIE L. GREEN, JR.
JASON K. GREENFIELD
HENRY GUDINO
SELMA GUICE, JR.
FREDRIC P. HACKETT
NEIL HALSTEAD
ERIC E. HAYES
ERVIN L. HENLEY
LENTEISA L. HILL
MICHAEL B. HOCH
RODNEY B. HOOKS
KEVIN L. HUGHES
CHAD R. HUNSUCKER
ELOUISE M. HURST
ADAM R. JARVIS
ERROL C. JOHNSON, JR.
MARK A. JONES
TERRENCE U. JONES
ROBERT L. KETCH, JR.
KEITH W. KING
BRYCE D. KLAPUT
BRIAN K. KULBETH
DAVID A. LAFEVOR
JASON A. LAURION
RONALD F. LEFAVORE, JR.
MARK C. LETOURNEAU
CHARLES A. LONGEWAY
WILLIAM H. LOZIER III
JOHN S. I. LUCAS
DAVID N. MACIAS
RANDALL L. MCATEE
WILLIAM J. MCCAMMON
TERRANCE L. MCCRAY
RICHARD C. MCNEIL
EUGENE MENDEZ
SCOTT MILDENHALL
JEREMY MINER
LOUIS A. MOORE
JOHN T. MOSLEY
MICHAEL R. MURPHY
LEONIDES E. NEPOMUCENO
DIANE E. NICHOLS
CRAIG C. NORMAN
MICHAEL J. NOVAK
WILLIAM M. NOVAK
BRIAN C. NUSS
ANTHONY W. OXENDINE, JR.
ERICH J. PARTSCH
NICHOLAS E. PECCI
JULIO A. PETERSON
ANTONIO PRIESTER, JR.
JAMES T. RATLIFF
ERIK J. REED
DENNIS L. RICHARDSON
ALLEN W. RICHMOND
MARK C. RINSCHLER
SHARIVA A. ROBINSON
GREGORY A. RODRIGUEZ
ERIC T. RYAN
MARLON I. SALES
CHRISTOPHER S. SCHMIDT
STEVEN A. SHEPSKI
PETTIS N. SIMS
JITINDRA W. SIRJOO
DENNIS D. SMITH, JR.
JEFFREY T. SMITH
BRIAN L. SNOOK
DAVID L. STARNES
SCOTT D. SULMAN
ROBERT B. SUTTER
JAMES K. SWE
RILEY E. SWINNEY, JR.
COREY J. SYLVE
DAREN D. TILLER
MARC B. TINAZ
DANIEL J. TRIERWEILER
MARCO R. VIDES
TRAVIS W. WAGNER
TODD M. WILD
DAVID M. WILLIAMS
DAVID T. WRIGHT
RICHARD P. ZABAWA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MATE W. AERANDIR
TONY V. ANDERSON
WILLARD E. BALL
CURTIS A. BELING, JR.
BRANDY D. BENNETT
MATTHEW B. BIELIK
JASON L. BRUEHL
LAJUANA BUHMANN
NEIL J. CURTIS
EDWARD M. DAVID
CYNTHIA R. DUKE
JUSTIN R. FARBER
HEATH C. FLORAY
LAUREN A. GOLDENBERG
WILLIAM L. V. GRENOBLE
CHRISTOPHER D. GUSTAFSON
RYAN F. HEALY
MICHAEL V. HOLLER
SHAWN R. HUGHES
GERALD J. JOHNSON, JR.
WESLEY D. KERR

BRETT T. KIRWAN
ARPAD P. KOROSSY
JOSE L. LEPESUASTEGUI
HEATHER D. MADERIA
TROY M. MCCORMICK
PHILLIP P. MENARD VII
ANDREW T. MICHALOWICZ
CHRISTOPHER M. MICHALSKI
DANIELLE K. MOEN
SHEILA R. MOLINA
KRISTEN M. MURDOCK
CURTIS B. NIEBOER
TOLULOPE E. OBRIEN
JOSEPH L. PRUCE
JESSICA A. REED
SCOTT E. RIFFLE
SERGIUS M. RODRIGUEZ
ADAM D. SEILER
JAMES M. A. SPALL
DAVID J. TEBBE
SARA E. WARYNOVICH
ROLLIE J. WICKS
JONATHAN M. WIENS
JEFFREY A. WILLIAMS
PAUL J. WOOD
ROBERT E. WOODS, JR.
