



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 2015

No. 79

CORRECTION

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Spirit, from generation to generation we will speak of Your greatness. Your voice is full of majesty, and we sense Your glory in the thunder. You sit enthroned as King forever. Thank You for the strength You give to all who love You and for the blessings You bestow upon America.

Lord, bless our Senators. Today, guide their thoughts and speech. Lead them on paths that will keep our Nation strong. May they conduct the work of freedom with justice and humility.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The majority leader is recognized.

USA FREEDOM ACT OF 2015— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to H.R. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 87, H.R. 2048, a bill to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the produc-

tion of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2048, an act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, Michael B. Enzi, David Vitter, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, Lisa Murkowski, John Barrasso, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker, Orrin G. Hatch, Jerry Moran, Patrick J. Toomey, Mike Lee, Ted Cruz.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to H.R. 2048.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

The motion is withdrawn.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978— MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 1357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 86, S. 1357, a bill to extend authority relating to

roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1357, a bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Daniel Coats, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Lamar Alexander, Michael B. Enzi, David Vitter, Johnny Isakson, Roy Blunt.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion on the Hatch amendment, No. 1221, be waived.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 2353

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3201

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2353) 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.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly vote on cloture—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 1314, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1314) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Pending:

Hatch amendment No. 1221, in the nature of a substitute.

Hatch (for Flake) amendment No. 1243 (to amendment No. 1221), to strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program.

Hatch (for Inhofe/Coons) modified amendment No. 1312 (to amendment No. 1221), to amend the African Growth and Opportunity Act to require the development of a plan for each sub-Saharan African country for negotiating and entering into free trade agreements.

Hatch (for McCain) amendment No. 1226 (to amendment No. 1221), to repeal a duplicative inspection and grading program.

Stabenow (for Portman) amendment No. 1299 (to amendment No. 1221), to make it a principal negotiating objective of the United States to address currency manipulation in trade agreements.

Brown amendment No. 1251 (to amendment No. 1221), to require the approval of Congress before additional countries may join the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Wyden (for Shaheen) amendment No. 1227 (to amendment No. 1221), to make trade agreements work for small businesses.

Wyden (for Warren) amendment No. 1327 (to amendment No. 1221), to prohibit the application of the trade authorities procedures

to an implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement that includes investor-state dispute settlement.

Hatch modified amendment No. 1411 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 1299), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will shortly vote on cloture on the Hatch substitute amendment, legislation to renew trade promotion authority and trade adjustment assistance. I know some of my colleagues have concerns about the process. Let me say that I also share those concerns.

From the very beginning of our discussions over 3 years ago on the renewal of TPA, I have done all I could to listen to all of my colleagues and address their concerns.

I first worked with Chairman Baucus to find a way to update TPA in a way that addresses many of the issues that have arisen since 2002, including concerns over labor and the environment.

When Senator WYDEN became chairman of the Finance Committee, I again went to the negotiating table to try to address many of the transparency and procedural issues he raised, and we again came to a bipartisan compromise.

When many of my Senate colleagues said renewal of TAA was a necessary component to passing TPA, I again did my best to meet those concerns, even though I myself have significant reservations about the program.

Throughout the Finance Committee consideration, I tried to conduct an open and fair process, which allowed many Members of the committee, even those who opposed TPA, the opportunity to be heard and to have their amendments adopted. As a result, the committee reported out four pieces of trade legislation, all with strong bipartisan support.

I will acknowledge that the process on the floor has not gone the way any of us would like. At the outset of this endeavor, I stated my commitment to a full, fair, and open debate over our TPA legislation. The majority leader made a similar commitment, and I know that was our intention. Indeed, from the very beginning, we had planned to hear everyone's arguments and consider a number of amendments.

This is how the Senate is supposed to function. Once again, we intended to let it function that way. Unfortunately, there were some who did not want to let that happen. They were, from the very beginning, committed to slow-walking this process and preventing regular order. That is just a fact.

I know there are some who want to blame the majority leader for filing cloture and trying to move this process forward. I am sure some are thinking of voting against cloture this morning in protest. That would be a grave mistake.

Let me remind my colleagues that we tried to move to the bill at the begin-

ning of last week. I know, after the many recent long days on the floor, that seems like a long time ago, but I think everyone here can recall what happened.

We attempted to get on the bill, and we were prevented from doing so. After we found a way to address our colleagues' concerns, we were finally able to begin debate on the TPA bill, but even then the process was slow-going.

As debate began, the majority leader attempted to keep the Senate open on Friday and into the weekend to allow Senators to debate and offer amendments. However, the Senate minority leader objected, which prevented the process from moving forward and set us back even further.

Then, we came to this week and debate finally began in earnest. Shortly thereafter, a new strategy emerged, wholly supported by the opponents of TPA. The strategy has been simple: Prevent any amendments from being called up and object to any and all unanimous consent requests.

I have been here on the floor all week, and I have witnessed firsthand the deployment of this plan to frustrate the process and to prevent a full and fair debate on trade policy. Now here we are facing a cloture vote and the prospect of cutting off debate. It is unfortunate that it has come to this, but given the total lack of cooperation we faced and continue to face on this bill, this is really the only option left.

Invoking cloture is not the end. If we can get agreement with our colleagues, I expect there will still be opportunities to call up and vote on amendments, but we cannot just sit around and wait for solutions to come together on their own.

If any Senator has a proposal for a path forward that will reasonably satisfy the various demands and objections that have been raised and allow us to break the logjam on amendments, I am all ears. Until then, our only choice is to press forward. We could extend this debate forever and still not satisfy every demand; there is no question about that. But this bill is far too important.

I have done all I can to address legitimate concerns, and as a result, the bill is supported by me, Chairman RYAN from the House Ways and Means Committee, Ranking Member WYDEN from the Finance Committee, and, most importantly, the President of the United States.

Let's be real here. We need to get this bill passed. Just this morning, I read that a ministerial that was to begin this month has been canceled, in large part due to the fact that Congress has not approved this bill.

Our Nation's economic health and prestige are on the line here today. The TPA bill is the only way Congress can effectively assert its priorities in our ongoing trade negotiations. It is the only way we can ensure that our trade negotiators can reach good deals with our trading partners. It is the only way

we can ensure that our pending trade agreements even have a shot at reaching the finish line.

As I have stated many times here on the floor this week, I am well aware that some of our colleagues here in the Senate oppose this bill outright and will do everything in their power to keep it from passing. As much as I have tried to change hearts and minds on these issues, there is very little I can do about that. But I also know that there is a bipartisan majority of Senators who support TPA and who, despite concerns about process, want to get this done. We are still in a position to reach a positive outcome on this bill.

I said at the beginning of this debate that this was quite possibly the most important debate we will have this year in Congress. It is President Obama's top legislative priority. It is a very high priority for many of us in Congress. On the substance, this is a good TPA bill, one Senators from both parties can support. It needs to pass. We need to pass it for the American workers who want good, high-paying jobs. We need to pass it for our farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, and entrepreneurs who need access to foreign markets in order to compete. We need to pass it to maintain our standing in the world and continue to advance American values and interests on the world stage. We need to pass it to demonstrate to the American people that despite our many disagreements, their elected representatives are capable of addressing important issues and solving real problems.

There is a path forward here, one that will still allow us to be successful, but in order to get there, we need Senators to support cloture this morning.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on cloture. It is crucial, it is of paramount concern, and it is something very highly wished for by the President of the United States and by a bipartisan majority in this body.

I hope we will vote yes on cloture here today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the opportunity to share some remarks.

I do believe Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN allowed a good debate in the committee. Unfortunately, we have not been able to have the kinds of amendments here on the floor that they allowed in the committee, so we are moving to this massive bill with very little debate, even on the fast-track policy. If that is adopted and TPP appears before us here on the floor, there will be no amendments on it.

In a few moments, we will vote on whether to shut off debate on the fast-track authority legislation. I see no reason that we have to rush this.

I will just note that we have the highway bill expiring, and we have the

PATRIOT Act expiring. Those are crises which need to be dealt with this week. This bill does not have to be done in that fashion.

This will be a crucial vote. Fast-track is an affirmative decision by Congress to suspend several of its most basic powers for the next 6 years and to delegate those powers to the Chief Executive.

Under the fast-track procedure, the President, not Congress, writes implementing legislation for any yet-unseen global trade pact. That legislation, no matter its contents, cannot be amended in any fashion. No individual Member of Congress can alter any line of text or remove a single provision that violates the will of Congress. That legislation, once called up, is guaranteed a speedy path forward—only 20 hours of debate—and the vote threshold is lowered to a simple majority. No matter how far-reaching the global trade agreement, Congress cannot subject it to the 60 votes applied to important legislation before the Senate or the 67 votes applied to treaties, as it really should be. Congress will have preapproved swift consideration of sweeping global pacts before the text has been made available and seen by a single Member of this body or the American people.

As usual through these processes—and too often—amendments are being constricted and blocked through one maneuver or another. The net result is we are coming down to a cloture vote without any amendments having been voted on.

Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I sent a letter to the President of the United States asking how fast-track and the vast Trans-Pacific Partnership would impact the jobs and wages of American workers. It is a simple question. Would it increase or reduce manufacturing jobs and wages in the United States? Shouldn't we know that? Is that an improper question to ask? He has refused to answer. I think the reason he has refused to answer is because the answer is not good and will not be well received. They want us to shut off debate and move forward without having these fundamental questions answered.

For too long, the United States has entered into trade deals on the promise of economic bounty, only to see workers impoverished and businesses disappear. Dan DiMicco, the chairman Emeritus of Nucor Steel, explains that this is because these free-trade deals have not been free-trade deals at all. Instead, they have been "unilateral trade disarmament," where we lower our barriers to foreign imports but they retain their barriers to our exports to those countries. This is what is fundamentally at stake here. A lot of people, in their religious view of free trade, don't care whether other countries have barriers. Their view is that we should welcome more imports. Mr. DiMicco has called this the "enablement of foreign mercantilism," a philosophy of trade that is too often

present around the world and certainly in the Asian sector.

Consider this in the context of automobiles. The Wall Street Journal published a story 2 days ago about how the American auto sector could be jeopardized by TPP. The Journal wrote:

In the transportation sector, led by cars, the TPP could boost imports by an extra \$30.8 billion by 2025, compared with an exports gain of \$7.8 billion.

So the imports of automobiles would increase by \$30.8 billion and our exports would increase by only \$7.8 billion. That was a study written by Peter Petri, professor of international finance at Brandeis University.

Well, having dramatically more imports than exports is not going to add jobs. Perhaps that is why we cannot get an answer. In other words, job-killing imports would vastly exceed any growth in foreign exports, thereby putting more Americans out of work.

We have seen this story before. The South Korea trade deal—and I supported that. I have great respect for the South Korean and the Japanese business acumen. But the South Korean trade deal, which was supposed to boost our exports by more than \$10 billion, actually ended up increasing our exports less than \$1 billion. If truth be known, it was \$0.8 billion. Instead, the deal boosted South Korean imports to our country by more than \$12 billion and nearly doubled the trade gap between our two nations, which was already large.

They say: Well, this time it is different. Trust us. Give us 6 more years of executive authority to pass any global deal we like under fast-track. No deal has ever been blocked.

Well, respectfully, the American people don't trust you. Here is what the Pew Poll reported recently: Twenty percent of Americans think these trade agreements create jobs and 50 percent say it destroys jobs.

Have we been adding jobs in manufacturing or losing jobs in manufacturing? We have been losing jobs in manufacturing. Are the American people so wrong in that conclusion? Forty-five percent of Americans think trade reduces wages; only 17 percent say it increases them. By contrast, 72 percent of Vietnamese believe this trade agreement would increase their salaries.

Because TPP is a living agreement, it can be changed after adoption. It says in the language of the agreement where it has this living agreement language that this is unprecedented. This is the first time this has been put in a trade agreement. The Congressional Research Service tells us that, too.

We are now creating a foreign international entity—one more international entity—with a commission that meets and votes and makes decisions that are binding on the United States of America. Frankly, I think this great Nation is exposing itself to too many of these agreements. Tying down the ability of the world's greatest power and economic engine, the United

States, is weakening our ability to function in a way that sovereignty should allow us to function. Dangerously, this agreement creates a new governing global authority that would add new members of their choice, change the terms of the agreement, and even subject U.S. citizens to its ruling—adjudicated in an international tribunal.

It is time for Congress to defend its shareholders—our shareholders—the American people. It is time to return to the regular order and to the principles of sound governance and to assert, not surrender, the power of Congress to the overreaching Chief Executive. I am therefore going to oppose shutting off debate that actually has not even begun.

I am frustrated that two of my reasonable amendments that I think would have had a very good chance of passing have been blocked and apparently will not get a vote. I don't think we have any need to shut off the debate today and to advance to a bill where we have had too few amendments and where we have had a steadfast refusal by the President of the United States, who is pushing every way he can to get this agreement adopted, until he answers the question: Will it improve manufacturing or further reduce manufacturing, as our previous agreement with South Korea did? It reduced manufacturing. Will it increase jobs or reduce jobs? All they promised—and they promised this repeatedly—is that it will increase jobs in the export sector. They don't say what it will do on net, when we have three, four times as many imports as we do exports, on net. As in the past, it appears this agreement will clearly reduce jobs and reduce wages as well, and reduce manufacturing.

We can't have a strong nation without a manufacturing sector—we just cannot. We can't be a strong nation without a steel industry—we just cannot. We need to ensure in these trade agreements—when we open our markets, what these countries want so desperately is access to the U.S. market. That is something of great value. We should not give it away until they agree to open their markets. That is what a good deal is. That is not what is in this deal, and it will not be in the agreement. It will be like previous agreements.

Mr. President, how much time is left on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. I don't see any others here. I will just discuss this a little bit more.

When Mr. Damico, who has been involved in world trade competition for years, said we are enabling mercantilism, what he is saying is that our trading partners have a goal that we don't seem to have, and that is to maximize their exports and minimize their imports.

They want access to the U.S. market. They have a mercantilist philosophy,

and that is what it is, really. That philosophy allows them to put up nontrade barriers, nontariff barriers, to use currency manipulation and other tactics to make it difficult for the United States to penetrate their market. They say they have signed a trade agreement, and they will agree on tariffs, for example, but they still, on net, don't open their market as effectively as we open our markets. That is the reality.

As a result, we have had a continual decline in manufacturing. We have seen a surge in our trade deficits. March was the highest trade deficit in almost a decade. The whole first quarter was horrible. Our trade deficits are increasing.

If this agreement is passed, will it increase or decrease our trade deficits? Isn't that a fair question to ask? Will it increase or decrease our trade deficits? They will not answer. Unfortunately, the answer is it is going to increase our trade deficits. We know that. If it were not true, they would be hollering about how it is going to greatly reduce our trade deficits. They would be saying, on net, we are going to have more jobs. They would say wages would go up.

The truth is we are not negotiating these agreements effectively, and the net result is it is going to weaken manufacturing, allow a reduction in jobs, and really put downward pressure on wages.

I hate to have to oppose this legislation at this time, but I have come to that conclusion. I have supported most of the trade agreements in the past.

I understand that we are in a global economy, and we have trading partners around the world. There is no way we are going to reverse that. Globalism is here to stay. We need to be a part of it. But it is time for our Nation to protect our manufacturing and our workers from unfair competition.

We cannot take the view, as some do and say openly, that if our competitors manipulate their currency to make their products cheaper and they penetrate our market and close American businesses as a result—we cannot say: That is all right; we have cheaper products. Don't worry about it. In the long run, somewhere along the way, it will all work out.

That is a guiding principle for the people pushing this legislation. They won't admit it, at least the politicians won't, publicly, but we know that is the guiding principle. I say that is a mistake. I say that is an extreme position. I say that we do have an interest in protecting our jobs, our manufacturing, and the ability of the American people to have a good job, to have a retirement plan, to have an insurance policy. I think that is important.

So I urge that we back off this agreement now. Let's reevaluate it and have the President of the United States answer the question: Will we create higher wages or lower wages? Will we increase manufacturing or reduce manufacturing? Will we increase wages or not?

I thank the Chair, and I reserve the remainder of the time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I echo the words of Senator SESSIONS, my colleague from Alabama.

These free-trade deals are not free trade. If they were free trade, they would be a couple of pages long that simply listed the tariffs that we are eliminating as incentives. Instead, these are a collection of special interest deals that take us somewhere else from where the proponents said they would.

Senator SESSIONS said something interesting: This is really about jobs. They would be making claims about jobs. Instead, they make claims about geopolitics in China and all of that. That is fine, but there are certainly other ways to deal with that better than we have.

We have seen big promises. We saw them from the first President Bush as he negotiated NAFTA. We saw them from President Clinton when he pushed NAFTA through Congress. We saw them from President Clinton on PNTR with China, which was not a trade deal but certainly acted like one in many ways in terms of what happened with China then. We saw them with the second President Bush with the Central America Free Trade Agreement. And we are seeing them now with President Obama and South Korea.

On South Korea, President Obama's administration promised an increase of 70,000 jobs and promised wages would go up. They always say more jobs, higher wages, but then we ended up losing 75,000 jobs under the South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Today we are voting on whether to end debate on the fast-track bill. If people are a little confused, it is very understandable. We are going to end debate, but we have barely begun it.

Historically, when we do trade agreements in this town—as bad as they have turned out to be for the American public and working families in places such as Reno and Cleveland, and smaller towns such as Mansfield and Lima, and really small towns such as Jackson, OH—when we passed these trade agreements, at least we have had open debate where we could offer amendments. The last time we did fast-track legislation on the Senate floor, there were 3 weeks of debate. This is about 3 days. We considered 50 amendments. We have considered two so far.

The majority leader came to the floor at the end of the first full day of debate and said we are filing cloture to shut down debate. At the end of the first full day of debate, they began the process of shutting down debate. The majority leader promised an open process.

I don't get it when my Democratic colleagues—I guess I get it with the free-trade fundamentalists here and people who are not as independent as Senator SESSIONS and the total party

loyalists who will always vote with their leadership. But I don't get it when Democrats in this body, who really do genuinely care about workers, as do many Republicans—why they are willing to shut down debate because the majority leader says let's shut down debate.

We had two votes on Monday night and none since. Six amendments are pending, but votes for them haven't been scheduled. Two hundred amendments have been filed. At least 30 Senators have filed amendments and a number of Senators have filed multiple amendments. We have 200 amendments filed and 2 votes and 6 amendments pending, even though the 6 amendments that are pending don't have any schedule on how they are going to be dealt with. At least one of them has been second-degreed, basically obviating or taking away any ability to vote strictly on that amendment. We had two votes on Monday night, no votes on this issue since, and as for the six amendments themselves, who knows how they are going to be disposed of. That is an open process?

People on my side of the aisle are willing to vote to shut down debate when 25 of their Democratic colleagues and another—I don't know, a half dozen; I don't know how many Republicans—are also offering amendments. So 200 amendments have been filed by—I just found this. Forty-six Senators have actually filed 200 amendments on an issue we haven't considered in 13 years, and we are going to shut down debate at the end of the first full day of consideration.

We had a truly open legislative process the last time we did it. I think it was a Republican Senate at the time. It was a very closely divided Senate. We have been promised repeatedly that is what this underlying bill deserves. It is what the American people deserve.

Keep in mind this fast-track legislation means that we will be considering—it opens the process, opens the door to two trade agreements that encompass 60 percent of the world's economy. Forty percent of the world's economy is in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and an additional 20 percent with the United States and the European Union, the so-called TTIP agreement. Again, after two votes, the majority leader filed for cloture at the end of the first full day of debate.

We are not being unreasonable. We have played this straight. We are simply asking for the Senate to debate this important legislation. I really don't understand how any Senator in either party, when half of the Senate has offered amendments—200 of them and counting and every day there are more amendments offered—how we can shut down debate when 200 amendments have been filed by 46 Senators. We are simply asking for votes on our amendments. I don't care when we complete it. I don't care if we right now defeat cloture and then come up with some kind of a UC to give us votes

on 25 or 50 of these amendments with time scheduled so we can finish. I don't care if we finish today or Friday or Saturday or Sunday or stay to Memorial Day or come back a week after Memorial Day and finish. It really doesn't matter about the time. I know a lot of my colleagues don't want to go home this week and have people who are angry because they know these trade agreements don't serve the public interest, and we know there are millions of Americans who have lost jobs because of decisions we make here.

We make decisions here that throw people out of work. Even the Wall Street Journal editorial page, the greatest cheerleader—the most vigorous, vociferous cheerleader for free trade of any newspaper in the country, I believe—even they acknowledge that people are thrown out of work from trade agreements because of the dislocation. We are going to leave here and vote on this without even having amendments on how to take care of those workers and how to do trade enforcement. It simply doesn't make sense.

Amendments such as the Brown-Portman Leveling the Playing Field Act amendment include much-needed trade enforcement provisions in this trade promotion bill. It was for all intents and purposes unanimously accepted in the Finance Committee. It has all kinds of Republican cosponsorships and all kinds of Democrat cosponsorships. My colleagues in the leadership in both parties, even though the leadership in both parties doesn't reflect the majority of the Members of both parties—that is the way it is sometimes—but we are asking for a vote on that. We haven't been given that yet—an actual vote. There have been promises, but there has been nothing really substantive in the end.

These provisions on a level playing field are supported by the White House and by House Republicans who have asked them to be included in fast-track. They are supported by numbers of U.S. industries that face an onslaught of unfairly traded imports and need our trade remedy laws to be as strong as possible.

We are not debating the Brown-Portman amendment. We are not debating any amendments. We are simply rushing to conclude consideration of this fast-track bill.

We are fast-tracking this whole idea of a fast-track process. Why is that good for our country or our workers or our small manufacturers and the supply chains of all of these big industries? Why is that good for our communities?

We have waited 8 years, and this has to be done today. Eight years we have waited for this. We had one full day of debate. Then the majority leader shut down the debate, after one full day of debate.

What we do in this fast-track bill will have implications for years to come. It will affect the Trans-Pacific Partner-

ship and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, both permanent trade agreements that represent more than half the world's economy.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. This will affect both TPP, 40 percent of the world's economy, and then a year or so later, TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, the United States-European Union agreement—both permanent trade agreements. There is 40 percent in TPP of the world's economy, and 20 percent in TTIP of the world's economy. These are permanent trade agreements that represent a huge part of the world's economy.