JACQUELINEMAR W. WRONA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN G. ACORD
FRANK P. AGCAOILI
JONATHAN R. ALSTON
MICHAEL J. ASCHE
TIMOTHY S. BLEVINS
MICHAEL S. BROCK
ROBERT A. BUCKLES
ANTHONY C. CAGLE
JASON R. CHAMBERLAIN
JASON E. DION
ISAAC J. DONALDSON
ANTHONY E. ELLIS
CHARLES W. GORNEY
GRANT K. GRAEBER
GLENN S. GREENLEAF
DANIEL J. HANSEN
JASON J. HUGHES
JEREMY J. HULS
BRUCE L. HUNT
CLIFTON E. JACKSON III
MATTHEW T. JOHNSON
KELLY A. KEISER
RICHARD E. KIDDER, JR.
KIRSTEIN S. LEWIS
DANIEL J. MACCABE
CRAIG T. MCLEMORE
THOMAS C. MCLEMORE
CHRISTOPHER J. MULLEN
CARLOS R. PESQUERA
CHRISTOPHER R. PISANI
SANTHOSH K. SHIVASHANKAR
CARLTON B. SUMMERVILLE
ANTHONY O. THOMAS
CHRISTOPHER J. WASEK
JON T. WENDE
JEFFREY A. WHITE
JEFFREY W. WHITSETT
BRIAN P. WORDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

AARON N. AARON
JOSEPH D. ANDERSON
KITAN BAE
KEVIN R. BARRETT
JASON J. BECKER
ANDREW R. BELDING
EHREN J. BITTNER
JOHN J. BOGDAN III
KENNETH W. BROOKS
WILLIAM B. CAMPBELL
ANTHONY J. CANTAFIO, JR.
JOSEPH E. CANTU, JR.
TYLER H. CARR
EREN D. CATALOGLU
NICHOLAS A. COLE
HOLLIE P. CRONLEY
MATTHEW G. DALTON
JOHN K. DOYLE
REGINALD C. FEWELL
ELIAS J. GEORGE
DONNA R. GILBERT
CHRISTOPHER P. HARNED
MARK G. HOFER II
JULIA M. HUBERTZ
ADAM T. HUMPHREY
WILLIAM R. HURD
MARK J. JACOBBI, JR.
CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON
KENYATTA M. JONES
VICTORIA A. KAYE
JOSHUA D. KHOURY
CARSON C. MCABEE
WYLIE MCDADE
CHAD M. MCDOWELL
MICHAEL N. PERKINS II
NICHOLAS J. RAUSCH
NATHANIEL D. RIGHTSELL
JEFFREY E. ROBINSON
DARREN J. ROGERS
JONATHAN J. SAHIM
BRIAN M. SALTER
MICHAEL C. SCHAEFER
ROBERT C. SELLIN
DAVID T. SPALDING
PHILIP J. STARCOVIC
JOSHUA C. STONEHOUSE
TONY V. H. TRAN
BRIAN K. VIDRINE
STEPHEN W. WILLIS
CHELSEY L. ZWICKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIAN F. BRESHEARS
ALEXANDER J. CULLEN
LYNNE H. EDWARDS
KYLE B. FRANKLIN
JAMES R. FRITZ
MARK A. HEBERT
CARTER L. JOHNSTON
COLLEEN M. MCDONALD
THOMAS J. MILLS
KYLE E. OBROCK
MICHAEL J. PAPA
WILLIAM A. SAUER II
JEFFREY D. SCOOLER
DAVID A. TRAMPP
GARY M. VINES
ROBERT D. T. WENDT
WALTER R. YOUNG, JR.