This bill will affect global labor standards, it will affect global environmental standards, it will affect international intellectual property standards, and more and more and more. That is why Senator SESSIONS has spoken out so effectively against it. That is why people in both parties are insisting they get these amendments, that they are voting against cloture until they get these amendments—Members of this body who have supported cloture in the past for a whole host of things.

Why we are rushing to end debate before it has truly begun is mystifying. Regardless of whether they support or oppose the underlying bill, I hope my colleagues recognize the importance of getting fast-track legislation right—not getting it done by Memorial Day, some artificial deadline that somebody somewhere set but getting this trade legislation right.

The Senate has not given the underlying bill the attention and deliberation it deserves. It has not given the amendment process the ability to—let alone to work its way through but even to get off the ground. I urge my colleagues to vote against cloture and ensure that a reasonable number of amendments get considered.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I can report there has been an all-night effort to try to work out this issue to bring parties together, particularly around our colleagues being able to offer more amendments, and on the issue of the Export-Import Bank—something I favor very strongly, and Senator CANTWELL makes a very important point that we have trade agreements, but it is also important to have financing tools, which is what the Export-Import Bank is all about. So we have been working throughout the night trying to address both of those issues, Export-Import Bank and the question of our colleagues being able to offer more amendments.

When you hear the words "TPA" and "TPP," it sounds like a company that has been through too many mergers,

but the fact is these terms are enormously important to America's economic future. Our markets are basically open. Many countries hit us with double- and triple-digit tariffs on our exports. Export jobs often pay better than the nonexport jobs do because there is a lot of value added in the process.

The vote today will begin the efforts to replace the outdated trade rules of the 1990s with a modern set of trade rules that can help America get more of those good-paying jobs.

When you talk about international trade, the first thing you have to focus on is the estimate is, in the developing world, there are going to be about 1 billion middle-class consumers. Those are middle-class consumers with money—money in their pockets—and they can buy American goods and American services. They can buy our wonderful ag products like Oregon wine. They can buy helicopters and bicycles and planes and computers. There is enormous affection around the world for buying the American brand, for buying the Oregon brand.

With modern trade rules, we can make sure our exporters are able to get the kinds of goods and services that those billion middle-class consumers are going to want to buy, and that is always what drives the modern economy—middle-class consumers buying goods and services. One billion people in the developing world are going to be middle class in 2025.

Chairman HATCH is with me on the floor. What we have sought to do for now about 7 months is replace the old 1990s playbook on trade with a modern one. That is important because in the 1990s nobody had iPhones, nobody was texting. We are talking about a very different time.

Here is an example: Opponents have often, and I think with substantial legitimacy, talked about how there has been way too much secrecy associated with trade. If you believe deeply in trade, as I do, and you want more of it, why would you want to have all this secrecy that just leaves the American people with the view that something is being hidden back in Washington, DC?

So Chairman HATCH and I came together and put in place the most transparent policies on trade in our country's history. For example, by law—by law—before the President of the United States signs the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that document has to be public for 60 days before the President signs it. On top of that, there are probably another 2 months that take place before anybody in the Senate or anybody in the House on the floor of those bodies actually votes. What that means—and I want to give the opportunity to my colleague to make closing remarks—what it means is, as part of the new day on trade policy—in the past a lot of Americans were in the dark about trade policy. Now they will be able to come to a townhall meeting of their elected officials, such as the ones

I plan to hold in a few days at home. The American people will be able to come to a townhall meeting, and starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement, have that document in their hands for close to 4 months before their elected representative has to vote. That is what Chairman HATCH and I have sought to do in terms of coming up with a modern trade policy.

I think it is appropriate that my colleague—and I appreciate his partnership—will have a chance to wrap this up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I appreciate my partner and his kind comments and his intelligent comments here this morning.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to call up the following amendments en bloc: 1, Boxer No. 1371; 2, Whitehouse No. 1387; 3, Brown No. 1252, to level the playing field; 4, Feinstein No. 1424; 5, Menendez No. 1430; 6, Paul No. 1383; 7, Paul No. 1408; 8, Sullivan No. 1246; 9, Sessions No. 1233; 10, Cruz No. 1384; 11, Cardin No. 1230; 12, Paul No. 1408.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, again, I appreciate the generosity of Senators HATCH and I think WYDEN on this. Some 200 amendments have been filed by 46 Senators. We have had two votes. We have six pending, but the six pending—they have had some interesting adjustments in terms of second-degree amendments, in terms of not being actually called for votes. Now we have an offer of nine more. That is a good step, but the majority leader came to the floor at the end of the first full day of debate to file cloture to shut down debate. We had only two votes all week.

I would like to have more votes. I think all of us on all sides of the discussion on this debate—the pro-free-trade Republicans and the anti-free-trade Republicans, the pro-free trade Democrats and the overwhelming majority of Democrats who don't like the way the rules are under TPA—would be willing to come together and pick out 20 or so amendments of the 200 that have been offered by 46 different Senators and have that debate with time limits. We should do all of that.

Instead, we have nine amendments here. As I said—in case I didn't say it three times—we have had only two votes so far. There are nine amendments here. Most of these amend-

ments—including level the playing field, which seems to have unanimous support—level the playing field is non-germane. So if Senators vote for cloture now, then all of those nongermane amendments are dropped and most of these nine will not see the light of day.

Madam President, I object to the UC. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I just want to point out that we tried to bring this bill up Thursday, then Friday. It was objected to. Then we brought it up Monday. We only had two amendments. Then Tuesday, Wednesday, and now today there have been logjams all the way through.

Now, look, I have been as fair as anybody could be. I have tried to accommodate my colleagues on the other side, and we were not making any headway.

So I thought that by calling up these 12 amendments, that would resolve it. But if not, we should proceed with the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I would again reiterate our offer. I don't know that I can do it exactly in a UC request. But I reiterate our offer that we sit down—that the leaders sit down—and discuss 15 amendments a side—15 Republican amendments, 15 Democrat amendments—and that we have a serious negotiation without cloture hanging over our head that will drop all of these nongermane, very serious enforcement amendments.

We had a vote last Tuesday where for the first time in 25 years a trade motion was actually defeated. The whole point of that vote was that we wanted enforcement as part of TPA, TAA. That is what this has been all about.

But in this UC request, most of the enforcement—for instance, level the playing field, but also some other things—will drop because they are nongermane.

I offer to Senator HATCH if there is a way of having this discussion and really moving forward—

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Hatch amendment No. 1221 to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Orrin G. Hatch, Daniel Coats, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, John Barrasso,

Mike Crapo, Jeff Flake, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Dan Sullivan.

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 substitute amendment, No. 1221, offered by the Senator from Utah, Mr. HATCH, to H.R. 1314, be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Feinstein	Murray
Barrasso	Fischer	Nelson
Bennet	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Cantwell	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heitkamp	Rubio
Carper	Heller	Sasse
Cassidy	Hoeben	Scott
Coats	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cochran	Isakson	Sullivan
Coons	Johnson	Thune
Corker	Kaine	Tillis
Cornyn	Kirk	Toomey
Cotton	Lankford	Vitter
Crapo	McCain	Warner
Cruz	McCaskill	Wicker
Daines	McConnell	Wyden
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hirono	Reid
Blumenthal	King	Reid
Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Boxer	Leahy	Schatz
Brown	Lee	Schumer
Cardin	Manchin	Sessions
Casey	Markey	Shelby
Collins	Menendez	Stabenow
Donnelly	Merkley	Tester
Durbin	Mikulski	Udall
Franken	Murphy	Warren
Gillibrand	Paul	Whitehouse
Heinrich	Peters	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 38.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I am very happy the Senate has decided to take another step forward on this very important initiative not only of the President's but of the majority party's as well, and I thank the folks on the other side who are also similarly inclined.

Let me just make it clear. Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN have done a terrific job. They are open to continuing to try to get amendments. We still have the opportunity to do that. As everyone knows, it requires some level of cooperation because anybody can object to somebody else getting an amendment. But Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN are anxious to do additional business, to open it up for more amendments, and with everybody's cooperation, that could be achieved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I think it would be appropriate—we have gotten to where we are—that we have a quorum call so we can find out where we are on amendments. There is agreement out there; we just have to see how we can get it arrived at. So I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, will the Senator withhold so I can make a short speech, less than a minute?

Mr. REID. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. I thank my colleague from Nevada.

Madam President, I thank all our colleagues for their support in helping us get this far. This last vote was a major step forward on this important legislation. We have a few more votes we are going to have to do, and we are getting very close to maybe doing this very important bill. I hope that now that we have taken this step, we can find a way to finish this legislation in short order, and I am willing to work with my colleagues to get us there.

Once again, I thank everyone who supported this today. It means a lot to me personally.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. NELSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1430 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I thank the Chair for the time, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we are going to be voting, we hope, on an amendment that is called the antidocking amendment. It observes, by reading the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that there apparently is a path for the executive branch to allow another country to become part of the Trans-Pacific Partnership without a vote of Congress.

In other words, as to the world's second largest economy, China, the administration, this President or the next President, could decide that, well, China should join the 12 countries al-

ready part of TPP if we affirm this vote down the road with TPP.

If China could join—the second largest economy in the world—they would backdoor, if you will, because of the administration's willingness to do it, with no input from the public, with no input from the Congress.

Our amendment is really simple. It sets up a process over a 90-day period. If a President wants to bring a country into the Trans-Pacific Partnership, that country would have to meet certain criteria, the same kinds of criteria that we have seen with these 12 countries, including sex trafficking and some labor law and other things.

Then Congress would actually vote. Congress would get 90 days to decide, up or down, whether a country can join TPP after it is up and running. The country that most concerns us, of course, is China. So when you hear this amendment discussed, you will hear China used as an example, because its economy, obviously, is so large. It passed Japan as the world's second largest economy, I believe, a year or so ago.

We just want to make sure that our integrity and the integrity of these 12 countries—12 other countries—is preserved. The way to do that and for the public to be heard is that Congress has to make the decision on whether another country can join.

That is what our so-called docking amendment does. I know Senator FRANKEN is about to take the floor. I want to say a couple of other things. This amendment is in no way meant to kill TPP. It simply spells out the process for future countries to join.

Here is exactly how the process would work. The President would notify Congress about an intent to enter negotiations. It would require certification from the two committees—Ways and Means in the House, Finance in the Senate. Then it would ultimately come to a Senate vote. That is how this would work to protect, I think, the public interest and to give the public input into what countries actually join the TPP. It makes sense, I think, for all countries involved.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

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

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

USA FREEDOM ACT

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in support of the USA FREEDOM Act of 2015. I am a proud co-sponsor of this bicameral, bipartisan bill which brings much-needed reform to the Federal Government's surveillance programs, including an end to the bulk data collection program that the intelligence community has said is not necessary, that the public has said they don't support, and that the Second Circuit has ruled as unlawful.

I am particularly proud to have developed the bill's transparency provisions with my friend Senator DEAN HELLER of Nevada. We are greatly indebted to Senator LEE and to Senator LEAHY for their leadership and their tireless work.

Americans understand, as I do, that our job here is to strike an appropriate balance, making sure, on the one hand, that we are safeguarding our national security, without trampling on our citizens' fundamental privacy rights, on the other hand. But the public cannot know if we succeed in striking that balance if they do not even have the most basic information about our major surveillance programs. That is why my focus has been on transparency, because I want to make sure that the American people are able to decide for themselves whether we are getting this right.

I support the USA FREEDOM Act because it moves us in the right direction on all of these fronts. On June 1, several national security authorities will expire. The House acted responsibly and passed USA FREEDOM, a bill that reflects the combined efforts and agreement of Republicans and Democrats, members of the intelligence and law enforcement communities, and advocates for privacy and civil liberties, as well as members of the tech sector and business communities.

This legislation ensures that the necessary authorities continue in force through 2019, and it makes important reforms that will actually improve national security. You do not need to take my word for that. The Director of National Intelligence and the Attorney General have told us, in no uncertain terms, that we ought to pass the USA FREEDOM Act and promptly.

Yet some of my colleagues are attempting to present us with a choice between reauthorization of the soon-to-expire authorities with no reform whatsoever or complete expiration of those authorities. That is profoundly unfortunate, because we have a compromise bill that has overwhelming support and was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Representatives by a vote of 338 to 88.

It draws broad-based support from business, from civil society, and within the government. I believe that the only thing that would stop this bill from garnering similar strong bipartisan support here in the Senate is if Republican leaders who oppose this bill pressure my Republican colleagues to filibuster. I really hope that does not happen. I hope it does not happen because USA FREEDOM's reforms represent real and meaningful progress. The bill ends the old program for the bulk collection of telephone metadata, which, according to reports discussed at a hearing last year, principally gathered call records from landlines. It replaces that program with a more targeted approach that permits the collection of call detail records, including prospective collection of those records. You

get a warrant, and you collect those prospectively, based on the government's reasonable, articulable suspicion of a link to international terrorism.

Now, I believe that is a much more sensible approach. I know that some of my colleagues disagree. Last November, one of my colleagues suggested that bulk collection is preferable to a targeted approach because American's privacy would be at risk if the government were "going to have to go to those companies and ask for the data."

But of course, no matter what, we have to go to the companies and ask them for the data. The records at issue here are the phone company's business records. That is what they are. I should also note that those companies have both legal and business reasons for why they retain and protect these records as they do, from the potential for billing disputes to commercial analytics to regulatory concerns.

The FCC regulations require them to hold on to telephone call records for 18 months. None of that has changed. It bears emphasizing that the relationship USA FREEDOM calls for between phone companies and the government is nothing new. Our Nation's law enforcement and intelligence agencies have long worked with phone companies to obtain specific records, either historic or prospective records, when conducting domestic criminal investigations or carrying out sensitive national security investigations such as FISA wiretaps.

So we have been doing this for a long time. The intelligence community, national security, law enforcement experts, and American businesses, not to mention the House of Representatives, all understand that we have to strike the right balance. We need to safeguard our national security, but we need to do it in ways that do not unduly tread on privacy and civil liberties.

Leaders across these different public and private sectors have managed to come together to strike that balance in the USA FREEDOM Act. That is where my work with Senator HELLER comes in. We recognized that when the public lacks even a rough sense of the scope of the government's surveillance programs, they have no way of knowing if the government is getting that balance right. So there needs to be more transparency.

Since the Snowden revelations came to light 2 years ago, a steady stream of news reports has provided details about NSA programs that collect information about both foreign nationals and the American people. Despite these disclosures, it remains impossible for the American people to get even a basic sense of the real size and scope of these programs. Americans still don't know the number of people whose information has been collected under these programs. They have no sense of the extent to which U.S. persons are affected and, particularly, have no way of knowing how often the government

has searched that information, such as call detail records of Americans. Senator HELLER and I crafted transparency provisions to make sure Americans get that kind of information. That way the American people can better judge the government's surveillance programs for themselves.

Under USA FREEDOM, the government will be required to issue detailed annual reports for each of the surveillance authorities at issue. Importantly, the government will have to tell the public how many people have had their information collected, and for certain authorities—like those permitting the targeted collection of call detail records or the communications of foreigners abroad—the government will also have to say how many times it has run searches for Americans' data.

The USA FREEDOM Act doesn't just require the government to be more transparent. We also make it possible for American businesses to provide their customers with more information about what they are asked to turn over to the government. This is not only good for transparency, it is good for our economy. It has been estimated that the Snowden revelations are costing American companies billions of dollars because people have lost trust in those companies, often assuming that all companies are handing over all of their information to the government.

So by allowing companies to report the size and scope of the government's requests, the public can get a better sense of what information is actually being turned over, and the bill makes clear that a company that has not received any national security requests from the government is free to say so.

All of this will calm fears, both here and abroad, and allow American companies to better compete with their foreign counterparts.

The provisions Senator HELLER and I wrote will expand the options that companies have to issue their own transparency reports and allow companies to issue those reports more quickly. But we also listened to the intelligence community to make sure we were striking the right balance and ensuring that ongoing investigations are not jeopardized by additional transparency.

Now, look, to get the broad, bipartisan support we needed, Senator HELLER and I had to compromise a great deal. We didn't get everything we wanted when we initially negotiated our provisions last year, and we had to compromise further still this year, particularly with regard to government reporting under section 702, which authorizes the collection, for intelligence purposes, of communications of foreign persons abroad. I am disappointed the bill doesn't include all of the requirements we agreed on last year and that were included in the Senate bill last Congress, which had 58 votes.

But I am committed to pressing my colleagues to revisit this issue in the

future—hopefully before the sunset of section 702—in 2017. That, of course, is the Internet traffic of foreign persons abroad who are suspected of being terrorists.

But in the meantime, the good news is that after all the give-and-take, our provisions that did get included in the bill will usher in a new era of transparency about our Nation's surveillance agencies. They will allow the American public to see—on an annual basis—whether the government really makes good on its promise to end bulk collection, and they will give those of us in Congress important tools as we work to continually improve our country's laws.

The transparency provisions are an essential part of USA FREEDOM, and the bill overall is a step in the right direction for reforming our Nation's intelligence laws. It is a step that the House has already taken on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis. It is a step that the Senate should take as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on an amendment I have filed regarding a crisis we are experiencing in the H-2B visas.

In North Carolina, we have a very large seafood industry, and we have a crisis that is shared by a number of other States that have the seafood industry with respect to the availability of H-2B visas, and the busy time is just about to start in a couple of weeks. It is the worst possible time for this industry.

We literally have jobs that have been created by people such as Don Cross and his brother and their Pamlico Packing Company in Grantsboro, NC. They simply can't find workers to do this job. It is going to ruin their business, and it is unacceptable. These are jobs these folks have created, like the Crosses, and they can't be filled. The jobs are waiting to be filled.

It is affecting other businesses we have in the shrimp and crab industries, but it is also affecting other businesses—will affect other businesses—such as grocery stores, restaurants, and other industries, like tourism, across the country.

The problem I have—and the nature of the amendment I will speak to briefly—but I have reached out to the Department of Homeland Security to ask a series of questions, and I simply haven't received answers. That is why I decided to offer an amendment—or to file the amendment.

DHS has refused to issue more work visas, even though the statutory cap of used visas has most likely not been reached. DHS claims the cap has been reached, and that is really odd because it is unusually early for them to take that position.

This is what I think the real truth is. Not every business applying for these visas is using them. DHS normally ap-

proves more visas so we make it more likely that we reach the cap, but we don't believe they have done that this year.

That is why we have asked for an audit, to make sure we know how many applications were actually approved, how many visas are actually used by the State, within the State, and how many of those visas are actually putting legal, migrant, immigrant workers into these jobs.

This year, they haven't even done an audit. We simply want to know why.

I think DHS is playing games with the numbers, and I demand answers. DHS seems eager to help the illegal population get acclimated, but they don't seem to place a priority on American businesses that need these people to come and work in our seafood processing facilities, not only in North Carolina like Don Cross's Pamlico Packing Company but packing companies across the coast.

I have had a discussion with a number of Members on the other side of the aisle. They share our concerns, and we are all working trying to simply get the answers.

So what my amendment does is—until we get the answers, until we solve the problem, we want to suspend the travel for all DHS employees to government conferences and symposiums until the Agency provides more transparent data as to how the H-2B program is being administered for this fiscal year and for the three previous fiscal years.

I want answers and I want action. We have businesses in North Carolina and across the country in the coastal States that need these workers, and we want answers now.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANCHIN. 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 REQUEST—S. 1381

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor and I, like my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts, am very concerned about the lack of transparency in this whole process of the trade agreement, very concerned.

I saw the TPP text. I went downstairs and I saw that. I have to say the whole process was extremely disturbing to me. Members must go to a classified room. Now, we do go to classified rooms, as a bipartisan group, on many issues that are very important to this country. I had gone down because I wanted to see for myself the transcript of the TPP, what they have dealt with and how far they are along right now in the negotiations.

The viewing of the documents that are very technical in nature, as we all know, is oftentimes without a trade staffer with appropriate clearance. So

here I am, I am not able to take staff—or only staff who has had secured clearance, and it might not be the staff on my staff who has the expertise in this, so that takes that equation away.

We are unable to take any notes to consider what we just saw unless we have a photographic memory. Unfortunately, I do not. I have tried the best I can to remember and look for things I knew I was looking for. But still yet, it is almost impossible to walk out of there having the ability to sit down and evaluate what you just saw, and then we are unable to talk to anyone about it—even to my staff, as I would like to get their input, since I have been, basically, looking at the details, and especially the public, too, has no idea about any issues that concern them.

The secretive nature of the largest free-trade deal in America's history truly just lacks common sense. Let me explain. In July of 2001, President Bush at that time released the draft text of the Free Trade Area of the Americas Agreement, the FTAA. He did this months before he was granted fast-track authority. He wasn't afraid to let us see it. He wasn't afraid to let the American public know what was in that. We were able to see it, and it didn't squelch the deal. It didn't harm anything.

They released the text of the FTAA, the different positions of 34 countries in important areas such as intellectual property rights, investor-state dispute settlements, and antidumping duties—all very important to our country and the jobs we have in this country.

Now we have a massive 12-country trade agreement that is currently being negotiated, and the President wants us to grant him the fast-track authority before not only the American people have even seen the text but mostly even our staffs whom we delegate to work on these intricate documents.

Our bill that we will be asking consideration for would simply require the President to release the scrubbed, bracketed text of any trade agreement at least 60 days before Congress would grant the fast-track authority. This is pretty sensible, pretty reasonable. Just release the scrubbed document that you have agreed on so far 60 days before you ask us to give the fast-track authority.

Before any Member of Congress is asked to vote on the most expansive bill in U.S. trade history, the American people deserve to see what is in the bill. That is why they elect us, to make sure we are able to confer with them, have a dialogue, and explain why we are or why we may not be for a certain piece of legislation, especially a trade agreement.

If this bill is as good for the American worker as proponents have claimed, then the administration and anybody else should not find it objectionable to see the details before Congress is forced to grant the President trade promotion authority.