DAVID A. ZIEMBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL J. BRADSHAW
ROY D. CHESSON
JARROD GAZAREK
JOHN S. HANCOCK
JONATHAN S. KIM
EMILIE A. KRAJAN
STEPHANIE C. LASTINGER
JOSEPH F. LEAVITT
TIMOTHY B. LINDSAY
ROSS W. PETERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ARLO K. ABRAHAMSON
DAVID A. BENNETT
BRETT A. DAWSON
THERESA L. B. DONNELLY
TIMOTHY A. HAWKINS
FREDERICK M. MARTIN
MARISSA N. MYATT
TIMOTHY C. PAGE
SCOTT D. SAGISI
MEGAN M. SHUTKA
RENEE F. SOLTES
TIFFANI B. WALKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES C. BAILEY
MIGUEL A. BERNAL, JR.
KACEY M. BOWMAN
JOSHUA I. CAMPBELL
CHRISTOPHER G. DANIELS
ANTHONY M. ELLERBE
CHARLES L. FISHER, JR.
JOSE R. GARCIA
GAVIN D. GUIDRY
CHAD C. JELSEMA
JAMES M. LANDRY
STEPHANIE R. MACKRIS
COLETTE M. PANAGOS
CHRISTOPHER T. SCHROCK
JASON R. STALEY
TOMMY T. Y. TONG
AMANDA J. WELLS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ERIC S. KINZBRUNNER
JUSTIN M. LETWINSKY
MATTHEW M. MCCLURE
JASON T. MOSTACCIO
ERIC M. ZACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JERMAINE A. BAILEY
BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI
ALEXANDER B. BAYNES
TABITHA A. BOOTH
KERRY N. BOSCHE
BRENT A. BOTTOLFSON
JAMES J. COLGARY, JR.
JONATHAN S. CONNELLY
AARON C. DAUSMAN
YEVTTE A. DAVIS
SJAAK A. DEVLAMING
LARIE A. DIXON
AARON T. DOBSON
MICHAEL G. DODSON
SEAN M. DOHERTY
JASON W. DOWNS
MARK A. EWACHIW, JR.
EID F. FAKHOURI
DEREK E. FLETCHER
ETHAN J. JAWORSKI
DAVID P. JOHNSEN
RYAN D. JOHNSON
RAYMOND J. KILWAY II
AMY C. LEES
JAMIE S. MASON
MONIQUA J. MAXIE
MICHAEL P. MCCORMICK
ALEXANDER L. MCGINNIS
ADAM J. MILLS
ADAM M. OSBORN
JARROD M. OZEREKO
CHRISTOPHER J. PANDY
THOMAS E. PILKERTON
BRANDON H. PONTIUS
JAVAN A. RHINEHART
MICHAEL A. SAMMATARO
AMIEL B. SANFIORENZO
MATTHEW B. STROTHER
WILLIAM T. TAFT
SPENCER V. TALLEY
ROBERT D. TUTTLE
JAMES M. UPSHAW
GILBERT P. VIERA III
JAMES W. WALDREP
JOHNATHAN C. WALKER
JEFFREY K. WHITE
JEREMIAH J. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JEMAR R. BALLESTEROS
GINA M. D. BECKER
MAURA G. BETTS
CLINTON T. CERALDE
TESSA M. DENARO
WALTER D. ENOS
ANNETTE M. FELICIANORAMOS
JOSEPH S. FELIX
JOHN B. FIELDS
DANIEL E. FRIAS
ANDREW C. GERLA
BRIAN J. GROW
PATRICE R. HENTZ
SHAINA M. HOGAN
MARK D. JENKINS
ALLEN T. KEYS
EMILY J. KLOSSNER
RICHARD H. LAY, JR.
VIANNY LEMBERTSANTANA
JESSICA K. MORRIS
SABINA D. PAMARAN
SARAH C. M. PETTIT
BRIAN C. RICHARDS
JONATHAN C. RYAN
REYNEL SAA
ASHLEY P. TAYLOR
KAREN J. TEAGUE
NICHOLAS S. TURNER
GIULIANA M. VELLUCCI
ADAM P. WALSKI
ANNE L. ZACK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHRISTOPHER A. CEGIELSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

KEVIN C. ANTONUCCI
CHRISTOPHER H. BLAND
MARSHALL T. BOYD
BERRY T. BROWN
TRAVIS C. BURNETTE
JASON CHUMA
MATTHEW B. DEBAUN
SCOTT A. EDMINSTER
BRYAN M. GALLANT
JEFFREY A. GARDNER
CHRISTOPHER J. HEINE
DANIEL K. HOLLINGSHEAD
JONATHAN A. HULECKI
LUKE H. I. IM
JEREMY R. JANNEY
DOMINIC J. KRAMER
JAMES C. LEASURE III
ANTHONY D. MACALUSO
SEAN M. MATSON
PATRICK L. MCCLERNON
MICHAEL N. MOWRY
DONALD NICHOLS, JR.