I want to say, in my beautiful little State of West Virginia, as I go through it and we look back through the trade agreements that have already been granted since NAFTA, we have not seen an uptick. In fact, we have lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs. I, for one, am not willing to vote to put one more job in jeopardy in West Virginia.

That is the concern we have. So what we are asking for is a very modest, very sensible, very reasonable, commonsense approach to how we should do the job the people elect us to do and how it should be transparent.

At this time I yield the floor to my friend, the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN. I thank him for his leadership. I thank him for his independence. I thank him for his partnership as we push for greater transparency on this very important trade bill.

In the past few weeks, the public has heard a lot about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, a massive trade deal the United States is negotiating with 11 other trade companies. The public has heard from supporters that it is the most progressive trade deal in history—a deal that will benefit working families and small businesses—and they have heard from opponents that it will only tilt the playing field further in favor of multinational corporations and leave workers and everyone else behind.

The public has heard a lot, but in all that time they have never actually seen the deal itself. In fact, the press hasn't seen the deal, economists haven't seen the deal, legal experts haven't seen the deal. Most everyone in America hasn't seen the deal. Why? Because the administration has classified the deal, making it illegal for any of those people to read it.

Members of Congress, as Senator MANCHIN said, can read it so long as they go into a secret room and don't leave with any notes. But even Members of Congress are prohibited from talking about the details in public or discussing the details with the people they were sent to Washington to represent. And yet, in the next day or two, the Senate is scheduled to vote on whether to grease the skids to make that secret trade deal—the TPP—the law of the land.

This isn't how democracy is supposed to work. One of our fundamental principles of representative government is transparency. Our government is supposed to keep things secret from the people only if it has a very good reason to do so. So why is this trade deal a secret? I just want to go over the answers I have heard so far, the reasons.

Some say the administration can't release the deal because the deal isn't finished yet. OK, so maybe there are some unresolved issues, but everyone

agrees the deal is nearly complete. It is close enough to being done that its supporters can confidently claim it is the most progressive trade deal in history. If you are sure that is right, then show it to us. If some parts aren't finished, then show us the parts that are finished. Don't keep every single word of the deal classified.

Others say releasing the text now would be tipping our hand in continuing negotiations, but that doesn't make any sense either. Our government has already shared the details of our positions with the other TPP countries, and those countries have shared details with us. That is how negotiations work. Publicly releasing what our negotiating partners have already seen couldn't possibly undermine our negotiations because, by definition, our negotiating partners have already seen it.

Here is another argument I have heard. Releasing the text of an unfinished international agreement simply isn't done; it is a breach of protocol. Well, that is not true either. As Senator MANCHIN pointed out, in 2001, President George W. Bush publicly released the scrubbed bracketed text of the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas several months before seeking fast-track authority for that agreement. At the time, his U.S. Trade Representative said that releasing the text "would increase public awareness and support for the trade deal." Guess what. Congress still approved that fast-track deal. Of course it can be done. It has been done, and it should be done.

Still others say that publicly releasing the text would endanger state secrets. Wow. But this agreement is not about nuclear weapons programs or military operations. There isn't any national security information in this deal. This deal is about things such as copyright rules and labor standards. And I know the President doesn't think there is any sensitive national security information in the deal. That is why he has already committed to publicly releasing the entire text. He just won't do it until after Congress has already voted to grease the skids to make it law.

That brings us to the last justification—that we should all be satisfied that the administration will release the text of the deal a few months before Congress has to vote on whether to approve it. But by then, Congress will have lost the ability to amend the deal, to stop the deal, or to slow it down. In other words, by the time you—the American public—can read the deal, your elected representatives will have lost the ability to use your input to help shape that deal. That sounds like a lousy arrangement to me.

So if there are no good reasons for secrecy here, that leaves only a bad reason, and believe it or not, it is a reason I have heard people give multiple times: We should keep the deal secret because if the details were made public now, the public would oppose it. Well,

that is how our democracy is supposed to work.

If the TPP is mostly done and the public wouldn't support it if they could see it, then it shouldn't become the law. That is why I have introduced a simple bill with my friend from West Virginia, Senator MANCHIN. This bill would require the President to publicly release the scrubbed bracketed text of a trade deal at least 60 days before Congress votes on any fast-track for that deal. That would give the public, the experts, and the press an opportunity to review the deal. It would allow for some honest public debate. It would give Congress a chance to actually step in and block any special deals and giveaways that are being proposed as part of this trade deal before Congress decides whether to grease the skids to make that deal the law.

If this trade deal is so great, if it will work so well for America's workers and small businesses, then make it public. We should pass this bill today and give the American people some time to read the deal before we tie ourselves to fast-track.

Whether you support fast-track or oppose it, whether you support TPP or oppose it, we should all agree that we should have a robust, informed debate on something that is this important. Anything less is a disservice to the people who sent us here to work for them.

So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the Committee on Finance be discharged from further consideration of S. 1381, that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, one concern I have heard from opponents of the trade promotion authority is that trade agreements currently under discussion have been negotiated behind closed doors and that by renewing TPA, Congress would be enabling and even encouraging further secrecy.

I am going to talk more on this in a minute, but there are 30 days before the President signs, 60 days after he signs where this will become well known. So I have to object to my dear colleagues' bill—I guess it is a bill at this time. I just have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have heard this concern from opponents of trade promotion authority from time to time—that trade agreements currently under discussion have been negotiated behind closed doors and that by reviewing TPA, Congress would be enabling and even encouraging further secrecy. These arguments are particularly being made about the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP, which is not

before us. Of course, we need to keep in mind that every Senator complaining about this supposed secrecy associated with TPP has had an opportunity to read through the current text of the agreement. And the agreement is not yet concluded. It won't be unless we pass TPA.

At the same time, I would be very surprised if these same Senators decrying the secrecy of the TPP negotiations also believe that contract negotiations between unions and management should be made public or that it would be a wise negotiating tactic for a private citizen negotiating the sale of their home to post all the offers they have received on the Internet.

My point is that in the midst of any high-stakes negotiation, some level of confidentiality is essential to getting a good deal, and especially in this case.

That said, I certainly understand the concerns about transparency, particularly when our government is negotiating on behalf of our country. Fortunately, our TPA bill strikes a good balance to address these very concerns. Our TPA bill goes further than any previous version of TPA to promote transparency and congressional oversight of the whole trade negotiation process.

First of all, under our bill, the full text of a completed trade agreement must be made public at least 60 days before the President can even sign it, giving the American people unprecedented access and knowledge of all trade agreements before they are signed and well before they are submitted to Congress.

In addition, the President must submit to Congress the legal text of a trade agreement and a statement of administrative action at least 30 days before submitting an implementing bill.

On top of that, our bill ensures that any Member of Congress who wants access to the unredacted negotiated text at any time during the negotiations will get it. In addition, Members of Congress will—once again, at any time during the negotiations—be able to request and receive a briefing from the U.S. Trade Representative's office on the status of the negotiations.

Our bill also creates in statute a transparency officer at USTR who will consult with Congress and advise the USTR on transparency policies. This will help ensure that there are consistent transparency policies across the Agency and promote greater public understanding of trade negotiations.

Now, let's be clear. I, as well as other authors of this legislation, understand the concerns we have heard from both inside and outside Congress about the need for greater transparency in the trade negotiation process. We have really worked hard to address these concerns in this legislation, and in particular the concerns of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, who is a good friend, whom I admire, and who I think has brought a certain dimension to this Senate that is very important.

In short, any Member of Congress who is concerned about a lack of transparency in trade negotiations should be a cosponsor of this TPA bill—that is, of course, if they are also supporters of expanded markets for U.S. exporters and the creation of high-paying American jobs. Those who oppose TPA and trade agreements outright will likely continue to use this supposed lack of transparency as an excuse to oppose the bill.

Those with genuine concerns will see that this bill is the right approach. And we have tried to make it the right approach. I believe it is the right approach. I believe the administration says it is the right approach. I know the Trade Representative says it is the right approach. He has bent over backwards to inform us and to open his office and to open matters into these not-yet-concluded agreements.

There is plenty of time for us to look at those agreements—any agreement that comes—and make up our own determinations at that time. So I don't believe the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will be deprived of an ability to look into these matters, completely test the transparency, and look at these agreements in ways that I think would please any reasonable person.

With that, I have had to object, but I hope we can pursue this bill and get it through as soon as we can because it will be a banner day for the President, I have to admit. He is my President, but he is not my party; yet, he is right on this. For the life of me, I can't understand why we are having so much difficulty with his and my friends on the other side. We ought to be supporting a President who has bent over backwards, through his Trade Representative and those around him, to be as open as he possibly can on this matter, at least at this particular time and I believe afterwards as well.

I always feel bad when I have to object to a person's unanimous consent request, but I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Will my good friend the Senator from Utah yield for a question?

Mr. HATCH. I will be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, I have the utmost respect for you and the job you do here every day for all of us. I appreciate that. But we have a difference here. My difference is that I have to look at the people in West Virginia—fewer than 2 million people—who depend on the opportunity to make a living for themselves, and they have hard, strong feelings about what we have done over the years in trade agreements. They haven't seen an uptick in opportunity for themselves or their families.

With that being said, what we have asked for here, the Senator from Massachusetts and I, is not something that has never been done before. I can't ex-

plain why President George W. Bush would have done this. Maybe it was on his own volition, saying: I am going to put out this agreement that has been scrubbed. Basically everything has been agreed on. We will let you see it and discuss it—the American people and the Senate and Congress that represents those people—to see if we have total buy-in and support. If not, we can make some adjustments and changes.

He did that. That is really what we have asked for here. I respect your right to object, and I understand the process here. But the American people don't have input into this, and it has a 51-vote threshold from this day forward. So any of us who have any objections or maybe have something that would enhance this bill don't have that opportunity. That is the reason we have asked for this.

I know the Senator was here and was very much involved in 2001. What was your position or your opinion when President Bush released a draft text of the Free Trade Area of the Americas, the FTAA? Do you recall, by any chance?

Mr. HATCH. I don't personally recall that at this time, other than that it did pass.

Mr. MANCHIN. He let everybody see it months ahead of time before he was granted the fast-track authority. He never even asked for TPA until he released it. And I am sure that you were in the majority at the time, and everyone had to support that position, I would think.

Mr. HATCH. If the Senator would yield—yes, we did. We supported the President's position, if I recall correctly. There is nothing that says the President can't do that. But this bill says he must at least do certain things.

Mr. MANCHIN. That is because he hasn't offered it to us.

Mr. HATCH. This is a 6-year bill.

Mr. MANCHIN. It is a 3-3. You are right.

Mr. HATCH. There is going to be another President in 2016, whether Republican or Democrat or otherwise.

So there is nothing that says the President can't do that, but we are making sure he does do that. We have done it because of questions that have been raised by people such as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and you. We think we have put reasonable time constraints in there, especially since you can review the TPP as it exists—although that may or may not be the final agreement. You can review that now, if you want, and that is well in advance of it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, again, I know you understand it. I am sure you probably have gone down into the secured room and maybe have looked through some parts yourself. But it is quite an onerous process. I couldn't take my staff person who had expertise in that arena because he did not have that clearance. So I had to go in, and I couldn't take notes out. Then on top of that, I couldn't even speak to him

about what I saw because he didn't have that clearance.

I have never been through something like this. For me to go home to West Virginia and say, with all full knowledge and my ability to make a decision on the facts I have in front of me, that I support or I do not support it for these reasons—I can't really do that. I am not really sure if I could support it. Maybe I can support TPP. But I am really objectionable to TPA by not having that opportunity to have input in TPP.

I think that is where I fall. And with a 51-vote threshold, I am not going to have any input to represent the people of West Virginia. With all due respect, that is where I am on this.

Mr. HATCH. I understand the distinguished Senator. Let me say that we all have to make our own individual decisions here.

I would encourage you to reconsider because I think we have a good bill that is far better than it has been in the past. Frankly, it is your administration that is putting this forward, and I am doing everything I can to help this administration get this through.

Mr. MANCHIN. I understand.

Mr. HATCH. Remember that this is the procedural mechanism that gives Congress the right to really know what is going on and to really look at these matters. That is why we put in these particular provisions, which, as far as I know, are better than they have ever been. So Members of Congress will have an opportunity to know what is in these bills. I don't know fully what is in TPP, myself, and I am going to be one of the most interested people on Earth when that comes, if not the most interested, and when we finally agree. It is still not a completed agreement, as far as I know.

All I can say is I think we provide enough time in this bill for anybody who is sincere enough and dedicated enough to look at it.

Mr. MANCHIN. Senator, if you do see something, let's say, as the bill unfolds and comes to its completion, that you really think is going to harm the people of Utah, you are not going to have any input to change that harm. And it is only going to take 51 votes to pass it, even if harm is in there for Utah.

Mr. HATCH. We will have the ability to take this floor, and those in the House to take the House floor, and fight against it if you disagree with it and it starts to get 51 votes.

The administration knows that. They know they can't do a slovenly agreement. They have got to do a good agreement in order to get both sides up here to, in a bipartisan way, accept the agreement for our country.

Mr. MANCHIN. I just feel very strongly that this most reasonable thing that we have asked for is something that was done under President Bush. I think it was in his wisdom to put it out there before. There was nothing to hide.

If we looked into their dialogue back at that period of time, they felt it was

necessary, as Senator WARREN mentioned, to get the public's buy-in, to get support from the public. So they were proud of what they put into it.

I am not saying things in here aren't good and won't be good for this country. But there might be some things that could be improved upon that would make it much better for this country.

I have lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs since NAFTA. It is hard when I go through my State and I look at people struggling. The jobs have not returned. They have not come to our little State. We did not see the uptick.

I am not saying my State represents every State, but I am sure there are parts of every State that have been hit pretty hard by this, and we want to make sure we get this one right. That is all we have asked for.

So I am sorry you had to object. I hope you understand our position on this.

Mr. HATCH. I do, and I appreciate the distinguished Senator and his efforts to represent his State. I know he does a very good job. I know the senior Senator from Massachusetts is doing a very good job. We are friends. This isn't going to change that. All I can say is that we disagree respectfully. I think I have made this as palatable as we possibly could under the circumstances.

The point I have been making is that the agreement is available 60 days before it is even signed. So it isn't as if people will not have a chance to look at it or to fight against it or talk to the President—whoever that might be.

The fact of the matter is that I am not sure that it should be longer than 60 plus 60 plus, I think, another 60.

So all I can say is that I have to object, as manager of this bill. I never feel good about objecting to something my colleagues want. I respect your desire to have as much information as you can. I respect the senior Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANCHIN. Would the Senator be kind enough to yield for a question from the Senator from Massachusetts if I would yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor.

Mr. MANCHIN. I yield for the Senator from Massachusetts for the purpose of a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I just want to say to the Senator from Utah how much I respect his leadership in this Senate and his leadership on so many important issues.

All I want to say about this is that we are just asking for the trade deal to be made public before we have this crucial vote about whether there will be any opportunity in the future to amend the trade deal, to slow down the trade deal or—as the Senator from West Virginia says—if we really find objectionable parts, to be able to block it. We are just asking for some transparency

before we have this crucial vote on the TPA. We don't want to see fast-track until the American public can evaluate the deal. That is all we are asking for at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like the floor. But I would yield the floor to Senator HATCH, and then ask my friends to stay on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business until 4 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, and that the time during morning business count postcloture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

FAST-TRACK AUTHORITY

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues, Senators WARREN and MANCHIN, because what they tried to do here is to give to the American people the same opportunity they had when George W. Bush was President and a trade deal was being negotiated. Before fast-track came up, everybody saw the deal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be added as a cosponsor to their bill.

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

Mrs. BOXER. I appreciate that. I am proud to stand with them on this. And I do respect Senator HATCH. He is my dear friend. But let's be clear. When you go down to that secret room—and I had the same experience as Senator MANCHIN. I couldn't take the proper staffers because they didn't have the clearance.

This isn't about fighting ISIS or the war in Syria or any other very high security matter. It is about a trade deal that is supposed to be negotiated in the best interests of the people of this country.

All my friends are saying is that before we give this President the ability to fast-track this deal, let's look at it. Here is what happens when he gets fast-track authority: Not one Member of this Senate and not one Member of the House can offer any amendment whatsoever.

I think the Senator from West Virginia was very clear on the point. What if we find out that there is something horrible in there for our State?

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out that there are whole parts of this deal—and I know I am not speaking out of turn here—where it

just says that they are still being negotiated. So how the heck do we know what we are even voting on? And here we have given away the store in this last vote so that we will not have an opportunity to make it better.

When my friend talked about how many jobs were lost in West Virginia after NAFTA, my heart sank. Those are a lot of jobs in a smaller State. My State is a large State. We lost about 80,000-plus jobs. That is a lot. We are a larger State, though.

Percentage-wise, you had 2 million and at the time we had about 30 million. So in terms of percentages, your people suffered mightily. But we suffered mightily. More than 80,000 families lost their jobs.

I don't want to keep my colleagues on the floor, but I am only going to speak for 60 seconds more because my colleague from Delaware is such a pal and said I could go before him.

I have a very simple amendment I am fighting to get a vote on. Listen to what it is. It simply says you cannot get fast-track authority to negotiate with any country that doesn't pay at least a \$2 minimum wage. I ask the people who are watching this debate here and at home: Do you know that out of the 12 countries we are negotiating with, 7 of them have less than a \$2 minimum wage?

Let me be specific. Chile has a \$1.91 minimum wage. Malaysia has a \$1.21 minimum wage. Peru has a \$1.15 minimum wage. Mexico has an 80-cent minimum wage.

Do you remember NAFTA? Let's do NAFTA. It is going to raise the standard of living in Mexico, and the Mexican people won't come across the border. We had all those factory jobs leave. And in this, Mexico is part of this deal.

How about Vietnam? 58 cents. And how about Brunei and Singapore? They have no minimum wage.

What kind of a chance do our workers have? I don't care how productive they are. We have the most productive workers. The people in these countries are very smart. They are terrific.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor on that amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent to be added as a cosponsor on that amendment.

Mrs. BOXER. Absolutely, I am very proud to have Senator WARREN.

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

Mrs. BOXER. What kind of chance do our workers have? Do you think a manufacturer in their right mind is going to stay here when they can go to Vietnam and have some terrific people?

I know the Vietnamese community in my home State is fantastic. They are fantastic leaders. They are fantastic workers. It is sad that the ones who are left behind earn 58 cents an hour. What chance do our workers have?

Now, we have 12 million manufacturing jobs left in this Nation of ours—

this greatest of Nations. What kind of chance do they have? Do you know that I cannot get this amendment up for a vote? I think I know the reason. They do not want to have to vote against it. I am still hopeful. I am holding out hope. I am fighting for it. But it seems to me when you are saying to the American people: Do you want your Senator to have to go downstairs to a secure room, give up your electronics to a clerk, be told that if you take notes you have to leave them behind so the clerk can read it, but your staff cannot read it, you cannot discuss it with the people who do not have top clearance for the trade agreement?

Then, you have to have the amendment that Senators WARREN and MANCHIN have offered, which simply says: Make the trade agreement public before we give exceptional fast-track authority to any President. I do not care who it is—Democrat or Republican—this is not a partisan issue.

I have voted for half of the trade agreements, so I have voted for many trade agreements but not with countries that pay slave wages. Let's be clear.

This is a tough day for the U.S. Senate. I know we have been split up every which way on this, but I think there are certain things we have learned from this debate: Secrecy is no good. I respect my President. I have talked to him. I know in his heart he is doing what he thinks is right, but when he says this is not secret and everyone has access to it, I say to my President and I say to my friend Senator HATCH: This is not an open process.

The secrecy is ludicrous. It is ridiculous. It is against the interests of the people we represent. I represent close to 40 million people. As Senator MANCHIN said, those people count on us, but if we do not know what is in an agreement, how can we be wise about what we want to say about it and what we want to do about it?

I want to thank my friends for coming down here this afternoon. I know this is hard on the Senate. We are going to probably be here a very long time. But the fact is that people depend on us, and I am proud to stand with them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

OUR COUNTRY'S TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I have come to the floor to discuss the need to strengthen the transportation system of our country, our roads, our highways, our bridges—our transportation system. A long time ago, the question was asked: What is the role of government? If you ask 500 people, you probably will not get 100 different answers, but you will get a lot of different answers.

Abraham Lincoln was once asked: What is the role of government? This is what he said: The role of the govern-

ment is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves. Let me say that again. The role of government is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves.

Sometimes I go to schools and young students ask me: What do you do? The kids in elementary schools, third, fourth, fifth graders say: What do you do?

I tell them I am a United States Senator.

They say: What do you do?

I tell them I help make the rules for our country. We call them laws. I do that with 99 other Senators, 435 Representatives, the President, and the Vice President.

They say: Well, what else do you do?

I tell them I help people. I help people. The best way to help somebody is to make sure they have a job—to make sure they have a job.

I had the privilege of being Governor of Delaware for 8 years. I am told that in those 8 years, more jobs were created in Delaware than any 8 years in Delaware history. I did not create one of them.

We have seen in the last 6-plus years in this country some 12 million jobs created. I did not create one of them. My colleagues did not create those jobs. The President and the Vice President did not create those jobs.

What we are responsible for doing here is to create a nurturing environment for job creation, access to capital—to money—for businesses that need to raise money, a world-class workforce, public safety, clean environment, public health, a Tax Code that is fair and reasonable, regulations that embody common sense and reflect common sense.

We actually have, believe it or not, on each of our desks on the floor, a book. It is called the "Senate Manual." We do not look at it that often, but if you go to one of the sections about two-thirds of the way through the book, you will find the Constitution. The Constitution lays out who is responsible for what generally in our country, for different responsibilities that do fall on government.

There is a section in the Constitution—I am not going to read it, but Senator JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma has oftentimes referred to it—where it talks about the obligation and responsibility of the Federal Government to post roads—post roads. For years, that has been read and interpreted to mean to build some roads, some highways, and some bridges.

As time goes by, we have more and more people to build transit systems as well. As it turns out, as we go along in time—after being a country for almost 225 years or so, one of the most important things that we do in creating a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation is to make sure our country has transportation systems—roads, highways, bridges, transit

systems—that are worthy of this great Nation that we are.