SAMANTHA A. ONEIL
MICHAEL P. ORFINI
TRAVIS B. POWELL
ROBERT RAMIREZ III
SCOTT M. REYNOLDS
SHAYNE J. SCHUMACHER
JEFFREY D. SCHWAMB
JAMES E. SHULER
JEREMIAH S. SMITH

JOSHUA M. SMITH
REID W. SMYTHE
WILLIAM C. STEWART
MATTHEW I. TENNIS
REEVES THURMAN
PAUL R. TRANBARGER
ANDREW J. VALERIUS
CHRISTOPHER W. VANLOENEN
ANDREW J. VINCENT
NELLIE WANG
JOSHUA D. WEISS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

FERDINAND D. ABRIL
JEREMY P. ADAMS
DEAN E. ALLEN
ROSS B. CAMPBELL
FRANK W. CARROLL
SOMCHANH CAVANH
CRAIG A. CLUTTS
CHRIS M. COGGINS
JEREMY B. GATES
JOHN T. JEFFREY
PATRICK C. JORS
IAN M. KELLY
CHARLES B. KUBIC
STEPHEN T. LEPPER
ANDREW L. LITTERAL
PAUL F. MAGOULICK
ANCELMO J. MCCARTHY
JOEL D. MCMILLAN
JOSEPH M. OSULLIVAN
AARON W. PARK
RUSSELL S. PILE
JAMES M. ROCHE
SHAWN M. ROCKWELL
ATIIM D. SENTHILL
ANDREW J. SHINKA
TORBEN T. SMITH
ANDREW J. SONIER
DANIEL A. STOKES
MICHAEL J. WANGER
ALLEN E. WILLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MICHAEL D. AMEDICK
JOHN G. ANDERSON
MICHAEL R. BAKER
MATTHEW K. BERRENS
ROBERT N. BURNS, JR.
ALAN CAMERON
MICHAEL B. CHANEY
STEPHEN M. COATES
DAVID D. DINKINS
RANDALL D. EKSTROM
DANIEL W. HALL
ROBERT W. HALL
HENRY F. HOLCOMBE, JR.
THOMAS A. IANUCCI
JOHN R. LOGAN
ROBERT A. MOORE
WESLEY T. MYHAND
RONALD C. NORDAN
MICHAEL L. PHILLIPS
WILLIAM S. RILEY
RONALD T. RINALDI
RICHARD L. ROE
JAMIE J. STALLRYAN
DARREN L. STENNETT
DENNIS M. WHEELER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KERRY E. BAKER
FORREST D. BAUMHOVER
DANIEL L. BESSMAN
KEVIN L. BORKERT
MARK S. BOWMER
PETER M. BRAENDEHOLM
JOHN H. BREDENKAMP III
MATTHEW J. BRICKHAUS
FREDERICK H. CRAWFORD
KAREN R. DALLAS
ANDRES DIAZ
STEFAN EDWARDS
VINCENT V. ERNO
RICHARD C. GUSTAFSON, JR.
DALE A. HANEY
SHANNON B. HARRELL
BRIAN D. HENDERSON
RONALD L. HOAK II
TARA L. HODGE
JASON G. HOFTIEZER
DEREK P. HOTCHKISS
KELLY W. HOUSE, JR.