As a former Governor—as I like to say, a recovering Governor—but as a former Governor, I have seen the impact roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems have on the economic growth and success in my State, the region in which we live, and across this country. It is how we move people. It is how we move goods. It is the key to an efficient and growing economy.

For more than a decade, however, we have faced funding shortfalls for the Federal highway trust fund. This stop-and-go funding and lack of uncertainty has undermined—has undermined—the potential for economic growth in America for years. That has to stop.

In fact, since 2008, we had to transfer nearly \$65 billion out of the general fund—nearly \$65 billion out of the general fund—which is far from running a surplus, to patch holes in the highway trust fund.

I like to use the example of the glasses. We have glasses here that the pages are nice enough to fill with water and to bring for us from time to time. I would like for this glass to be the Federal highway trust fund. It is empty. There is another glass here. This is the general fund of the United States. It is empty. We have another glass over here that is full. It is full. When the general fund is empty and the transportation fund, the highway fund are empty, what we do is we go to this glass over here and say: How about some water? How about some money?

We borrow money all over the world—all over the world. One of the places we borrow a lot of it is China. When the Chinese lend us money, they do not want to be bothered when we feel they may have been manipulating their currency.

They will say to us: We thought you wanted to borrow money, so leave us alone on currency manipulation. They may say: Leave us alone when it comes to taking unfair advantage in terms of trade. When the Chinese are pushing around the Vietnamese in the Philippines in the South China Sea—where I used to fly as a flight officer—they would say: You cannot do that.

And the Chinese might respond: Well, we thought you wanted to borrow our money.

We find ourselves in a very difficult position to be obligated to a lender that is doing things that we think are inappropriate or wrong.

Unfortunately, with the example like the one I have just given you, this actually does happen.

We have not had a transportation bill that lasts for more than 2 years for, I think, now 7 years. It used to be commonplace that every 6 years we would pass a fund, a transportation bill, for our country. We call it the highway bill, but it was for roads, highways, and for transit systems—every 6 years, almost like clockwork.

The money provided by the Federal Government provides roughly one-half

of all the money that is spent in the State highway budget, State highway transportation budget. Half of that money is Federal money appropriated by the Congress and approved by the President.

Why we have not had a transportation bill that lasted for more than 2 years, since 2008—we have passed some short-term funding provisions and authorization provisions for transportation that lasts as little as a few days—a few days. This undercuts Governors and undercuts mayors around the country. It prevents them from making long-term investments in critical transportation projects.

Let me give a good example. State Route 1 Delaware runs from I-95 to the north, north-south, right past Dover, our State capital, passing Dover Air Force Base, and heads on down to the southern part of our State, where we raise more chickens and soybeans in Sussex County, DE, than any other county in America. It is a county that has more five-star beaches than anywhere else in America.

When I had the privilege of being Governor of Delaware, we actually built, modernized, and expanded State Route 1. We replaced about 40 traffic lights with a four- or five- or six-lane limited access highway that cuts not in half but greatly eliminates bottlenecks and expedites the flow of traffic in my State. It took over a decade—maybe a dozen years—from start to finish.

Why did it take that long? It is because these projects need some things. You have to take some time to plan the project. You have to take some time to fund the project. You have to take time to contract the project through competitive bids. You have to get the permits for the project. Sometimes there is litigation to work through. It is part of what has to be done to build a major road, highway or bridge in a State. It does not take just a few weeks to do this. It does not take just a few months to do this. It can take years.

In the case of State Route 1—in a little State—it took years, roughly a dozen of them. And without the certainty in the future that the Federal funding will be there for a project that is almost impossible to do it well and, frankly, without that kind of certainty, it is really expensive to do these projects. Stop-and-go. “Stop-and-go” means stop and pay lot more money for the projects we are trying to build.

Yet even though we know our States, our counties, our cities, and our businesses are counting on us in this body to do our jobs, we let them down time and time again. What is worse is that Congress has known about this problem for just about a decade—for almost a decade.

It was in 2005 that Congress included provisions in transportation legislation to create not one but two blue ribbon commissions. For what purpose? Will it help us to figure out how to pay for

highways, bridges, and transit systems which we are not smart enough to figure this out? Why don't we put together some commissions and let the experts come in and they can help us out? We received the reports and the recommendations. We just never acted on them.

In 2008, these two Commissions delivered reports summarizing the advice of countless experts and giving us a roadmap to fixing the problems for good. Among all of their recommendations, one idea was stressed above all the rest: gradually raise transportation user fees and then index them to inflation going forward.

Despite understanding the problem and the smartest solutions for nearly a decade, we have only shirked our responsibility to agree on a solution again and again.

Rather than take advantage of those blue ribbon ideas, we have continued to kick the can down the road, continued to avoid doing what voters sent us here to do; that is, to make decisions, tough decisions, in the best interests of our country.

I stand here today to say it is high time we finally take care of business and do the job the American people sent us here to do.

My concern about this issue should come as no surprise to any of my colleagues. For years I have been outspoken about my desire to fully fund a multiyear transportation bill.

Government does have a clear role in ensuring that our country has modern, high-quality roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems. That is why the Framers of our Constitution had the good sense to as much as say so in that Constitution. Unfortunately, it seems to me that our courage and willingness to fulfill this responsibility continues to escape us. Instead, we avoid tough choices and simply do things such as smooth pensions or steal Customs fees. Sometimes we will steal Customs fees that are not due for maybe 6, 7, 8 years into the future, and we steal that future money and use it to pay for a couple of months' worth of road, highway, and bridge construction today. We borrow mine safety funds. We apply other bandaids as well.

The standard justification for each of these short-term patches has been that we need just a little more time to work out the details of a long-term plan. Just give us a little more time, and we will work this out. But, as usual, during the 10 months we gave ourselves when we passed the last short-term extension, which, as I recall, was early last August—the 12th time we have done this in 6 years, in case anyone has lost count—we have come no closer to a solution.

The Washington Post last summer may have put it best, and here is what they said: “Congress doesn't need more time, Congress needs more spine.”

Albert Einstein once said that the definition of insanity is doing something over and over again and expecting a different result. Today, I am asking our colleagues to join me and others to help stop this insanity. If we work together, I know we can find a way to invest in the 21st-century transportation system our States, our cities, and our businesses deserve and need in order to compete in a global marketplace. In an effort to do just that, Senator BOXER and I have introduced a measure that would at least get us started, taking a constructive step that would align the expiration of transportation programs with the funding available in the highway trust fund.

What we have right now is that at the end of this month, the authorization for spending Federal money for these roads, highways, bridges, and transit projects—the authorizations to spend that money expires, effectively stopping the use of Federal money for these purposes at the end of this month. We can't let that happen.

The authorization ends at, we will say right here, the end of May, in about 10 days. Meanwhile, the actual funds in the transportation trust fund, the highway trust fund, are good until the end of July. So the legislation Senator BOXER has joined me in introducing says: At least, if we do nothing else, let's align the end of the authorization—now May 31—to the end of the funding so that we can at least continue the work that is being done in States across the country in the meantime. If we work together, I know we can find a way forward.

We have introduced this legislation, and this adjustment will keep the Congress from putting this issue, we hope, on the back burner yet again.

We hope this will increase the likelihood that we can finally sit down and come to a long-term solution not this fall, not next year, but this summer. I know there are some who say: Well, let's just push this off until December. We have done that before and we can do that again. I just say to my friends, we have a way of—we are getting to the elections. We are getting into the election cycle for President later this year. Maybe there are some who feel that will be helpful to us in finding a way to come together and funding a transportation project. I would beg to differ. I think if we don't get it done sooner rather than later, if we don't make those tough decisions now, we are not going to make them when the caucuses are gathered in Iowa and the primary voters are starting to get riled up in New Hampshire and South Carolina. That is not going to help us do our jobs.

There is a friend of mine who likes to talk about stopgap funding and the need to make a long-term commitment to America's growth and success. He says it is something like what we do now. It is something like taking a road trip—maybe a summer road trip across

the country—stopping to fill up our cars, our trucks, our minivans with gas 1 gallon at a time. Instead of filling up, we stop at a gas station and we get 1 gallon, and then we go down the road and a little while later we stop at another gas station and we buy another gallon. It is wasteful. It wastes time. It wastes money. It is no way to take a trip across the country with your family, and I can assure my colleagues it is no way to build a transportation system for a world-class power—America.

In any event, as I said earlier, I took two or three ideas away from the elections last year. No. 1, Americans want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get things done; and No. 3, they want us to do everything we can to enhance and strengthen our economic recovery.

Finally finding an agreement on a way to pass a fully funded 6-year transportation bill would help us do all three. We would demonstrate that we can work together. We would demonstrate that we can get things done for States and cities and counties across America. No. 3, we really would strengthen our economic recovery. We wouldn't just put 600,000 or 700,000 people to work across America building roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems; we would do a lot more than that. That is important. A lot of jobs need to be filled, and a lot of people would love to have those jobs.

As it turns out, the McKinsey Global Institute recently reported that making a major effort to repair and improve our roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems could add about 1.5 percent to our annual GDP growth and create at least 1.8 million jobs. Let me say that again. Making a major effort to repair and improve our roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems could add about 1.5 percent to annual GDP growth. Keep in mind that GDP growth I think in the last quarter was only about 1 percent. This kind of investment could add another 1.5 percent to annual GDP growth and create almost 2 million jobs.

By failing to pass a long-term transportation bill, we are sacrificing this potential growth and job creation. It is a little bit like leaving money on a table—in this case, a lot of it on a table.

The Federal Government shares the responsibility with State governments to make investments in their aging infrastructure. As I said earlier, the Federal Government—when States spend money on roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems, whether it is in New Hampshire or Delaware, roughly half of that money is coming from the Federal Government. Our States are counting on us to be a partner in funding our transportation systems that the families and businesses we represent count on every day. When a Federal policy fails to plan for the future, we leave these people in the lurch.

The highway trust fund has several dedicated revenue streams in the form

of various user fees, as we know. These fees haven't been adjusted in over two decades. During that time, the purchasing power of transportation has nearly been cut in half. There have been increases in the price of concrete, asphalt, steel, and labor. The 18.3-cent Federal gas tax that we set up in 1993 is now worth less than a dime. The 24-cent diesel tax is worth less than 15 cents.

The Congressional Budget Office put together the chart here on my left that shows the growing difference between the highway trust fund, the money we put out for transportation projects, and the money we take in from user fees. I would say we were doing reasonably good from 1998 to 2014. Every 6 years, we see it go up and then it drops down, and then it goes up and then it drops down. That is a 6-year transportation authorization bill.

Look what happened starting this year.

I might add that over the last several years, a lot of this money was just transferred out of the general fund, not money we actually raised. Then we borrowed most of that money from around the world.

But we get to the year 2015, and look what happens. At the end of the year, every year up through 2025, this will be the shortfall. I think it adds up to about \$140 billion by 2020. One does not have to be an accountant to know we have a problem when what we are spending outpaces what we collect more and more each year.

We need to find a long-term solution that we can agree on to fix this problem, and we need to do it this summer. We don't need to do it this fall. We don't need to do it next winter. We need to do it this summer. Again, I talked about kicking the can into a Presidential election year. If we don't do it this summer, my fear is we won't do it at all—at least not a long-term bill.

Many of my colleagues have said we must wait until we can enact comprehensive tax reform that creates revenues to solve this problem. As a strong supporter of tax reform, I hope we can find a way to reform our Tax Code, find a way to generate some revenues that can be used to invest in the country's roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems. As I understand, this idea has support from not only President Obama but also from the House Ways and Means Committee Chairman PAUL RYAN, and that is encouraging.

One thing I know for sure is that this idea is a lot better than kicking the can down the road. Let's be honest—we have been talking about tax reform for years. It is one of the most complicated problems Congress is facing. We can't just wait around letting our highways and transit systems that people count on deteriorate while we negotiate the incredibly tough decisions surrounding tax reform efforts. Furthermore, tax reform only offers one-time revenues that won't fix the long-term problem with the highway trust fund.

I believe we have to have a viable backup plan in case a bipartisan deal on tax reform continues to elude the Congress. That is why I talked to literally a dozen Members of the House and the Senate from both parties and I asked them to share with me their most thoughtful ideas of what I hope could become an “all of the above” transportation funding proposal that we expect to unveil at the beginning of next month. I urge any of my colleagues with serious thoughts on how to shore up the highway trust fund to bring us their ideas and join this effort because I hope to present such a plan, as I said earlier, very soon and to make sure that we don’t once again kick this can down the road. There is time to act. It is not next year. It is not around Christmastime. It is this summer.

Gas prices this Memorial Day weekend will be lower than any Memorial Day in recent memory and are likely to stay that way for at least a while longer. The prediction is that they are actually going to start dropping again as we move into summer.

There is an amazing coalition of stakeholders from all parts of the community—frankly, all parts of our country geographically—and throughout the business sector and our government as well, and they support a long-term transportation bill. They are businesses, labor groups, construction companies, transits, retail businesses, manufacturing businesses, and a lot of American families. Their message to us is the same: It is time to do the right thing. It is time for us to do our jobs. It is time for us to give America the roads, the highways, the bridges, and transit systems that we can be proud of and that will help our Nation to continue to grow and to be great.

Mr. President, thank you so much.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY).

The Senator from New Hampshire.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a very important issue to my State of New Hampshire, and that is American trade and our ability to create more jobs in New Hampshire and in the United States of America by giving our businesses the opportunity to sell to consumers around the world since our businesses are creating the very best products and technology, and their ability to sell to those around the world is going to create more jobs in New Hampshire and in this country.

I also wish to speak about an important financing mechanism to businesses in New Hampshire and to businesses in this country, and that is the Export-Import Bank.

When traveling throughout New Hampshire and meeting with businesses both small and large, what I hear most often is this: In Washington, please make it easier, in terms of the

regulatory environment and the tax environment, for us to do what we do best, and that is create jobs and put people to work. I have also heard we want more opportunities to sell what we produce to other countries in the world, and we also want opportunities to make sure financing is available to increase opportunities for New Hampshire businesses to export to other countries around the world.

An important tool for New Hampshire businesses is the Export-Import Bank, which is set to expire next month, at the end of June, and that is why getting the bill pending on the floor is important. I fought to ensure that there is a way forward to secure a path for a vote on the Export-Import Bank reauthorization before it expires at the end of June.

I thank our leader for committing to allow us an opportunity to extend this important financing mechanism to businesses in New Hampshire to ensure that mechanism is still available and that those New Hampshire jobs continue and that we can continue to grow our economy.

In New Hampshire, the Export-Import Bank supports \$416 million in exports and has helped 36 New Hampshire businesses over the last 7 years. Its continued existence is not only important to the Granite State economy, but it translates to over 2,300 jobs that are supported by the opportunity to have financing available through the Export-Import Bank to New Hampshire.

I met with New Hampshire exporters from around the State who have been able to grow their businesses and create more jobs by utilizing the Ex-Im financing to export goods and services overseas. In fact, in December I hosted a roundtable in New Hampshire at the Seaport International Forest Products in Noshua. In the past, they have been able to use Export-Import financing. They were gracious enough to hold a roundtable when Fred Hopper, the head of the Export-Import Bank, came to New Hampshire and met with businesses in New Hampshire to allow them to give him feedback as to how the Bank was working and how important it was to their ability to obtain this financing and expand their exports overseas. In fact, one of the participants in that roundtable, Jerry Boyle, who is the leader of Boyle Energy and Technology Services in Concord, explained how he grew his business 75 percent in the past few years because of the opportunity to use Ex-Im financing.

Make no mistake—failure to renew the Bank’s charter would cause us to lose jobs in New Hampshire and lose jobs in this country and would hurt the economy at a time when we should be focusing on making it easier for businesses to create jobs and making sure our businesses have opportunity and access to markets overseas to create more American trade.

I will continue to push this body to reauthorize Ex-Im so that New Hampshire businesses can continue to have

access to this financing, can continue to grow their opportunities to create more jobs in New Hampshire by using this financing and to sell their goods and services overseas to create jobs.

I want to address the critics of this Bank. I look at this and I wonder—we are competing in a global economy, and so many of our competitors are actually offering even greater financing mechanisms for their businesses. So without this opportunity for our businesses, we would be putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage. In fact, the Ex-Im Bank actually has a lower default rate than commercial loans and returns money to the Treasury.

If someone asked me about the Ex-Im Bank, I would tell them that it creates American jobs and returns money to the Treasury to help pay down our debt. If every Federal agency were asked that question, that would be an easy question to answer, wouldn’t it? We would probably be a lot farther along in dealing with our \$18 trillion in debt.

To me, this is a program that allows us to create more New Hampshire jobs and more American jobs. We have to get this done. I am glad we have a commitment to have a vote on it in this body to allow us to reauthorize it before it expires. Again, it returns money to the Treasury and creates American jobs. Imagine if we could say that about every Federal program.

I wish to talk about another issue that is very important to jobs in New Hampshire, and that is trade promotion authority, which we are currently debating and which is pending on the Senate floor. This will have a real impact on New Hampshire’s economy and create thousands of jobs in my State.

In 2014, New Hampshire exported \$4.4 billion worth of goods and services and exports and supported about 23,000 good-paying New Hampshire jobs. Over the past decade, we have seen Granite State exports increase by 175 percent. As a testament to America’s entrepreneurial spirit, almost 90 percent of New Hampshire’s exporters are small or medium-sized businesses.

Last week, I had the opportunity to visit Mercury Systems, which designs and builds defense and commercial electronics in Hudson, NH. Since opening in Hudson in 2014, Mercury Systems has more than doubled its workforce from 70 employees to now 170 employees—thanks in part to their opportunity to export what they manufacture.

In April, I visited Corfin Industries in Salem. Corfin provides robotic processing services that are used by the defense, medical, and telecommunication industries. Corfin relies on exports and access to international markets, which has helped to create 22 new jobs in New Hampshire, and now they see a growing portion of their sales going to exports—American trade creating jobs.

There are many other important companies in New Hampshire that support trade promotion authority, and

they view this as an opportunity to create more Granite-State jobs, including companies such as BAE Systems in Nashua; Bosch Thermotechnology in Londonderry; Elbit Systems in Merrimack; Globe Manufacturing Company in Pittsfield; General Electric in Hooksett; Goss International Americas in Durham; Intel Corporation, which also has a facility in Merrimack; Medtronic in Portsmouth; and New Hampshire Ball Bearings in Lanconia. In fact, I had a chance to visit New Hampshire Ball Bearings and to talk to them about the importance of not only Ex-Im financing—as a supplier, this is important to them—but also the importance, obviously, of trade. Also, Osram Sylvania in Manchester, Hillsboro, and Exeter; Polartec in Hudson; Texas Instruments has a facility in Manchester; and Velcro USA is in Manchester. These are just a few examples of the many Granite State companies that depend on American trade and an opportunity to sell the great products they produce overseas.

Here is what I have heard from my constituents in New Hampshire about the pending bill on the floor when it comes to creating good-paying jobs in New Hampshire.

Tony Giunta, a city counselor for Franklin's Ward 1, wrote to me and said:

Our community is working diligently to boost its economic development. Our priority is jobs and attracting new businesses to our city. It is in that regard I am writing to ask for support on the pending trade vote in the U.S. Senate . . . Our President needs the flexibility to handle the details and present a full plan to Congress for final approval.

That precise system has worked for many years and I believe it should be extended for another 5 years. . . . The Wall Street Journal recently reported that our trade deficit rose to its highest level in nearly six and a half years and the trend line is headed in the wrong direction. We need to do all we can to boost free trade in this country.

Our state's economy depends on it. My city's future depends on it as well. . . . Considering nearly one-quarter of our workforce provides goods and services that are exported abroad means this proposal will have a tremendous impact on our state's economy.

Emily Heisig is senior vice president of the New England Council. This council is a very important council for employers in New England and in New Hampshire.

She wrote:

While interstate commerce among the states remains a significant avenue for business prosperity, The New England Council believes that foreign markets must be cultivated to tap into the buying power of this vast and ever-burgeoning consumer base. Indeed, across New England, more than 24,000 companies export to foreign markets, and in 2014, that supported nearly 265,000 export-related jobs for our region. The value of goods exported from New England last year was \$56.5 billion.

Jim Roche is president of the New Hampshire Business and Industry Association. The New Hampshire Business and Industry Association is a very important group in New Hampshire and

brings New Hampshire businesses together. He wrote to me and said:

Nearly 40 million American jobs depend on trade. This is especially true for New Hampshire where trade plays a big role in our economy. Trade supports more than 179,000 jobs in the state and our exports of goods and services last year reached nearly \$7 billion. Trade is especially important for New Hampshire's small businesses, more than 2,200 of which are exporters.

Pete McNamara, president of the New Hampshire Automobile Dealers Association, recently visited me in Washington. He also wrote to me and said:

The New Hampshire Auto Dealers Association supports free trade. In this competitive world market, the U.S. needs the TPA. America drives the world economy, but outside our borders are markets that represent 80% of the world's purchasing power, 92% of its economic growth, and 95% of its consumers.

Texas Instruments has a very good facility in Manchester. I had a chance to visit that facility and meet the workers in these great-paying jobs and also jobs that are very important, with expertise on technology.

Mark Gary is the vice president and manager of the Manchester site. He said:

Texas Instruments strongly supports TPA-2015 and urges its swift approval. Renewing TPA provides an opportunity for American companies and their workers to secure 21st century rules to govern international trade. Innovation is the Granite State's greatest asset. New Hampshire's high-tech companies, startups, and universities are generating breakthrough innovations and technologies. High tech companies now represent 8.6% of the state's economy and pay 92% more than average wages. TI Manchester is the heart of the largest power management unit . . . TPA is critical for TI to secure market access, maintain a competitive global supply chain, and support our high value-added design jobs here in New Hampshire.

I also heard from Sylvia Linares, director of engineering and New Hampshire site leader at Intel in Merrimack, NH, which is also very important for New Hampshire jobs.

Passing TPA will arm U.S. trade negotiators with a clear set of principles and objectives that support our nation's economic, social, and technological interests. These rules have never been more important. In Merrimack, NH we have a very specialized design team that stands to benefit from these rules—rules around intellectual property theft, forced technology transfer and compromised encryption standards. At Intel, we conduct roughly three quarters of Intel's advanced manufacturing and R&D right in the U.S., investments which are supported by three quarters of our revenue from sales elsewhere in the world. We are proud to be part of the New Hampshire tech community by spending more than \$5 million annually with approximately 50 suppliers in the state.

With 95 percent of the world's customers and 80 percent of the world's purchasing power outside of the United States, we have to do everything we can to ensure that we have more American trade. American trade that supports jobs here allows us to sell the great work we and our workers do here and the products we produce overseas.

That is why the bill pending on the floor is so important to creating more American jobs.

Since the 1930s, nearly every President has used trade promotion authority to negotiate foreign trade policy. This bill contains the clearest outline of trade priorities in our Nation's history. It includes almost 150 ambitious, high-standard negotiating objectives that will direct our trade negotiators to break down barriers that hurt American businesses and will allow American businesses to have more American trade to create jobs here.

The bottom line is that trade promotion authority will ensure that in the Granite State, New Hampshire businesses can create more jobs. In fact, the estimate in New Hampshire is that if you look at some of the agreements, such as the current transatlantic and transpacific trade negotiations, those could spur international investment in New Hampshire and create an estimated over 8,200 jobs in New Hampshire if the President is able to go forward and negotiate the right agreements that allow us to create American jobs.

So there are two issues that I have talked about. We need to get the Ex-Im Bank reauthorized before it expires so that employers in New Hampshire that have been able to use this financing mechanism and the many suppliers that also support companies outside of New Hampshire but that create New Hampshire jobs can have an opportunity to continue to use this financing to put more people to work in New Hampshire. We also need to pass trade promotion authority that is pending on the floor. If you look at the list of New Hampshire businesses that will benefit from this opportunity to create more New Hampshire jobs and more American jobs in the United States of America, this is something we need to do to strengthen our economy in the Granite State and to strengthen our country to make sure there are more opportunities for people to work in this country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, shown in this picture I have in the Chamber is Christina from Stratford, CT. She is a small business owner, and she has a story that is becoming pretty familiar all across the country. She left a job a couple of years ago that provided for employer-based health care, and she wanted to start her own business in Bridgeport, CT, right next to Stratford. So she stayed insured through COBRA for a period of time until it expired, and then she had to go out into the individual market. She recalls having to fill out a 15-page questionnaire when she was applying for individual coverage. She said it asked about "anything that I had even remotely discussed with my doctor." Unfortunately

for her, some of those things—pre-existing conditions—meant that she was denied health care coverage.

So she had to go into Connecticut's high-risk pool, which meant she was paying \$1,200 per month. Anybody who has started up a small business from scratch knows that can be pretty prohibitive. Her salvation came through the Affordable Care Act. When it went into effect and Connecticut's exchange was established, she was able to find a plan that cost her \$430 per month, which is frankly on the high end of plans but it was much more affordable than the one she had.

She said: "I'm thankful that there was a solution for me to be able to keep my business [and] have affordable health insurance" that can't be taken away.

Similar stories can be told all over the country, but it is not just anecdotes that we have to rely on any longer to talk about the success of the Affordable Care Act.

I know that we are obsessed this week, appropriately so, with the PATRIOT Act, the transportation reauthorization, and the free-trade agreement, or the fast-track agreement. But the Supreme Court is likely upon our return after the Memorial Day recess to rule on one of the most important cases that it has heard during most of our tenures, and that is the *King v. Burwell* case. It is important to spend some time before we break talking about the subject of that case, the Affordable Care Act. Christina's story is miraculous—somebody who was able to start a business and keep that business open because of the Affordable Care Act. But she is one of 16.4 million people all across this country who now have health care because of the Affordable Care Act—most through Federal and State exchanges but some because they were able to stay on their parents' plan until age 26 or are able to access Medicaid.

Last month's Gallup poll showed that the uninsured rate in this country has declined by 35 percent over the course of the last year and a half, or since 2013. That is a remarkable number. We shouldn't hesitate from noting that it is just absolutely exceptional in the history of this country to have a one-third reduction in the number of people who don't have insurance in such a short period of time. The good news is that most of the folks who have insurance are satisfied, just as is Christina. Opponent after opponent of the ACA tells us this is going to be terrible health care and that there is no way the government could have anything to do with a health care plan that people want. Of course, it is not government-run health care. It is subsidized by tax credits from the government, but it is private health care insurance, with the exception of those Medicaid plans.

J.D. Power surveyed thousands of ACA enrollees and found that they like their exchange plans more than people like their nonexchange plans. So

health care on this exchange is more popular than health care off of the exchange.

The good news isn't just about the number of people who have coverage; it is that costs are coming down. For the accountable care organizations, which are an innovation in the Affordable Care Act to try to build big integrated systems of care, the pilot program just came in with their savings numbers, and \$384 million were saved just on this one innovation alone. That is \$300 per patient. That is a big deal because it speaks to a larger trend line in which we are for the first time in a very long time able to control health care costs. On an annual basis, last year we saw the lowest increase in medical costs, the lowest medical inflation number in a generation.

But costs are coming down in part because of things that we put into place through the Affordable Care Act. My colleague Senator BARRASSO was down here yesterday with a wonderful chart about Connecticut. I appreciate his giving Connecticut a little bit of extra publicity, but his speech really was a wonderful advertisement for the Affordable Care Act. He noted that several insurers in Connecticut just came out with rate increase requests, and he had the numbers up there. They were 8 percent and 10 percent. They were substantial increases. They were not unfamiliar, because prior to the Affordable Care Act, that is what individuals and businesses were facing every single year. They were double-digit increases.

The rate increases that Senator BARRASSO was referring to were completely in line with what those same insurance plans requested last year in Connecticut. Last year Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield requested a 12-percent rate increase. ConnectiCare requested 12 percent. Because of the Affordable Care Act, which allows States to do reviews and amendments to those rate increases, Anthem's request last year went from 12 percent to 0 percent, and ConnectiCare's request went from 12 percent to 3 percent. We had in Connecticut one of the lowest increases in health care premiums on record because of the Affordable Care Act.

So it is right that these health insurers are requesting big rate increases. But now, because of the law we passed, they don't get those rate increases in States such as Connecticut. They actually have their numbers vetted. They have their actuarial analysis reviewed, and they get a better number to the benefit of my constituents.

But this Supreme Court case that is going to come up is important because it puts millions of Americans at risk for losing many of the protections that I just talked about. It basically says that the Affordable Care Act was designed in a way to only provide these subsidies to help people get insurance on State-based exchanges, and if they were on a Federal exchange, they, by design, weren't supposed to get these subsidies.

Well, a lot of people talk about what the intent of the law is, but you don't even have to get into the intent of the law. On its face the text of the Affordable Care Act is absolutely clear, because, yes, there is a reference—one line to the fact that subsidies will flow to the State exchanges. But the plaintiffs' case completely ignores another section of the Affordable Care Act which gives the Secretary the power to establish exchanges in States that don't do it themselves. That is what has happened by the substitution of Federal exchanges for State exchanges. And, of course, the text of the bill just does not work if you believe the plaintiffs' analysis. The plaintiffs say this is supposed to be a penalty. If you didn't set up a State exchange, we are penalizing your constituents by withholding subsidies. Well, there is not a single line in the Affordable Care Act that suggests that this is a penalty. And there is the fact that the Supreme Court has said that if you want to do that, you have to make it explicit and you can't have guesswork involved as to the carrot-and-stick approach afforded to a State.

Doug Elmendorf, who was the head of CBO at the time said:

I could remember no occasion on which anybody asked why we were expecting subsidies to be paid in all states regardless of whether they established their exchanges or not. And if people had not had this common understanding about what the law was going to do at the time, I'm sure we would have had a lot of questions about that aspect of our estimates.

Finally, the bill doesn't work on its face if you believe the plaintiffs' argument. Why? Because the insurance reforms are national. And yet the subsidies, according to the plaintiffs, are only for States that established their own exchanges. Well, the insurance reforms don't work if everybody doesn't have insurance in those States. You can't say that folks who have pre-existing conditions can't be discriminated against if people in those States don't all have insurance. That actuarially doesn't work. So the whole bill falls apart if you believe the plaintiffs' case.

I am, frankly, totally confident that the Supreme Court is going to find in favor of the government because there is no other way to read the Affordable Care Act other than to believe that subsidies go to both State and Federal exchanges. It is plain on the face of the statute, but certainly you have to get to it in the intent as well.

We are starting to see that Republicans are thinking they are going to need to have an answer if—in the unlikely case, as I believe—the Supreme Court decides in favor of the plaintiffs.

But this is a pretty good summary of what the Republicans' plan is to respond to *King v. Burwell*. The Republicans' plan, if *King v. Burwell* goes in favor of the plaintiffs, is essentially a shrug of the shoulders.

The predominant bill on the Republican side is offered by my friend Senator JOHNSON from Wisconsin. He

claims that this bill is going to fix the problems in the Affordable Care Act if the King v. Burwell decision is decided in favor of the plaintiffs. But it is nothing except for just another attempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act. It is disguised as a way to address King v. Burwell, but it is simply an effort to repeal the law. You don't have to read too deeply in the bill to figure that out. It preserves the subsidies for about a year and a half, but after that period of time it ends subsidies in the Federal exchanges and then it also ends subsidies in the State exchanges.

Let me say that again. The Johnson bill doesn't just end the subsidies that the Court might rule unconstitutional; it also ends the subsidies in the exchanges that the Court won't rule as unconstitutional if King v. Burwell is decided in favor of the plaintiffs. Thus, it is a repeal of the bill. It goes well above and beyond what would be necessary to address an adverse decision.

It then goes even further. The Johnson bill then repeals the individual mandate. It repeals the employer mandate, and when you do that, the insurance reforms fall apart. Even Senator CRUZ on the floor during his filibuster conceded that you can't protect people with preexisting conditions unless you also require people to get insurance.

Lastly, the Johnson bill ends the essential-benefits packages. So this guarantee, that if you buy insurance you are going to get a basic floor of services, is no longer. The Republican response to King v. Burwell is simply to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and I hope we never get to the point where we have to debate how we address an adverse decision in the King v. Burwell decision, but this is a nonstarter. Everyone inside and outside of this building should understand that. I don't think it is coincidence at all that over 30 cosponsors of the Johnson bill also support repealing the Affordable Care Act.

One cannot deny that it is working. From the New York Times to the Washington Post to the Wall Street Journal, people understand that the Affordable Care Act is changing people's lives—16 million people with insurance, health care costs stabilized for the first time in many of our lifetimes, and quality getting better. The Affordable Care Act works, and I hope that our colleagues will come together, no matter the decision in King v. Burwell, to make sure that it continues to work for Americans all over this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5 p.m.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1243

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I want to talk about trade for a minute. Let me start by saying that I believe in free trade. I strongly support swift renewal of the trade promotion authority we are considering today. We all know the benefits of increased market access for U.S. goods and services are good for American consumers and businesses.

Renewal of trade promotion authority will pave the way for future free-trade agreements between the United States and many other nations. Countries around the world are not standing still on trade, and we cannot afford to sit idly by while they move ahead and engage with each other. History has shown that without trade promotion authority, there is virtually no chance that the United States will successfully reach agreement to lower trade barriers with other countries. We have to have this authority.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in these deliberations, with a shared goal of making sure the trade legislation we are considering today ends up on the President's desk. Toward that goal, I want to raise an amendment I filed that is currently pending.

The proposal we are now debating will renew trade promotion authority for 6 years, but it will also renew trade adjustment assistance. This program will be expanded as well. The Flake amendment No. 1243 will strike the trade adjustment assistance title, or TAA, in its entirety from this package. It is unfortunate that Congress has grown accustomed to tying legislation that expands trade opening for U.S. businesses with this costly trade adjustment assistance.

I reject the notion that these trade-offs are necessary. When Congress takes steps to embrace trade liberalization, it is a responsible reflection of the changing realities in the global marketplace. Almost 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of our borders. The export of U.S. goods and services has been and will continue to be a vital part of our economy. Adjusting and modernizing U.S. trade priorities to increase economic opportunity is a realization that there is a necessary shift in our economy. Changing economic trends and conditions are a recurring part of our country's history. Look no further than the emergence of digital technology to see a familiar example. But it is only in the case of trade policy changes that the Federal Government is expected to layer on additional benefits for impacts to the workforce.

When you look at this economy and you look at how we have grown and if you look at the shifts in the economy from the industrial age onward, there have been shifts and there have been dislocations, but this is the only area where we say: All right, we are going to try to account for that with adjustment assistance beyond what we already have with the Federal Government.

Now taxpayers can at least breathe a sigh of relief that an amendment offered earlier this week that would have dramatically increased the program's authorized funding, this TAA funding, was handily defeated.

If this program is approved, we can expect to see \$450 million a year spent on training, employment, case management services and job search and relocation allowances alone. In fact, all told, TAA reauthorization will likely cost the U.S. taxpayers about \$1.8 billion.

TAA benefits were expanded in the 2009 stimulus bill. Those expanded benefits were, for the most part, continued from 2011 through 2014. Now, this reauthorization will restore much of that benefit expansion from the manufacturing sector to the service sector and will cover any jobs moved overseas, not just those related to countries with which we have free-trade agreements—this is despite the application criteria for Federal adjustment assistance having been notoriously lax, most notably when employees who were laid off after the Solyndra Federal loan guarantee debacle were awarded TAA benefits.

To be clear, it is not as if those who claim to need trade adjustment assistance are somehow turned away from existing Federal unemployment benefits. These trade adjustment allowance benefits provide a weekly payment to those who have already received unemployment insurance benefits. Including unemployment benefits, these payments can last as long as 130 weeks.

Duplication in Federal job-training programs has been highlighted extensively in the past. According to a 2011 Government Accountability Office report, although some of these have been repealed, 79 Federal agencies spent \$18 billion to administer 47 programs in fiscal year 2009. Again, some \$18 billion was spent to administer 47 programs in fiscal year 2009.

Supporters of trade adjustment assistance claim that the needs of workers impacted by vibrant international trade are somehow special in nature, but when the price tag for all existing and newly authorized training programs and funding reaches into the billions, those arguments wear a bit thin.

There have also been persistent questions related to the program's effectiveness, TAA's effectiveness.

The nonpartisan Congressional Research Service noted that "estimating the impact of the program, for example the differences in employment outcomes of TAA beneficiaries versus otherwise identical workers who did not participate in TAA, is extremely difficult."

A 2012 study by Mathematica Policy Research commissioned by the Department of Labor did a comparison of TAA beneficiaries to those who were not receiving them. They found that after 3 years, TAA recipients actually had lower reemployment rates. However, after 4 years, employment rates for both groups were statistically the

same. So, overall, TAA recipients ended up earning less annually.

At best, the impact of TAA is a multibillion-dollar question mark. At worst, research says it is ineffective and even counterproductive.

While trade adjustment assistance is of dubious value, we certainly know that renewing trade promotion authority is an incredible opportunity for the U.S. economy. It is my fervent hope that Congress will move forward in approving legislation reauthorizing TPA. It is also my hope that one day we can recognize the benefits of trade and the fact that it lifts our economy. I hope we can advance a sound trade policy without these costly adjustment assistance programs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

OBAMACARE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor noting that my friend and colleague from Connecticut was just on the floor talking about the President's health care law. It is interesting that he would do so at a time when we are seeing headline after headline about ObamaCare plan premiums increasing again all over the country.

Remember what the President said. He said: If you like your plan, you can keep your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor.

He said premiums would go down by \$2,500 for a family of four. What we have seen is premiums go up across the country. Now my colleague from Connecticut says—in spite of all the money being spent on the President's health care law, premiums are still going up. In his home State of Connecticut, they are going up, and they are going up across the country.

There is a headline in the Connecticut Mirror: "Insurers seek rate hikes for 2016 ObamaCare plans." That is in Connecticut.

You know, it is interesting. I heard my colleague talking about the upcoming Supreme Court case of King v. Burwell, the implications of that case. He said the Republicans did not have a plan. Where is the President's plan? He is the guy who made this mess. This is the President's law. This is the law the Democrats voted for.

You know, there is that old sign in the Pottery Barn: If you break it, you bought it. The President broke the health care system in this country. If the Supreme Court rules that he has acted illegally—he is the one who made the mess; he is the one who created the problem.

When my colleague from Connecticut says "Where is the Republicans' plan?" I say "Where is the President's plan?" It is interesting. The President does have a plan to protect the insurance companies, but he has no plans to protect the American public, the American taxpayers. He has a built-in plan for the insurance companies so that

when they wrote the policies this year, there was a decision made by the White House that those policies could be canceled by the insurance companies if the Supreme Court ruled that the President acted illegally. Yet, there is no path, no safe path for those American taxpayers who thought they were obeying the law if the court rules the way I believe they should based on the reading of the law.

So of course people around the country are very concerned when they see once again that the insurance they are mandated to buy by President Obama and the Democrats, the insurance they are mandated to buy by the health care law is going to be even more expensive next year than this year.

In Connecticut—the first paragraph of this article: "Insurance companies selling health plans through the state's health insurance exchange are seeking to raise rates next year. . . ."

It goes on to say: "Despite that, the carriers projected increased costs, citing rising claims expenses and a planned reduction in protection against high-cost claims. . . ." Reduction in protection against high-cost claims. Why? Well, it says "from a temporary federal program intended to provide stability for insurers during the initial years of the health law." This was the bailout of the insurance companies that President Obama and the Democrats built into the President's health care law to get them to go along.

It says, "The rate filings are proposals, not actual changes." Proposals, not changes. It says, "The insurance department will now analyze the proposals, accept public comments. . . ." This is the Connecticut Insurance Department. Well, you know, a lot of members of the public in Connecticut filed comments. I have them to share with the Presiding Officer and with our listeners today. These are the constituents of the Senator from Connecticut, who comes here to the floor and says things are working great in Connecticut. These are his constituents who say:

I am barely making ends meet as it is. I was under the understanding that this was to be AFFORDABLE—

With all the letters of "affordable" in capital letters—

—healthcare. So far it has been nothing but a burden.

This is a constituent in Connecticut—"nothing but a burden."

He said:

I was happy with my previous plan. . . .

Weren't so many Americans happy with their previous plan before the President, who told them if they liked it, they could keep it—well, that is why there is so much disappointment out there. And the President's statement was called "the lie of the year."

This person was happy with his previous plan, but it was eliminated as of January 1, 2015. "My health care," he says, "went up \$100 for less coverage."

People are paying more and getting less, and Democrats wonder why this health care law is not popular. All across the country, people are paying more, getting less, and the Democrats are clueless as to why this is so unpopular.

"Please do not allow this increase."

That is just one of the constituents who wrote to the Connecticut Insurance Department, a public comment. Here is another:

Please no rate increase. I cannot afford the insurance now. I pay \$594.00 a month for myself, a 60 year old female in relatively good health. I have a \$5,500 deductible. I cannot afford to have some testing done because I don't have the deductible amount.

But we heard the Senator come to the floor and say all of these people have insurance. This person figures—well, she has insurance, but it is of no value to her with her \$5,500 deductible. She can't afford to have testing because of the deductible. She says:

It is bad enough we have the big security breach and we have to worry about our personal info stolen in the years to come and you now want to increase our rates.

That is what we are seeing happening across the country, that is what we are seeing happening in Connecticut, and that is what the public is telling the Connecticut Insurance Department dealing with these proposed health rate increases.

This is another:

I am writing to you regarding the . . . rate increase filing in particular and the health insurance filings in general. I am an individual buyer who does not qualify for federal subsidies due to my income level. I have been buying my family plan since before the Affordable Care Act has been passed and implemented.

They had insurance and do not qualify for a subsidy. Continuing:

Since then—

Since the Affordable Care Act was passed—

buying a family health plan in CT has become almost financially impossible for me to buy as it has become a real financial burden for me. Currently, I am paying some 22% of my Federal AGI for a high deductible (family deductible of \$11,000) HSA plan.

Now, the Senator from Connecticut may say: Hey, great. This person has insurance, insurance they can't afford and they cannot use because of the deductible.

It says:

As you are certainly well aware before the passing of the Care Act my premium for health care was much more affordable.

Why is it? Well, it is because the President decided he wanted to transfer money from one group to another, and this individual who had insurance that he liked, the family liked, worked for them, they could afford, now cannot afford, cannot use because of the deductible. They are still insured, so I guess the Senator from Connecticut would call that a big win for one of his constituents who is clearly being hurt.

This is another one that has come in from Connecticut:

Are you nuts? This cannot go on. My "affordable" insurance has already increased \$200/mo and now you want more? My income doesn't even increase this much.

Paying the penalty for no insurance is a better option than this.

DO NOT INCREASE! Learn how to live within your means like the rest of us do.

This is what we are seeing. Is this a surprise that this continues to be a very unpopular law. Should it surprise?

It surprises the Democrats, obviously, when they see that in poll after poll, month after month, the health care law is more unpopular than it is popular, and the reason is people don't see it as good deal for them. They feel, in terms of their own health, their own families, their own communities, this health care law has been a burden on them, in their lives, and has impacted them as a family.

There is another one from Connecticut:

The ACA raised our health insurance expense (both premiums and deductibles) by 67% for similar coverage!

Sixty-seven percent for similar coverage. Remember, the President told a lot of people that what they had coverage on wasn't any good. It wasn't good enough for the President—might have been good enough for that family but not good enough for the President.

So they had to buy, for similar coverage, premiums and deductibles up 67%.

Continuing:

Please do not approve this additional increase.

This person says they would be fine with their own policy, but they weren't allowed to keep it because of the health care law.

I could go on and on. It is astonishing what we are hearing from the Connecticut Insurance Department, with a response, when they were asked, and put out the filings of the requests for higher rates. It is just interesting.

Here is one more comment from Southbury, CT:

The alleged purpose of this pool, and the affordable care act—

Alleged purpose. Remember NANCY PELOSI: First, you have to pass it before you get to find out what is in it.

Continuing:

The alleged purpose of this pool, and the affordable care act, was to get and keep health care costs under control. My (subsidized) monthly premium is more than double what I paid before being forced into this pool. . . . If the ACA is a failure, then why am I being penalized?