ROBERT J. JAMES
THOMAS R. JENKINS
MATTHEW S. JONES
PATRICK J. KELLY
SHANI S. LEBLANC
MICHAEL F. LORRAIN II
VALERIE M. MCCALL
CRAIG A. MIHALIK
JAMES D. OLEARY
STEVEN M. OSBORNE
GILBERTO P. PENSERGA
ALLEN RIVERA
DAVID W. RODEBUSH
SCOTT A. ROSCOE
MICHAEL P. RYAN
BENJAMIN L. SHEINMAN
ELISHA E. SINGLETON
FREDERICK H. SKINNER
TERESA A. STEVENS
CHRISTOPHER M. SWANSON
CHRISTOPHER C. TECMIRE
CHARLES M. TELLIS
JUAN C. URIBE
KRISTEN D. VECHINSKI
KRISTIAN L. WAHLGREN
SHANNON W. WALKER
DARYL M. WILSON
MICHAEL D. WINN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KENNETH R. BASFORD
JOHN G. BROOM
CHERYL L. COTTRELL
WILLIAM G. DANCHANKO
CHARLES E. DICKERSON
KENNETH L. FOLSOM
DAWN E. GALVEZ
JAMESETTA W. GOGGINS
RYAN P. GRISWOLD
ROBERT J. HAAG
SHAWN M. HARRIS
TOD A. HAZLETT
TED W. HERING
CYNTHIA A. HUTCHINSON
COREY A. JAGO
PATRICIA B. JOHNSON
LALON M. KASUSKE
CHRISTOPHER D. KEITH
MATHEW R. LOE
MARK A. LYNCH
HALEY T. MACEK
SUZANNE F. MALDARELLI
JESSICA NICHOLS
CHARLENE R. OHLIGER
HEATHER B. RAY
ROBERT J. ROADFUSS
TIMOTHY R. ROUSSELOW
JARED E. SCOTT
JAMI A. STAKLEY
KELLY E. K. VEGA
JOHN M. WATERS
ANDREW S. WILSON
KENNETH A. WOFFORD
JOHN P. ZALAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR.
BRENT K. FAULKNER
RICHARD E. FEDERICO
DANIELLE M. HIGSON
SHANE E. JOHNSON
ROBERT T. KLINE
DEBORAH M. LOOMIS
JOHN M. MONTGOMERY
GREGORY W. SAYBOLT
HOLLIS N. SIMODYNES
MATTHEW J. SKLEROV
WILLIAM P. SMITH
GRETCHEN D. SOSBEE
IAN P. WOLF
SYLVAINE W. WONG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KEVIN S. BAILEY
STEVEN M. BAILEY
EDWARD A. BENCHOFF
JOSEPH L. BONVIE
RAYMOND M. BRISTOL
ERIC B. CARLSON
LORI A. CHRISTENSEN
CHRISTOPHER L. COOPER
SHAWN P. CRAWFORD
RODEL H. DIVINA
KARLTON K. DODSON
JUSTIN W. DOWE
GREGORY R. FAIRCHILD
DAWN M. FREEMAN
JOHN D. GARBRECHT
LEAH Y. GEISLINGER
JOHN S. GRIESENBECK
TIMOTHY D. HENNING
DANIELLE V. HICKS
CARY J. ISAACSON
JUSTIN C. LOGAN
KELLIE L. MCMULLEN
RYAN L. MESKIMEN
ROBERT C. MORRISON
JOSE E. NIEVES
OLAITAN F. OJO
EDWARD H. OWENS
JAMES W. PERRY
JACQUELINE L. POLLOCK
CHADWICK E. RAY
SHAWN E. SOUTIERE
HAZELANN K. TEAMER
DENNIS C. TOLENTINO
AMY C. VARNEY
BETH A. VEALEY
ANGELA M. WEBSTER
MATTHEW A. WEINER
LISA A. WHITE
THEODOR A. ZAINAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DAVID L. BELL, JR.
ANDREW A. BOOKWALTER
JASON J. BREZOVIC
WILLIAM J. BURKE, JR.
MATTHEW W. CHANG
HEIDI S. ELLIS
MICHAEL A. GENTILE
CHRISTOPHER N. HANHILA
SUSAN E. HINMAN
KEVIN E. HUDSON
CHRISTOPHER S. KAPLAFKA
KHON H. LIEN
GARIN M. LIU
JOHN W. MCGEHEE, JR.