People all across the country believe they are personally being penalized because of the failure of the Obama health care plan and this administration who chose to, with one party and one party alone, force a very expensive, unworkable, really unaffordable, unmanageable, unexplainable health care system down the throats of the American public.

So we will see what happens when the Supreme Court rules at the end of next month. Secretary of Health and

Human Services Burwell said that the administration has no plan. The President told me personally—and the White House earlier this year—he had no plan to deal with the Supreme Court ruling that says his actions were illegal, and he has no plan to deal with so many people who thought they were following the law, who have been hurt by the law.

But he has a plan to bail out the insurance companies and to protect them because we know where the President is in terms of looking at this. And his proposal, his quintessential piece of legislation—the one named after him—has clearly done a significant amount of damage to families all across the country.

I believe it has harmed the health care system, which has always been the best in the world.

We needed health care reform in the country. We did not need what President Obama forced down the throats of the American people with people across the country saying no.

People knew what they wanted in health care reform. What they knew they wanted was the care they need from a doctor they choose at lower cost, and they have not received that under the President's health care law.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 25, 26, 74, and 107; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; 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; further, that all time in executive session count postcloture on the TPA bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will not object. I am pleased to see some judges finally moving forward.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, we expect some of these votes to be by voice vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. 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. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes.

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

TRADE POLICY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I listened to some of the debate earlier this afternoon—in between the effort to make progress toward getting a fair array of amendments for both sides—about this whole question of secrecy surrounding trade policy. A number of Senators were discussing it, and so I just wanted to take a minute to be very clear that I think they have a very valid point with respect to the secrecy that has long accompanied these trade discussions. I would like to discuss how I made it my paramount reform to make sure we would have a new era of transparency, openness, and accountability in the discussion about making trade policy.

I have always felt that if you believe deeply in international trade—the way I do—and you want more of it, why in the world would you be for all this secrecy? That just makes Americans more cynical about the whole topic and makes them think that in Washington, DC, there is something to hide.

I note my friend and partner in all this, Chairman HATCH, is on the floor, and he will recall when we began our discussions—and they went on really for close to 7 months in our effort to forge a bipartisan package—that I wanted to take a very fresh approach with respect to transparency, and I wanted us to be able to say that for the first time in the history of debating these policies, we would no longer have the country and elected officials in the dark with respect to really what is at issue in these discussions.

So here is a short assessment of what really has changed. Of course, right now we are working on the rules for future trade agreements. We are working on the trade promotion act that sets out the rules for future agreements. Obviously, the first one will involve the Trans-Pacific Partnership—what is known as TPP—and there are a variety of others that are under discussion, particularly one with Europe.

If the Congress—the Senate and the other body—adopts this package that Chairman HATCH and I, in conjunction with Chairman RYAN, have put together over these many months, I think we will have achieved our goal of making sure everybody in the Congress and everybody in the United States who chooses to can have the information they need about trade agreements

before a single vote is cast on the floor of the Senate or on the floor of the other body.

Here is how the reform would work: First, it is required by law—in other words, this isn't something that is discretionary—that these trade agreements, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, would be made public 60 days before the President of the United States signs that agreement. That means if you want to come to a town-hall meeting in Colorado, held by the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate—even before the President signs it—a citizen in Colorado can come with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement—the entire agreement—in their hands and ask questions of the Presiding Officer of the Senate or any one of our colleagues in the Senate and the House.

After that 60-day period of sunshine and exposure, the President can sign it, and then there would be close to 2 additional months—2 additional months—before the voting on the floor of the Senate and the House begins.

So when I heard my colleagues—Senators whom I respect greatly—talk earlier today about secrecy and that secrecy was no good and why couldn't this be changed and why couldn't that be changed, it made me want to come to the floor—and I will do an overview of all of the progressive reforms that have been made to this package; reforms I thought were important for a new era of what I call trade done right—to make sure we corrected the suggestion that somehow everybody is going to be in the dark before the Congress and the country saw voting begin in the Senate and the House.

Chairman HATCH is here, and he remembers all of our negotiations on this point. It is really going to mean—with the 60-day requirement for sunlight before the President signs the agreement and then probably 2 more months after it has been signed, before we start voting—that a citizen can come to a town-hall meeting in Colorado, Utah or any part of the country and have that Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement in their hands in order to be able to ask questions about it.

I certainly think that puts our trade negotiators and everybody else kind of on their toes because they know the American people and the Congress are going to have that document. That is going to start with the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement.

Now, Chairman HATCH and I made a number of other changes. In the future, it would be possible for the discussion of negotiations—summaries of the negotiations—to be made public so people would also have more information about the process as it was going forward. We have lifted a number of the restrictions in terms of Members having access to the materials and staff having access to the materials.

Because the chairman is here, I want to express my thanks to him especially on this point. We spent a lot of time on

a whole host of issues: How you could put the brakes on a flawed agreement. I am glad the chairman can smile about our discussions on that point today, but suffice it to say they were pretty spirited. We had discussions on a host of these topics. I am especially pleased we made these very substantial changes on the issue of sunlight, transparency, openness, and accountability because I think my colleagues—who discussed it on the floor and many others who have been concerned about secrecy in the past with respect to these agreements—when they get a chance to actually see the details that are in the reforms Chairman HATCH, Chairman RYAN, and I put together, are going to see we have made some very dramatic changes.

Now, I think some specific changes here are areas that I would like to outline. I am going to go to the question of major changes in workers' rights and environmental protections because I know that a number of my colleagues, when they talked earlier, were concerned about these issues as well.

Suffice it to say, on workers' rights and environmental protections, if we go back to the 1990s, back to the NAFTA era, these vital priorities basically were just shunted to the side. It would be almost inflationary to say they got short shrift. They basically got no shrift. They just got shunted to the side. They were in unenforceable side deals, which meant that the United States in effect had to take it on blind faith that our partners would live up to their commitments. It was my view that many of my colleagues, particularly on the Democratic side of the aisle, were spot-on in saying that wasn't good enough.

This trade package will say in clear terms that the United States is done allowing labor and environmental protections to be pushed aside and disregarded. Our partners will be required to adopt and maintain core international labor standards. Core international labor standards are going to be required of our trading partners. They will have to adopt them, and they will have to maintain them. That is not something that is to the side and is unenforceable. That is real. It has got teeth.

Also, our partners would be required to adopt what are really common multilateral environmental agreements, and these would be backed by the threat of trade sanctions. So these are major changes that certainly contribute to what I think makes the most progressive approach with respect to trade policy in the future.

And for the first time, the President is directed under this piece of legislation to make sure our trading partners adopt and maintain key laws. That is why, for example, I mentioned labor standards. And here is what those are: freedom of association, the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining, the elimination of all forms of forced or compulsory labor,

the effective abolition of child labor and a prohibition on the worst forms of child labor, and the elimination of discrimination with respect to employment and occupation.

Now, those are the keys with respect to the labor side.

Here are the key protections on the environmental side, which I have again highlighted here at the outset. The bedrock protections here are that there has to be recognition to ensure that there is compliance with the Convention on International Trade and Endangered Species Act, the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Depletes the Ozone Layer, the Protocol on Prevention of Pollution from Ships, the Convention on Wetlands, the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Resources, the Convention on Whaling, and the Tropical Tuna Convention.

This, again, is not stuck in a side deal but is fully enforceable, and not just rearranging inadequate policies of the past, sort of rearranging sinking deck chairs. This is better than anything that has existed before—better than the North American Free Trade Agreement, better than the Central American Free Trade Agreement.

With these changes, our country is saying that we will no longer take it on blind faith that other countries are going to adopt stronger standards for protecting workers and the environment. This is the first time the United States is setting the standard and demanding that trading partners hit that mark. That is very real progress.

I will close with just this point. Many colleagues who have been skeptical about trade agreements always raise the issue about whether trade is somehow going to be a race to the bottom. What I have just described is a concrete way to have a new force for raising standards up and getting the standards up, because my colleagues are right that they have been inadequate in the past.

So whether you are for this bill or not, I hope my colleagues will take a look at the new sunshine provisions, because the American people are not going to be in the dark about what is in a trade agreement before anybody votes on that agreement here in the Senate and the House.

I hope my colleagues will especially look at the new provisions with respect to labor rights and environmental rights, because the day is over when those considerations are going to be shunted to the side. They are going to be front and center, and they are going to have teeth. And instead of a race to the bottom that my colleagues have been concerned about, the United States will be where it always is, where we are at our best—forcing standards up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to personally thank the distinguished

Senator from Oregon for the work he has done on this bill. It couldn't have been done without him. A number of other people on his side have been very contributory and helpful.

We are not there yet, but we are going to work at it. I just have to say how much I have enjoyed working with him on the floor so far. I just hope everything will go smoothly so we can get this bill up and out and get the President what he needs to conclude these negotiations and also especially for our Trade Representative. Mr. Froman has done a very good job, as far as I can see. We will have to see what the TPP is like, but we will all have a chance to look at it for a considerable period of time before we have to vote on anything regarding that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF JILL N. PARRISH TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

NOMINATION OF JOSE ROLANDO OLVERA, JR., TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

NOMINATION OF PATRICIA D. CAHILL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

NOMINATION OF MARK SCARANO TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Jill N. Parrish, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah; Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas; Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020; and Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we are finally voting on the nomination of Jill Parrish to serve as a Federal district judge in the District of Utah and Jose Olvera to serve as a Federal district judge in the Southern District of Texas. Five and a half months into this new Congress, these are just the third and fourth judicial nominees that we will vote to confirm. That is simply unacceptable.

Both of these individuals were nominated last September—more than 8 months ago. After receiving a hearing in January, they were voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote in February. Their nominations have now been on the Executive Calendar for nearly 3 months. There is no good reason why these nominees should have waited this long for a vote. The vacancy Jose Olvera will fill in the Southern District of Texas has been designated a judicial emergency. In fact, he will fill just one of six district court emergency vacancies in the State of Texas, which currently has a total of eight district court vacancies.

The Senate has a duty to fill judicial vacancies no matter which party holds the majority. When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee during the Bush administration, I worked quickly to schedule confirmation hearings for judicial nominees and moved them through the confirmation process without unnecessary delay.

In the 17 months I chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee during President Bush's first 2 years in office, the Senate confirmed 100 Federal circuit and district court judges. I also served as chairman during the last 2 years of the Bush administration and continued to hold regular hearings on judges. We confirmed 68 district and circuit court judges in those last 2 years.

Now, this Republican majority has taken 3 months to schedule a confirmation vote for a single district court judge, and after today's votes only 4 district court judges will have been confirmed this year. In contrast, when the Democrats were in an equivalent position in 2007, the seventh year of the Bush administration, we had confirmed 18 circuit and district court judges after 5 months. That's 18 judges under a Democratic majority compared to 4 under the Republicans.

Nevertheless, the Republican majority continues to make excuses for their continued obstruction and delay on confirming judicial nominees. Their excuse is that the Democratic majority was only able to confirm those 18 judges in 2007 because those nominees were held over from the previous year. What the Republicans failed to note is that half or nine of the judges confirmed in the first 5 months of 2007, were not among those left pending on the Senate Executive Calendar at the end of 2006.

The justifications offered by the Republican majority also miss the bigger picture. The Republican majority is simply holding up judicial nominations

for no good reason. Since the beginning of 2015, the number of circuit and district court vacancies has jumped from 40 to 51 vacancies after today's confirmations. The number of judicial emergencies has doubled, from 12 to now 24 after today's confirmation of Judge Olvera. The Republican majority is failing to govern responsibly and to fill judicial vacancies where they are needed.

It is unfortunate that as we head into Memorial Day recess the Senate Republicans are allowing confirmations votes on only 2 of the 10 noncontroversial judicial nominees pending on the Senate Executive Calendar. There is nothing keeping the Senate from confirming all 10 nominees—nothing, except for the mindset of delay for delay's sake, which is unfortunately the hallmark of the majority's leadership on nominations.

There are nominees that remain pending on the calendar that will fill a vacancy on the Federal Circuit as well as a nominee to serve in the Western District of Missouri who were first nominated last year, had a hearing more than 2 months ago, and were reported favorably out of committee 1 month ago by voice vote.

In addition, there are five U.S. Court of Federal Claims nominees who were first nominated a year ago. These five CFC nominees had hearings 10 months ago, were favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and again earlier this year. We have heard no opposition to any of these nominees, yet they have been in limbo for months and months. The CFC is where our citizens go to seek redress against the Federal Government for monetary claims. The cases this court hears include claims of unlawful takings of private land by the U.S. Government without proper compensation under the 5th Amendment, claims of veterans seeking disability benefits for combat related injuries, and vaccine compensation claims.

We are debating trade policy in the Senate, yet the nomination to fill one of four current vacancies on the U.S. Court of International Trade has sat idle on the Senate Executive Calendar for months. Like the CFC nominees, the CIT nominee had a hearing last year, was favorably reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote last Congress, and again earlier this year.

I urge the Republican leadership to clear the Executive Calendar of the many consensus executive and judicial nominations before we break for the Memorial Day recess. Let us show respect for our co-equal branches of government and put these nominees in place to get to work for the American people.

PARRISH NOMINATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be voting to confirm Justice Jill Parrish's nomination from the Utah Supreme Court to the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah.

Justice Parrish, who currently sits on the Utah Supreme Court, is extraordinarily well-prepared to fill this vacancy, and I hope and expect that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support her nomination.

Justice Parrish is a well-known and highly regarded leader in the Utah legal community, who has served with honor and distinction on the Supreme Court of Utah. Her sharp legal mind, breadth of experience, and impressive judicial temperament prepared her to serve on the Federal bench. I cannot think of a more qualified nominee to fill this vacancy at this time. I support Justice Parrish's nomination in the strongest possible terms, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

As a former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I have long worked to secure confirmations for the most qualified judicial nominees. In fact, I have participated in the appointment of three-quarters of the judges who have ever served on the U.S. District Court for the District Utah. That experience has given me a sense, both personally and professionally, of the kind of individual who will serve well on the Federal bench. That experience gives me every reason to strongly recommend Justice Parrish for this appointment.

Justice Parrish is a talented jurist with an impressive background. After graduating from Yale Law School, she distinguished herself in private practice before appointment to the Utah Supreme Court. During her 30-year service, she has established a record of excellence both before and behind the bench, in both State and Federal courts, in both the private and public sector, and in both trial and appellate courts.

The American Bar Association gave Justice Parrish a "well-qualified" rating—a distinction the organization only awards to experienced nominees with the most remarkable legal ability and the highest reputation for integrity. Federal nominees who receive the "well-qualified" rating are also known for their breadth of experience, their success in the legal community, and their capacity for judicial temperament.

Not only does Justice Parrish match the ABA's requirements, but in every respect, she exceeds them. The United States has the most respected judiciary in the world, and we expect our nominees to the Federal bench to have a record of accomplishment in their chosen area of legal expertise. Justice Parrish is remarkable in that she has not just one but multiple areas of expertise, bringing keen judgment to an appointment that requires a broad range of experiences.

I have every confidence that Justice Parrish will serve admirably as a district judge, just as she has served honorably on the Utah Supreme Court. I might say, in supporting her confirmation, I wish to thank Senator LEE, who is not only my colleague on the Judiciary

Committee but also my partner in representing our great State and in recommending the best candidate for judicial appointment. We agree that Justice Parrish is a well-qualified nominee, and we strongly recommend her swift and unanimous confirmation. I call on my colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to support her nomination.

I know this woman personally. I know her very, very well. All of the qualities I have been speaking about I have personally observed.

I think everybody here knows how seriously I take appointments to the Federal bench. In this particular case, I feel very, very good about this nomination. I ask my colleagues to vote for her.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we will have the opportunity in a few moments to vote on a friend and colleague, Jill Parrish, who serves currently on the Utah Supreme Court. She has been nominated by President Obama to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Utah, replacing Federal Judge Dee Benson, with whom I have clerked.

I can think of no one better to replace Judge Benson than Justice Parrish. She is a friend, she is a respected jurist, and she is a dedicated citizen. She is a friend to all who know her.

I am honored to have the opportunity to vote for her today, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jill N. Parrish, of Utah, to be United States District Judge for the District of Utah?

Mr. LEE. 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 clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Donnelly	Manchin
Ayotte	Durbin	Markey
Baldwin	Enzi	McCain
Barrasso	Ernst	McCaskill
Bennet	Feinstein	McConnell
Blumenthal	Fischer	Menendez
Blunt	Flake	Merkley
Booker	Franken	Mikulski
Boozman	Gardner	Moran
Boxer	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Brown	Graham	Murphy
Burr	Grassley	Murray
Cantwell	Hatch	Nelson
Capito	Heinrich	Paul
Cardin	Heitkamp	Perdue
Carper	Heller	Peters
Casey	Hirono	Portman
Cassidy	Hoeven	Reed
Coats	Inhofe	Reid
Cochran	Isakson	Risch
Collins	Johnson	Roberts
Coons	Kaine	Rounds
Corker	King	Rubio
Cornyn	Kirk	Sanders
Cotton	Klobuchar	Sasse
Crapo	Lankford	Schatz
Cruz	Leahy	Schumer
Daines	Lee	Scott

Sessions	Thune	Warren
Shaheen	Tillis	Whitehouse
Shelby	Toomey	Wicker
Stabenow	Udall	Wyden
Sullivan	Vitter	
Tester	Warner	

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON OLVERA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Jose Rolando Olvera, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas?

Mr. BURR. 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 clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 100, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Ex.]

YEAS—100

Alexander	Flake	Nelson
Ayotte	Franken	Paul
Baldwin	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Gillibrand	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blumenthal	Grassley	Reed
Blunt	Hatch	Reid
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Boxer	Heller	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sanders
Cantwell	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Schatz
Cardin	Johnson	Schumer
Carper	Kaine	Scott
Casey	King	Sessions
Cassidy	Kirk	Shaheen
Coats	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cochran	Lankford	Stabenow
Collins	Leahy	Sullivan
Coons	Lee	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Thune
Cornyn	Markey	Tillis
Cotton	McCain	Toomey
Crapo	McCaskill	Udall
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Donnelly	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	
Fischer	Murray	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am sure everybody is interested in the state of play. Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN are meeting off the floor to try to identify a path forward. We would like to get more amendments pending and set some votes for later this evening.

I hope we will have an update from the bill managers here shortly, but I want to remind everybody, we are going to finish this bill before we leave. We are going to deal with FISA and we are going to deal with highways. There is a path forward, if people want to take it, that could complete all of this work at a reasonable time—probably sometime tomorrow—or we could make it difficult, but the end won't change. So I would just encourage at least some level of cooperation here because

we are doing TPA and we are doing FISA and we are doing highways.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CAHILL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Patricia D. Cahill, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for a term expiring January 31, 2020?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SCARANO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Mark Scarano, of New Hampshire, to be Federal Cochairperson of the Northern Border Regional Commission?

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, free trade is very important to our country and to our future economic prosperity. Anyone who does not believe that is in denial, in my opinion. We live in a global economy and we need to lead on the issue of free trade.

We must not make excuses and cower away from the opportunity in front of us.

The trade promotion authority legislation we are considering is a critical tool for the advancement of our economic interest throughout the world.

This legislation is also proof that Congress and the administration can work together to increase economic opportunity for Americans across all 50 States.

Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN have worked for months to get us to this point. I commend them for this effort and I look forward to working with them to finish this process.

We know that 80 percent of the purchasing power in the world is located outside the United States, along with 95 percent of the world's consumers.

As the middle class expands in regions such as Asia, we have to make sure our businesses and workers have the ability to take advantage of the opportunity that growth presents.

Some estimates predict the middle class in Asia is going to swell from half

a billion people to over 3 billion people in just the next 15 years. Are we going to sit on the sidelines while other countries gain preferential access to those consumers?

Governor Branstad of Iowa, recognizing the benefits of trade, sent a letter to me this week outlining his support for trade promotion authority. The letter was signed by 74 other Iowans who represent businesses and associations that also believe it is critical that Congress pass TPA.

The letter states:

Quite simply, international trade is important to Iowa's businesses, workers and farmers. A vote for leveling the playing field in international trade is a vote for Iowa.

I couldn't agree more with Governor Branstad on that point.

Last year, U.S. exports equaled \$2.35 trillion and supported nearly 12 million jobs. Can any of us imagine our unemployment rate without trade supporting 12 million jobs?

In Iowa alone, 448,000 jobs are dependent on trade, according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. And those jobs pay 18 percent higher wages on average because they are tied to trade.

Americans know the benefits of trade. And we know that American businesses and workers are some of the most efficient and productive in the world. We just need to make sure they have the opportunity to succeed.

That is why we are considering this bill—to expand economic opportunities for American businesses and workers.

Free-trade agreements that lower trade barriers in other countries can do an amazing thing—they can stimulate our economy through exports without requiring additional spending.

During testimony to the Senate Finance Committee, Trade Representative Froman pointed out that the U.S. is already an open marketplace with tariffs that average just 1.6 percent, some of the lowest in the world. Yet at the same time, our companies face very high tariffs in other markets. Some agricultural products face tariffs up to 400 percent, machinery can be up to 50 percent.

We cannot let the status quo on trade, where we have an open marketplace while our businesses face extremely high tariffs, continue. Trade agreements set the stage for long-term opportunity. The citizens in Iowa who may benefit the most from more trade with Pacific rim countries are probably still in school. We can help their future today.

Iowa exported \$15.1 billion in 2014. That represents a 135 percent increase compared to a decade earlier. \$9 billion, or 60 percent of the exports went to TPP countries under current trade rules. Imagine what is possible just in Iowa if we reduce barriers in that region.

Roughly, \$3.6 billion worth of machinery assembled by Iowa workers alone was exported last year. The goal of the legislation before us is to increase that number.

According to the Department of Agriculture, fiscal years 2010–2014 represent the strongest 5 years of agricultural exports in the history of our country. We exported \$675 billion worth of agricultural goods during that period.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership would create more opportunities for our farmers and ranchers in a region of the world that represents 39 percent of global GDP. You heard me correctly, we have a chance to give our farmers, ranchers, and businesses better access to markets that represent over one-third of global GDP.

And while I support and believe in the immense benefits of free trade, I also oppose countries tilting the field in their favor through actions like undervaluing their currency. An undervalued currency makes export goods cheaper from the country with the cheaper currency and also makes it harder for consumers in that country to purchase foreign goods, like our agricultural products.

I support addressing currency manipulation in our trade agreements. I have watched administrations of both parties put their heads in the sand on this issue. Everyone opposes currency manipulation, yet little ever gets done.

This TPA bill represents the modern realities we face from the global economy that need to be addressed by our trade negotiators.

The bill includes clear negotiating objectives for standards on sanitary and phytosanitary regulations that must be science-based. Having science-based standards will help limit disruptions to U.S. agricultural exports and even open up some new markets for our producers.

Negotiating objectives are offered related to digital trade in goods and cross-border dataflows that are new and unique issues for the time we now live in.

Clear guidance from Congress is also given for localization barriers and intellectual property rights. More transparency and consultations are also required of the administration.

This is a good bill that we need to pass so we can finish the free trade agreements we have been working on for years.

The Trans-Pacific Partnership and other trade agreements like the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, known as TTIP offer tremendous opportunity for our country and my home State of Iowa.

Throughout the world, there are an estimated 260 preferential trade agreements, the United States is only involved in 20 of them.

We must embrace our role in the world as the competitive economic powerhouse that we are. America is a country that leads, we have a chance to enter into a trade agreement that will set new rules and standards for one-third of the global economy.

Getting TPA through Congress and completing more free trade agreements in the future can unleash economic

prosperity that leads to more jobs, more economic growth, and more opportunity for our workers.

I will end by asking what our alternative is for future competitiveness. Other countries are working on preferential agreements. Are we going to sit idly while other countries enter into strategic agreements?

Should we let China start setting the rules of trade throughout the world?

Should we allow other countries to continue blocking our agricultural products with nonscientific excuses?

Should we watch the growing middle class in Asia get their food and products from other countries without trying to compete for their business?

The status quo on trade guarantees us a future with less economic opportunity compared to passing TPA and new trade agreements. That is why we must pass TPA and then pass new trade agreements to help ensure America has a brighter economic future.

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. HATCH. 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. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes today to talk once again about Congress's role in advancing our Nation's trade policies and specifically on the increasingly important issues of digital trade and intellectual property rights.

Let's keep in mind that the last time Congress passed TPA was in 2002. We live in a very different world than we did 13 years ago. Technology is vastly different. Commerce is vastly different. For example, in 2002, less than 700 million people worldwide had access to the Internet. Last year, that figure reached nearly 3 billion—with a "b"—3 billion people. In 2002, e-commerce platforms such as Amazon and eBay were just beginning to gain widespread use. Special media sites and other platforms that today drive so much Internet traffic and user-generated content—sites such as Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter—did not even exist.

In the last 13 years, an entirely new economy has developed based on these online platforms. Today, Facebook has around 1.4 billion—with a "b"—active users, with approximately 83 percent living outside of the United States of America and Canada. YouTube has more than 1 billion users, with local interfaces in 75 countries and compatibility with 61 different languages.

Mobile technology has similarly been transformed since 2002, as the term "smart phone" has become part of our regular vocabulary. Mobile phones were big and clunky in 2002 and were not good for much more than making phone calls. Today, smart phones perform a myriad of functions, including streaming video from the Internet,

video calling, digital photography and videography, and GPS locating, just to mention a few.

The growth of the Internet and mobile technologies has transformed our economy, the products and services we buy, and how we buy them. The advances have significantly reduced the cost of moving products and services across borders and boosted productivity in this country and around the world.

Digitally traded goods and services are growing and are expected to continue to grow. According to a recent study conducted by the International Trade Commission, in 2012, U.S. digitally intensive firms sold nearly \$1 trillion or nearly 6 percent of our total GDP in goods and services over the Internet. About one-quarter of those sales were small and medium-sized enterprises. The people behind these numbers are everyday Americans just trying to compete in an increasingly competitive global marketplace.

Fortunately, our TPA bill includes upgraded negotiating objectives that reflect the world in which we now live. To address this new digital economy, our bill for the first time recognizes the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce. It would also extensively update and expand the e-commerce directives from the 2002 TPA bill to require U.S. negotiators to ensure that all trade agreement obligations, rules, disciplines, and commitments apply to digital trade and that digitally traded goods and services receive no less favorable treatment than comparable goods and services and that they are classified to ensure the most liberal trade treatment possible.

The free flow of data across borders is critical to facilitating digital trade, as it allows U.S. companies to identify market opportunities, innovate and develop new goods and services, maintain supply chains, and serve their customers around the world. Unfortunately, an increasing number of governments are considering or imposing restrictions on cross-border dataflows, including requirements that U.S. companies store and process data locally. Our bill directs U.S. negotiators to ensure that our trading partners refrain from such restrictions and requirements.

It also includes several new and expanded negotiating objectives to address common regulatory issues faced by U.S. companies in the digital economy. For example, the bill directs U.S. negotiators to seek greater openness, transparency, and convergence of standards, development processes, and to encourage the use of international and interoperable standards.

I would urge any of my colleagues who oppose this bill to explain how they plan to give American workers and businesses in the digital economy an opportunity to thrive in an increasingly competitive marketplace—global marketplace, really. They talk about

wanting to preserve jobs and protect Americans, but existing trade rules were written for a time long since passed.

Beyond transitioning our country into this increasingly competitive world of technological growth, our TPA bill also takes a bipartisanship, bicameral approach to improving intellectual property rights protections. Protecting intellectual property is critical to the development of the digital economy, just as it is critical to overall economic growth.

Our Founding Fathers believed intellectual property to be so fundamental to America's future prosperity that they explicitly granted Congress the congressional authority to protect it. Since Jefferson's moldboard plow and Eli Whitney's cotton gin, American intellectual property has spurred on American job growth and prosperity, creating more competitive businesses here—right here in America. Intellectual property, be it for mechanical products, software, or semiconductors, creates value for individuals and American businesses. In turn, these businesses create jobs, spur economic growth, and enrich our culture.

The simply truth is, the countries that strengthen intellectual property rights enjoy great economic benefits. They attract more investment, technology transfers, increased immigration, and ultimately more prosperity for their citizens. Yet, despite these fundamental truths, intellectual property protections around the globe are often fundamentally deteriorating and continually at risk.

Our economic and strategic competitors are well aware that the United States leads the world in innovation, but all too often they fail to understand why. Instead of fostering policies to advance innovation, they seek shortcuts to undermine and even steal American intellectual property. The tools they employ are numerous and very sophisticated. Some of these tools include nontransparent reimbursement and licensing regimes, unfair standard setting, and burdensome regulations.

All of these mechanisms are designed specifically to pry away some of the most innovative and productive parts of our economy, tearing away the competitive edge our American businesses have worked so hard to create and stunting what could be a much more liberal playing field. If enacted, our bill would represent a significant step forward in strengthening the protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights around the world.

It calls for robust intellectual property rules, building on the strong intellectual property standards found in the prior 2002 TPA law. This includes requiring that trade agreements meet the same high standards found in U.S. law. Our bill also requires countries to fully implement the TRIPS Agreement, particularly the enforcement obligations.

To address the challenges and opportunities created by the digital economy, our bill would ensure that right holders are able to keep pace with technological developments by controlling and preventing unauthorized use of their works online.

A growing problem around the world is that foreign governments are stealing valuable technology from U.S. businesses. This type of trade-secret theft threatens to diminish U.S. competitiveness around the globe. It puts American jobs at risk and poses threats to U.S. national security. To address this problem, our bill calls for an end to government involvement in intellectual property rights violations, including piracy and cyber theft of trade secrets.

The bill also ensures that governments limit the unnecessary collection of trade-secret information and protects any information they do collect from disclosure. This is the first time TPA legislation has addressed these issues—these very important issues.

The bill also requires the elimination of the price controls and reference pricing, which are used by many countries to deny full market access to innovative pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

The bill further includes a new provision to direct the U.S. negotiators to ensure that regulatory reimbursement regimes that make pricing and reimbursement decisions are transparent, provide procedural fairness, are non-discriminatory, and provide full-market access for innovative pharmaceuticals and medical devices.

Our bill also calls for the elimination of measures that require U.S. companies to locate their intellectual property abroad as a market access or investment condition. Finally, this legislation includes an expanded capacity-building objective, directing the administration to work with U.S. trading partners to strengthen not only their labor laws, as was provided for in 2002, but also their intellectual property rights laws.

Once again, we live in an economic and technological environment that is very different from the one that existed in 2002. Advances in Internet and mobile technologies have transformed whole sectors of our economy. Our bill positions our country to take advantage of the opportunities and face the challenges presented by the 21st century economy, and that is one of the many reasons why it should pass.

I urge each of my colleagues to work with me to help move this bill forward so we can negotiate strong trade agreements that serve today's economy as well as set the stage for America's next generation of entrepreneurs and innovators.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Nebraska.

BUILD USA ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak about our Na-

tion's infrastructure. In just a few days, authorization for our Nation's transportation programs will expire. By August, the highway trust fund will run out of money. Our States and citizens will face the consequences of inaction in Washington.

Americans depend on our Nation's roads every day as they travel to work, bring their children to school, and transport goods to consumers. Transportation infrastructure is an essential component of our daily lives and for the national economy. As such, it must be efficiently maintained. But today, all across America, our highways and bridges languish in disrepair. Our citizens are no strangers to potholes, road closures, and "expect delays" signs. Moreover, as America's population continues to grow, expansion projects for our crumbling highways remain caught in bureaucratic redtape.

For decades, it has been apparent that excessive regulations, coupled with inadequate funding and financing, have delayed badly needed road projects. I have firsthand knowledge of the challenges facing our Nation's transportation system. In my home State of Nebraska, roads and bridges connect vibrant, urban communities with our open country.

Before arriving in the Senate, I served as chairman of the transportation and telecommunications committee in the Nebraska Legislature. And while there, I spearheaded a bill that eventually became law.

What is now known as the Federal Funds Exchange Program provides the State of Nebraska with the ability to voluntarily exchange Federal transportation funding for State transportation financing at 80 cents on the dollar. In exchange for giving up this Federal funding, counties and cities receive State transportation dollars with more reasonable regulatory requirements.

This program has been a great success in my State of Nebraska. For example, in Buffalo County, federally exchanged funding made a longstanding bridge replacement possible. A major arterial street in South Sioux City is up and running because of the program. In Scottsbluff, a city in the Nebraska Panhandle, they are using our State program to conduct important maintenance on city streets, and the program has also enabled Adams County to construct several bridges and a large culvert project.

Despite these accomplishments in Nebraska, States across the country suffer from very rigid, regulatory requirements and a shortage of transportation funding options. Our current system is broken. States not only need more options, but they need some relief as well.

In fact, the Congressional Research Service estimates that a lack of flexibility has caused major highway projects to take as many as 14 years to plan and to build.

The time has come to bring successful practices from Nebraska to Washington.

For this reason, I have introduced the Build USA Act. This bill will create a new funding structure for State transportation projects. Specifically, the Build USA Act establishes the American Infrastructure Bank. The bank will allow States to remit Federal transportation dollars.

States would then be able to receive 90 percent of this money back and retain control over the environmental, construction, and design aspects of highway projects. This new strategy will infuse more dollars into our transportation system, and it is going to provide States with greater flexibility so they can build and maintain their roads.

The revenues that are generated from State remittance agreements with this bank would also help fund other local infrastructure projects. Currently, the Federal Government only offers large-scale financing options for States seeking core infrastructure funding. So, as a result, smaller communities are often ineligible to receive Federal assistance for their projects, while major metropolitan areas benefit from easier access to financing.

Under the Build USA Act, bank loans would not be subject to a minimum project cost or size. The revenue from these loans could help local governments apply for core infrastructure financing at a rate that is going to be more competitive than the private sector.

The Build USA Act provides additional funding flexibility for those immediate transportation needs that we see all across this country. And, what is more, it accomplishes it without raising taxes.

Under this proposal, a voluntary 3-year repatriation holiday would be implemented to generate seed money for the bank's revolving fund operations. Recent estimates by the Joint Committee on Taxation suggest that the first 3 years of a similar repatriation plan could raise as much as \$30 billion.

Although some Members of Congress wish to save these revenues for an overhaul of the Tax Code, most of us do acknowledge that tax reform is unlikely to come to fruition in the near future. Meanwhile, our Nation's transportation needs are immediate. We better address them now. These dollars should go toward solving problems that our citizens experience every single day. As such, revenue should help provide a long-term solution to highway funding, not just a one-time jump-start or a shot in the arm, as some people have suggested.

This proposal is a long-term solution. It is a solution to issues that have plagued our Nation's roads for decades. Individual States must have the flexibility to address the unique needs of their local communities.

In order to address the transportation challenges facing our Nation, we need to have more options available. Although this plan does not address the immediate challenges facing the

highway trust fund, it does represent a way to infuse new money into our Nation's transportation system, while it is offering States new solutions to get transportation projects up and running.

It looks to the future. This is a proposal for the long term. It is time that we start thinking outside the box. It is time to offer Nebraska's best practices to help the Federal Government help itself.

Our Nation needs to get moving, so I encourage all of my colleagues to look at this proposal, to consider this proposal, because it moves us forward into the future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, we have been talking over the past several days about trade. I wish to add a little discussion here about some of the specific amendments that may come up over the next day or two. I am hopeful that we will have a vote on some of these amendments later this evening.

It is incredibly important for us to expand opportunities for our workers and our farmers by knocking down barriers to trade. That is why more export promotion is a good thing. These are not only more jobs for America, for my State of Ohio, for the Presiding Officer's State of Arizona, but these are better-paying jobs as well. There is no question that not having trade promotion authority over the last 7 years has been detrimental to us in terms of losing market share for our workers and our farmers.

Other countries are negotiating agreements. In fact, there have been well over 100 agreements negotiated without the United States being a party and that cuts us out.

But as we do that, as we expand exports—which is a good thing—we must be sure that playing field is also more level and fairer, so that our workers and our farmers, and our service providers have the opportunity to compete.

That is all we are asking for.

There are a couple of amendments likely to come up again this afternoon and over the next couple of days. One is with regard to this issue of when somebody dumps a product or when a country has a policy of subsidizing a product, there should be the ability for American companies to respond on behalf of their workers.

When products are dumped or when there is a subsidy on an import, there is a process by which you go to the International Trade Commission and seek help, show that you were materi-

ally injured, that damage was done to you, your company, and your workers because of these unfairly traded imports. You then go to the Commerce Department's International Trade Administration and make the argument as to what the countervailing duty ought to be, what the tariff ought to be to combat this. The problem is that in that system today, it is so hard to show material injury and to get that relief that often by the time you can get that relief, it is too late.

We certainly found this in Ohio with regard to many of our industries, and a lot of them, therefore, are very interested in this amendment. One is steel. Right now, there is a lot of tube and pipe coming into this country from overseas. We believe some of it is being sold at below its cost here in America. That means it is being dumped. We believe some is being subsidized. That means it should be subject to countervailing duties. Yet, by the time you can get that relief, find that remedy, often it is just too late. You have lost your market share. You have lost the American jobs.

So this amendment, which is bipartisan and which is backed by over 80 American companies and trade associations and many companies in my home State of Ohio, such as U.S. Steel, Timken Steel, ArcelorMittal, is a commonsense measure that says: Look, workers shouldn't have to lose their jobs before they can get relief.

Seventy-eight of our colleagues backed this amendment in the Customs bill last week. In fact, Senator HATCH, chairman of the committee, who has done a good job shepherding this process through, included this amendment in his mark in the Committee on Finance, which demonstrates how much support it has. However, we feel it is very important that it be in this legislation, in the trade promotion authority bill, which is the bill we are now debating on the floor. We can't let it get left behind.

It is interesting because other countries do have provisions in their laws to keep our exports out if they believe they are unfairly traded or for other reasons. Let me give an example of this by going to AK Steel, which is a company that is based in West Chester, OH. It has 4,000 workers in the State of Ohio. AK Steel produces a high-tech steel called grain-oriented electrical steel. It is a silicon alloy used in the power generation and transmission industry and is more commonly referred to as GOES. GOES steel is a specialty steel. It is an incredibly important product for AK Steel because it is one they are able to export. They are so efficient at producing it and it has such high value that they are exporting it to a number of countries around the world. They produce this steel with 250 United Auto Workers—members of the UAW—in Zanesville, OH.

Back in 2010, China imposed anti-dumping and countervailing duties on GOES from the United States, includ-

ing this product from AK Steel made in Zanesville, OH. They claimed U.S. producers had received subsidies through the "Buy American" provisions in the stimulus bill. They didn't, by the way, but that is what China claimed. It was really retaliation that had to do with some other products that had been coming from China to here—tubular products for the oil and gas industry—and they were retaliating. Anyway, that was China's claim.

So our company, AK Steel, said: Look, this is not accurate. But these duties were put in place anyway by China. It reduced the exports by 92 percent from Ohio to China. So the United States—rightfully so—took China to the World Trade Organization and won the case because the facts were on our side. We won the case, but China appealed it—without removing the duties.

So this all takes time. Meanwhile, you are losing market share. Instead of immediately removing the duties, when they lost the appeal, China chose to run out the clock, only dropping their tariff a couple weeks before the WTO forced them to do it. So American-made GOES was kept out of China for 5 years. This process took 5 years and cost American workers millions of orders.

Meanwhile, the U.S. domestic producer sought relief from their government by going to the ITC as well as the ITA—the International Trade Commission and the International Trade Administration—and they found the domestic industry was not injured in a case against producers from several countries, including Japan, Germany, China, and Poland, despite surging imports and dropping prices. So on the one hand, they were not able to sell in China for 5 years and lost a lot of market share and millions of dollars. On the other hand, when they went to their own government to ask for a little relief on this product coming in, they were not able to show injury despite surging imports and dropping prices.

The provisions we have simply clarify that when a producer—a U.S. company—is injured, when it is material injury as was defined in the statute, they shouldn't have to wait until after the factory is closed and workers are laid off for us to stand up for our workers.

By the way, just last month these GOES producers were cut out of another large international market. The European Union announced it would be imposing duties on this same electrical steel from the United States, again putting millions of dollars of exports at risk.

So our provision is an attempt to help level this playing field. It is WTO-consistent; in other words, it doesn't violate our international obligations. It simply clarifies what "material injury" means. It goes back to the original statutory language and makes it easier for American companies to seek

the relief they deserve. This is going to help protect millions of American jobs that otherwise could be at risk because our trade laws haven't kept up with international commerce.

This is an example of one of the amendments we would very much like to offer on the floor. I know there is discussion right now in another room in this Capitol about whether we will be able to offer this amendment. It is an amendment by Senator BROWN and me. It is an example of what—if we included it in the trade promotion authority legislation—would make this a bill that is truly balanced, one that expands exports, which is incredibly important, as I said earlier, to the people I represent—our farmers, our workers—and to our State and our economy, but that also ensures that there is a more level playing field, that there is fairness in this underlying legislation.

The second amendment we hope to offer is with regard to currency manipulation. We have talked a lot about this on the floor this week, and I would just say three things.

One, this is something a lot of Members in this Chamber have already looked at because 60 Members of the Senate in 2013 sent a letter to the President of the United States saying that with regard to trade agreements, there should be enforceable currency manipulation prohibitions—60. Some of those Senators are still in this Chamber. Most of them are. I would hope we again would have a strong message from the Congress, which is what trade promotion authority is, that in the context of trade negotiating objectives—and there are about 20 different trade negotiating objectives in TPA—one of them should be that we have a prohibition on currency manipulation, and it should be enforceable.

Second, there will be an alternative amendment offered that agrees with our amendment in terms of the definition of currency manipulation. Specifically, it does not affect monetary policy. It does not affect what the United States has been doing with QE2, QE3, QE1.

By the way, for those who think that kind of monetary policy is export-oriented, look at the value of the dollar. It has certainly not been effective at lowering the price of our currency. In fact, our currency has gone up in value. It is about stimulus. We can argue about the merits or demerits of that monetary policy, but it is not affected at all by this amendment, and the amendment specifically clarifies that.

So just to be clear, No. 1, 60 Senators have already signed this letter; No. 2, this is consistent with the International Monetary Fund definition, which says this is not about monetary policy. It is about real intervention. It is about intervention in currency markets to be able to affect exports, to lower the price of exports unfairly and to increase the cost of our exports to other countries unfairly.

Finally, I would just say this is about the balance we talked about earlier. The American people want to know that while we are expanding exports, we are also ensuring that we get a fair shake—our farmers, our workers, our service providers.

There is a quote by a former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Paul Volcker, that I think is telling. As a former Chairman of the Federal Reserve, he said that, "In five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish."

As a former U.S. Trade Representative, I agree with that. Currency manipulation takes away so much of the value of what we are trying to do on this floor. Those who support trade should be in favor of prohibitions on currency. This is a distortion. If you are a market-oriented fiscal conservative, if you are someone who believes we ought to let markets work, then you should be against currency manipulation because it does distort the market. If you are someone who believes we should be expanding exports but it should be fair, you should be for this prohibition on currency manipulation and making it enforceable. And we should have the courage of our convictions. If we really do believe that, we should be sure there is some ability to make this enforceable.

The countries of the Pacific region that are currently negotiating with us on the Trans-Pacific Partnership do not currently manipulate their currency, but a couple of them have in the past. Notably, Japan has over 300 times before 2012. Malaysia has. It doesn't make sense to put in place this provision to say: In the future—once we have completed this agreement with you, we have knocked down these trade barriers in the United States and in your country to enable us to have more trade—you would not be able to manipulate your currency under this agreement.

There is some polling data out there that indicates 9 out of 10 Americans agree with that, by the way. And of course they do because it is just common sense. All we are looking for is the ability to compete fairly.

Wouldn't it be great if we could do both of these things—expand exports but also be sure we are getting a fair shake for the people we represent, the AK Steels of the world that have their products blocked in China and their products blocked in the EU and yet can't receive the relief here or the companies in my home State that work hard to bring some business back from China?

In one case, there is a small manufacturer in Cleveland, OH, that told me about this. It is a company that makes highly valuable steel products, and these are products that help hold up speakers at major concerts. They brought some of that business back from China.