KEITH R. MERCHANT
JEFFREY D. NEAL
JEROME N. RAGADIO
MARK A. ROMANO
CHERI R. SMILEY
CALVIN B. SUFFRIDGE
JOSE A. SURIS
NATHAN J. WONDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

RUBEN D. ACOSTA
JOHN E. ALEX
KAIVON ARFAA
MARCO A. AYALA
ANDREW J. BALDWIN
THOMAS M. BALDWIN
MICHAEL M. BARNA
PATRICK L. BASILE
JARED D. BERNARD
LUKE F. BREMNER
ZACHARY W. BROWN
DAVID I. BRUNER
MICHAEL A. BUCKLEY
WAYNE M. BURR
MICHAEL A. BURT
COREY A. CARTER
KEVIN M. CASEY
WILLIAM K. CHIN
KENNY K. CHOI
ALISON M. CHRISTIE
MATTHEW S. CHRISTMAN
ERIN B. COAN
MICHAEL S. DENT
TODD J. ENDICOTT
RICK L. FISHER
ANDREW S. FLOTTEN
MICHAEL R. FRASER, JR.
JENNIFER C. FREEMAN
JERALD W. FROEHNER
DIANA C. FU
SATYEN M. GADA
ALEXANDER B. GALIFIANAKIS
PHILLIP G. GEIGER
JEFFREY W. GERTNER
CHARLES F. GOULD, JR.
SCOTT E. GRABILL
ADOLFO GRANADOS, JR.
MARION A. GREGG
ERIN A. GRIFFITH
NOA C. HAMMER
SCOTT M. HARLEY
JOSHUA M. HARRISON
BRADLEY W. HICKEY
THOMAS R. HICKS
STEVEN J. HOLLEY
ALEXANDER M. HOLSTON
KERRY A. HUDSON
CRAIG J. HURT
JEFFERY C. JOHNSON
SONOVIA L. JOHNSON
MICKAILA J. JOHNSTON
AHMIK L. JONES
LINDSAY E. JONES
MICHAEL R. KAPLAN
MICHAEL J. KAVANAUGH
BRYAN J. KEENAN
JOSHUA T. KINDELAN
MICHAEL C. KING
BRIAN T. KLEYENSTEUBER
ALAN S. LAM
SHANNON V. LAMB
EDWIN J. LANDAKER
IAN M. LAUGHLIN
RACHEL U. LEE
ELIZABETH A. LEONARD
SEAN P. LEONARD
PHILIP R. LETADA
JASON J. LONGWELL
ROBERT M. MARKS
MATTHEW R. MATIASEK
CARI E. MATTHEWS
DAMON M. MCCLAIN
JAMES M. MCDONALD
MICHAEL R. MELIA
TODD J. MONDZELEWSKI
JOSEPHINE C. NGUYEN
DANIEL G. NICASTRI
THOMAS W. NIPPER II
EMEKA O. OFOBIKE

TIFFANY M. OHTA
SHAUNA F. OSULLIVAN
AUSTIN L. PARKER
DOUGLAS E. PITTNER
TIMOTHY A. PLATZ
TRAVIS M. POLK
ANGELA M. POWELL
SHAWN D. REDDING
KENNETH E. RICHTER
LISA K. RIVERA
ANNE B. ROBERTS
RYAN C. ROCKHILL
GREGG W. SCHELLACK
TAMMY E. SERVIES
COREY A. SHAW
JAMES B. SOLOMON
MICHELE E. SPROSTY
DAVID A. STANECK
MELISSA R. STEGNERWILSON
DANIEL M. STULACK
DANIEL M. SUTTON
GUS THEODOS
DRAKE H. TILLEY
HEATHER J. TRACY
RALPH E. TUTTLE
GINA R. VIRGILIO
CHRISTOPHER M. WATSON
JIBRI M. WIGGINS
RASHAD C. WILKERSON
PAUL J. WISNIEWSKI
JASON A. YODER
DAVID M. YOU

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 17, 2014:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DAVID B. SHEAR, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

DAVID ARTHUR MADER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CONTROLLER, OFFICE OF FEDERAL FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.