One day I was in their shop talking to them, and they said: Well, we are going to lose this order. Why? Currency manipulation. That made the Chinese imports into our country less expensive because they manipulated their currency and lowered their value and made it much more difficult for them, therefore, to be competitive. They were concerned that they were going to lose that order despite the fact that they had done everything to make their plant more efficient and that the work-

ers had made concessions. They had done everything right and played by the rules. That is what we are asking, that everybody be asked to play by the rules.

So I hope the underlying legislation passes, but I hope it passes with these improvements to ensure that we do have a balance here; that we are able to tell our farmers and our workers and our service providers: You are going to have the opportunity now to access 95 percent of the consumers who are outside the borders of the United States of America. That is a good thing. It will mean more jobs and higher paying jobs, paying on average 15 to 18 percent more, and better benefits. But also, by entering into these agreements, we are going to have more fairness for you so you can get a fair shake and be able to do what you want to do, which is to be able to compete in this global marketplace and be assured that competition will be fair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the trade promotion authority bill which has been debated on the Senate floor the last few days.

I begin, though, by complimenting my good friend and colleague from Ohio—one of the most well-respected Members of this body, I think an example of a true American statesman, and certainly one of our best U.S. Trade Representatives who knows a lot about the topic that we have been debating. So I thank him for his tremendous service for the people of Ohio and of our country.

The TPA bill we have been debating is going to be good for the country. It will help move our country forward, provide tremendous opportunities for growth and expansion—for our farmers, ranchers, businesses, fishermen, workers, and those in the high-tech sector.

As Senator PORTMAN mentioned, 95 percent of all global consumers lie outside of the United States—95 percent. What we need to do is access those consumers to have more opportunity.

Currently, it is estimated that over 38 million jobs in the United States are tied to trade. The trade agreements we are talking about on the Senate floor that would come after TPA will create hundreds of thousands of new jobs and new opportunities for Americans. These are good jobs, and we need more jobs.

This has been one of the weakest recoveries of any major recession in American history. We are barely growing at 1.5 percent, 2 percent GDP growth. These are not traditional levels of American growth. Why? Why has our growth been so slow?

Well, there are many reasons. But I think the overregulation of our economy by the Federal Government clearly is one of the major reasons, and trade agreements are exactly the kind of boost we need. What do trade agreements do? They reduce regulations, they cut redtape, they reduce taxes on goods coming in to American families. We need this kind of policy, in terms of less regulation and more freedom for our domestic economy and internationally. That is how we are going to get

moving again. That is how we are going to get this economy moving again. That is how we are going to get Americans working again. That is why TPA is so important to begin this process. But TPA is also about American leadership—bipartisan U.S. American leadership.

Since the end of World War II, every administration—Democratic, Republican, it doesn't matter—has wanted to lead on trade, has wanted to obtain trade promotion authority, and that has been critical to American leadership, global leadership, and helping our businesses and workers.

It is also critical to make sure we have a seat at the table, to set the rules for the global trading regime as we have traditionally done—again, bipartisan, Democrats and Republicans for decades have been doing this—and to help make sure we are leveling the playing field for our workers.

The American workers—the American fisherman, the American rancher, the American farmer—can compete against anyone in the world with a level playing field. We have done that for decades. That is the American way, but we have to be in the game. We need to be the country setting the rules. We need to be the country that lays out trade agreements that have strong intellectual property rights protection, that open markets, that get rid of state-owned enterprises, that have strong enforcement provisions—so when countries cheat in global trade, we have the ability to enforce rules and strike back if we need to, to protect our economy, our workers, our farmers, our fishermen.

I wish to talk a little bit about free trade as it relates to my home State of Alaska.

Here are some facts about trade in Alaska: Already, in my State of Alaska there are over 90,000 jobs tied to trade. That is more than one in five of all jobs in the Alaska economy tied to global trade, particularly trade to the Asia-Pacific region.

We are also a huge recipient of foreign direct investment—foreign direct investment that employs Alaskans. These are good jobs. Fourteen thousand Alaskans are directly employed by foreign companies, and there are tens of thousands more who are indirectly benefited. So many Alaskans count on these important jobs.

In terms of exports, of course we are a very large State with a relatively small population—a little over 700,000 citizens. But in 2013, the State of Alaska exported over \$6 billion in goods and services. Per capita exports, we are a powerhouse. We are one of the strongest exporters in the country. And in terms of fish and seafood, we are the superpower of exports—not per capita but absolute exports. In 2013, we exported roughly \$2.3 billion in seafood and fish.

The fishing industry is a very important industry for a lot of States in our country, but more than half of all sea-

food harvested in America comes from Alaska's waters. It is also one of the biggest employers in my State. In fact, it is the biggest employer in my State, even more than some of the resource industries. There are 78,000 Alaskans employed in this industry, and these are the epitome of small businesses.

Every fishing vessel, when you look at one, is a small business. What do they do? They take risks. I am sure some have seen "The Deadliest Catch." A lot of times they are family-owned. They work hard, and they produce a great product—a great product—king crab, fresh Alaska salmon—a great product. These are classic American small businesses, which brings me to my amendment.

As my colleague from Ohio mentioned, there are a lot of discussions right now. We sure hope Members of this body are going to have opportunities to present amendments to make the TPA bill stronger.

The amendment I have filed, that I want to offer, is a simple amendment to make a principal negotiating objective under TPA focusing on making sure members of the fishing community—American Fish, American Seafoods—have opportunities for more open markets overseas. This will benefit the hard-working fishing families all across America.

This amendment will ensure that of the many TPA objectives, this one will be in there—more access to markets, more opportunities for these great American small businesses.

As I mentioned, not only in terms of Alaska is this an important industry, this is a hugely important industry for the United States. In 2013, our country exported over \$5.5 billion worth of fish and seafood. The commercial fishing industry in the United States in 2013 employed over 1 million Americans, with an income of \$32 billion. Let me repeat that: Over 1 million Americans in this industry nationwide and \$32 billion in income—and, again, most of these are classic American small businesses. This is who TPA should be focused on.

As I mentioned, the current TPA bill has negotiating objectives for a lot of important industries in our great country—textile, agriculture, services, manufactured goods. There are about 20 specific trading negotiating objectives that the TPA bill directs the U.S. Trade Representative to get in terms of the free-trade agreements he will try to seek once TPA has been passed, and this is the way it should be. Those are all great sectors. Agriculture is hugely important to our country. But we should also have a similar negotiating objective for another very important industry in this country—our seafood industry, the fishing industry.

This is a simple amendment. It asks that the U.S. trade negotiator focus as a principal objective to make sure this industry has opportunities just like all the other industries do and, importantly, particularly as we are trying to

work through this bill to see what amendments we can get on it, this is a very bipartisan amendment.

Senator MARKEY of Massachusetts, on the other side, has a lot of hard-working fishing families. So from Alaska to Massachusetts, this is a very bipartisan bill that will help small businesses, and it help coastal communities that rely so much on fishing.

Finally, I want to talk about TPA and go back to the issue of American leadership. TPA, open trade, and free-trade agreements can work for America. They can work for our workers, farmers, businesses, ranchers, fishermen. I know. I have had the opportunity of seeing this firsthand.

I worked as an Assistant Secretary of State under Condoleezza Rice on economic issues, on trade issues, and a number of the free-trade agreements we currently have in force were ones I had an opportunity to work on with many members in the Federal Government.

Let me give two examples: the free-trade agreement we had with Singapore and the free-trade agreement we had with Australia. Once these were passed and the barriers to our exports came down, American exports skyrocketed to these countries. As I mentioned, American workers can compete with anyone. Give us a level playing field, and we will take advantage of it.

U.S. exports, in terms of goods to Australia, rose 33 percent between 2004 and 2009. U.S. goods exports to Singapore were up \$21 billion—31 percent—from 2003 to 2009.

I met with the Singapore Ambassador today. He reminded me that we actually have a trade surplus with Singapore, as I believe we do with Australia, because of these free-trade agreements.

So free-trade agreements are a win-win for our country economically, but they also importantly deepen the economic ties that bind our country and our citizens to some of our most important friends and allies—such as the country of Singapore, such as the country of Australia, and that is happening.

Finally, though, trade is also about American leadership, it is about American confidence, the ability to say: Open the markets and we can compete with anyone. We need that confidence back.

For too long under this administration we have been disengaged from the world. For too long we have allowed other countries to be in the driver's seat globally—where we have not been driving events, we have been reacting to events internationally. For too long we have been withdrawing, for too long we have been leading from behind, and for too long we have not been showing confidence globally; we have been showing weakness. Weakness is provocative, and you see that all over the world.

Now, I have been critical of this administration's approach to foreign policy in a whole host of areas—its foreign

policy of global disengagement, its lack of confidence, and American leadership in the world. But I applaud the President for what he is doing now. I applaud the President for his strategy of rebalancing the focus of military forces and trade in the Asia-Pacific.

I applaud the President for doing the hard work of seeking TPA. These are never easy votes. These are never easy votes. But we should support what he is doing because it means America is back. We are engaging again. We are not leading from behind. We are leading the way countless administrations in the past have done with regard to global trade.

This will enable us to determine our future, to drive it, not react to it. I urge my colleagues to vote for this TPA bill because it is a vote for American leadership.

I also urge my colleagues to vote for the amendment that is going to help many small businesses throughout the United States and coastal communities and our strong fishing communities.

My amendment will strengthen the TPA bill, and I encourage all my colleagues to support that amendment as well.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN.

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

SMALL BUSINESS AND TRADE

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I appreciate the chairman's leadership on the trade promotion authority, TPA, legislation. As he has said, this bill creates the process by which the administration can negotiate trade agreements that have the potential to enhance trade opportunities for American businesses. The ability to reach new markets is critical for ensuring that American businesses can compete in a global marketplace.

Trade has become increasingly vital for small businesses looking to diversify and grow. And yet, even though 95 percent of the world's customers live overseas, less than 1 percent of small- and medium-sized businesses in the United States sell to global markets. By comparison, over 40 percent of large businesses sell their products overseas.

As ranking member of the Small Business Committee, one of my priorities is narrowing that gap. I believe that, as we consider expanding trade relationships, we must make sure that small businesses have a seat at the table and the support they need to reach global markets and compete internationally.

Does the chairman agree?

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. Yes, I agree wholeheartedly. Small businesses are a vital part of promoting international trade.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the chairman. To that end, I have filed an amendment, amendment No. 1227, that would take a number of steps to ensure

that our small businesses benefit from international trade and potential new trade agreements.

Although I understand that we will not have an opportunity to amend the TPA legislation, I hope to work with the chairman to ensure that this amendment is included in H.R. 644 or a similar bill as reported by a conference committee to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator has my commitment to work with her to do so.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the chairman. I appreciate his support for this amendment.

Does the ranking member agree that we should ensure that small businesses are supported as part of our trade agenda?

Mr. WYDEN. I do, and I support the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire that would make sure that we engage small businesses as part of our efforts on international trade. I also look forward to working with her to do everything possible to get this amendment included in H.R. 644.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I thank the ranking member.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO BOB SCHIEFFER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, later this month, a man we have all become accustomed to welcoming into our living rooms will leave behind a decades-long journalistic career and embark on a new journey with his wife, Pat.

Bob Lloyd Schieffer has been a Pentagon reporter. He has served as a State Department reporter. He has covered the White House. And he has roamed the halls of the Capitol as a congressional reporter.

It is rare to see any journalist serve in all four of the big DC national assignments. But Bob Schieffer has.

Bob has interviewed every President since Nixon. He has moderated debates between Kerry and Bush, between Obama and McCain, and most recently between Obama and Romney. He has won just about every award possible in broadcast journalism, including a few Emmys. And he has turned out chart-topping hits, like "TV Anchorman," as the front man for a honky-tonk band.

Perhaps that is the passion Bob will follow in retirement. We will see.

But here is one thing we do know: Bob Schieffer is one of the most famous

Horned Frogs ever to graduate from his beloved TCU. It is no wonder Bob Schieffer's alma mater elected to name its School of Journalism after the man who hosts CBS' "Face the Nation" every Sunday.

I have been a guest on his show many times. He can ask tough questions. But he is fair.

The last time I appeared with Bob, we talked about the new majority's drive to restore the Senate. He later shared his view on our efforts with his audience.

"What's happening is by no means on the scale of an Old Testament miracle," he said.

"But," he noted, "Every journey begins with a first step."

I agree with him. It is not like we are parting the Potomac. But we are getting the Senate moving again, debating again, amending again, and working again. I think it is good for our country.

Perhaps Bob might take some of his own advice as he looks to the future too.

Because every journey does begin with a first step.

So whatever it is Bob ultimately chooses to do in retirement, whether it is penning a memoir or cutting more honky-tonk hits, it all begins with that first step. He will take it on May 31, when he signs off for the last time.

I am sure it will be a bittersweet moment for him. But it is a step he is likely to ultimately welcome after so many years in the spotlight. The Senate wishes him all the best in retirement.

CELEBRATING RABBI YOCHAVED MINTZ OF CONGREGATION P'NAI TIKVAH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today in celebration of Rabbi Yochaved Mintz' 10th anniversary with Congregation P'nei Tikvah in Las Vegas, NV. Through her dedication to serving others, Rabbi Mintz has helped further Congregation P'nei Tikvah's commitment to providing an inclusive and open environment for spiritual development. I am appreciative of her tremendous efforts on behalf of the Jewish community and the city of Las Vegas.

Rabbi Mintz' many leadership roles demonstrate the seriousness with which she takes her duties as a spiritual leader, as well as her compassion and willingness to devote much of her time to helping others. Within the Jewish community, her responsibilities include president of the Mintz Family Foundation for Creative Jewish Education and serving on numerous boards, such as the Jewish Family Services Agency and Rabbis for Religious Freedom and Equality in Israel. Rabbi Mintz also brings her years of experience in Jewish education to the community through her work as founding board chair for the Florence A. Melton School for Adult Jewish Education. As the first female president of

the Las Vegas Board of Rabbis, Rabbi Mintz is an inspiration to many young Jewish girls and women who aspire to become Rabbis and leaders within their communities. In line with Congregation P'nai Tikvah's commitment to fostering a welcoming environment for religious life, Rabbi Mintz is a board member of the Interfaith Council of Southern Nevada and the Clark County Ministerial Association.

For decades, Rabbi Mintz has provided opportunities for religious education to Jews of all ages, and I am pleased to stand today in celebration of the 10 years she has devoted to Congregation P'nai Tikvah in Las Vegas. I congratulate Rabbi Mintz and Congregation P'nai Tikvah on this important anniversary.

LEGISLATION PROTECTING VICTIMS OF SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on the floor yesterday, the majority leader claimed that last Congress, Senate Democrats "failed to bring any trafficking legislation to the floor."

I do not normally do this, but I must correct the record. The facts are exactly the opposite, and the Senate's history must be clear on this.

Last Congress, despite the opposition of the majority of Senate Republicans, including Senators McCONNELL and CORNYN, Senate Democrats reauthorized our Nation's two cornerstone pieces of legislation that protect victims of sexual violence and human trafficking—the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA, and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, TVPA. Combined, these two bills reauthorized nearly \$1 billion a year in funding for survivors of these horrible crimes. As we updated and modernized these landmark laws, we listened to the survivors and the advocates who work with them every day to make sure that our legislation responded to the real needs of real people. We were not looking for gimmicks or shortcuts. Instead, we dedicated hours of time learning about what was working and what needed to be improved in order to best meet the needs of survivors.

The end result was two bills that did more to prevent sexual assault and human trafficking and to reach more victims than ever before. Because of our comprehensive and inclusive approach, these bills had the strong and vocal support of more than 1,400 local, State and national organizations.

In addition to the successful reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act last Congress, I later moved a comprehensive package of legislation to address the issue of human trafficking here in the United States, which included critical support programs directed at runaway and homeless youth to prevent trafficking in the first place. Last year that package, which included the Justice for Vic-

tims of Trafficking Act, as well as the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act, the Bringing Missing Children Home Act, and the Combat Human Trafficking Act, was reported out of the Judiciary Committee, which I chaired. I then sought the unanimous consent of the Senate to pass that bipartisan package, and every single Democratic Senator agreed. But Republicans blocked it. They objected to it. Senator McCONNELL failed to mention any of this yesterday.

So if such assertions are going to be loosely made on this floor, let the record be clear about who, in fact, stood in the way of protections for trafficking victims last year. Look to see which Members voted against the reauthorizations of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. Those two laws were passed with the votes of every Senate Democrat. And last year, it was Republicans who obstructed passage of the subsequent comprehensive domestic antitrafficking package, supported by every Democrat, that included critical trafficking prevention legislation. On top of all that, under Democratic leadership of the Senate Appropriations Committee, total appropriations for trafficking victims' services more than doubled in fiscal year 2015, rising from \$28.1 million to \$58 million.

When we look at the facts, it is simply outrageous and laughable to suggest Senate Democrats did not support antitrafficking efforts last Congress. These facts matter and I cannot allow revisionist history to muddy the accomplishments we and so many advocates fought for in the last Congress.

Regrettably, the newly empowered Senate Republicans have not continued the same survivor-led approach we took in the last Congress to pass VAWA and the TVPA. Instead they sought to use a new antitrafficking bill, the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, JvTA, to expand the reach of the Hyde amendment and its restrictions on health care for these women who are survivors of trafficking crimes. In doing so, the same Senators who voted against VAWA and TVPA in the last Congress inserted unnecessary and destructive politics into what was otherwise a bipartisan antitrafficking bill. The result was to needlessly tie the Senate in knots for weeks over this legislation. More importantly, Senate Republicans' effort to expand the Hyde amendment undermined what should be the very goal of antitrafficking legislation—to help return dignity and self-determination to the lives of survivors of human trafficking. That was certainly the goal of our successful effort to expand the scope of VAWA and TVPA to reach all victims.

It is also the goal behind the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act that I reintroduced with Senator COLLINS this Congress. This bill, which was a critical

part of the debate last Congress and should remain a critical part of the debate in this Congress, aims to prevent young people from becoming victims of trafficking in the first place. We know runaway and homeless children are exceptionally vulnerable to human traffickers. These children literally have nowhere to go. And traffickers prey on this vulnerability. That is why Senator COLLINS and I fought so hard to add this legislation to the JvTA. The runaway and homeless youth programs supported by our bill keep kids safe, save lives, and prevent human trafficking in the first place.

I was very disappointed when our amendment failed to pass by just four votes. What was most disheartening was that the principal objection was the inclusion of an important non-discrimination provision to ensure that no child, including those who identify as LGBT, faces discrimination by service providers. But I am not giving up. I will keep fighting to see this legislation passed because it is so important. As the Polaris Project, a leading antitrafficking advocacy organization, recently told the New York Times:

Successful efforts to combat modern slavery must address the root causes that make people vulnerable in the first place . . . Until critical funding is reauthorized through the Runaway and Homeless Youth [and] Trafficking Prevention Act to support critical services, such as shelter beds for homeless kids, this population will face increased risk.

Senator McCONNELL and I may differ in our opinions, but I think it is important to get it right when it comes to facts. To say that Senate Democrats failed to move antitrafficking legislation last Congress rewrites history and does a tremendous disservice to all of those victims and advocates who so recently dedicated years of their lives to the successful reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and the Trafficking Victims Protection Act, and to crafting a bipartisan package of antitrafficking legislation that was ultimately blocked by Senate Republicans.

RECOGNIZING THE J. WARREN AND LOIS McCLURE FOUNDATION ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am honored to recognize the J. Warren and Lois McClure Foundation on the celebration of its 20th anniversary. For two decades, the selfless philanthropy of the McClure family has allowed scores of deserving Vermonters to pursue financial stability and academic success.

Established in 1995, the foundation was built upon Lois and her late husband Mac's concept of "giving with warm hands." Inspired by the idea of collaborative philanthropy, the McClures set out to give with the hope it would encourage benevolence among future generations.

For 20 years, the foundation has collaborated with private and public partners to support low-income and first-

generation students, adult learners, and veterans. From providing transition services for homeless youth, to promoting single parents' education programs and mental health services for veterans, there are no bounds to the McClure family's encouragement of life-long success.

Institutions such as the Vermont State Colleges, the American Red Cross of Vermont, the Vermont Department of Libraries, the Vermont Vet to Vet Program, and hundreds more have expanded innovative learning programs as a result of the foundation. From cancer patients to legislators, the foundation has touched countless lives, while inspiring those to follow their dreams.

The foundation has also been instrumental in supporting historical preservation projects at the Leahy Center for Lake Champlain and the Lake Champlain Maritime Museum. The McClures' vision to inspire a lifelong cultural and historical education for all Vermonters, meanwhile maintaining a commitment to environmental sustainability, has enhanced multiple facets of our State's diverse landscape for generations to come.

As someone who has met many leaders and legends within public service, I am continually humbled by the McClure family's boundless charity and true dedication to supporting the common good.

Marcelle and I are proud to call Lois our dear friend, and we were blessed and honored to know Mac. We are forever proud of the McClures' undying commitment to Vermonters, and we are thrilled to congratulate the foundation on 20 wonderful years of extraordinary and selfless service.

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing May as National Mental Health Awareness Month. Sadly, mental health is a subject that often does not receive the attention it deserves in our society, despite the fact that mental illness touches the lives of tens of millions of Americans each year. Nearly 50 percent of American adults will develop at least one mental illness in their lifetimes, and in a given year, one in four American adults, more than 60 million people, experiences some form of mental illness. Of that number, approximately 5.8 percent suffer from a serious mental disorder like schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, or major depression.

Mental illness can have a devastating impact on an individual's overall health and quality of life. Those suffering from serious mental illnesses are not only at increased risk for chronic medical conditions, but they also die, on average, 25 years earlier than other Americans, due in large part to treatable medical conditions. Adults with severe mental disorders are also much more likely to be impoverished, further

limiting their access to health care services needed to help manage their illnesses. A 2012 study published in the *Journal of Mental Health Policy and Economics* found that the presence of a household member with a severe mental illness was shown to increase the likelihood of poverty in a home by more than three times.

Mental illness also has a significant impact on our country's economy. According to the CDC, the economic cost of mental illness in the United States was a staggering \$300 billion in 2002.

The good news is that high-quality, evidence-based treatment for mental illnesses can be very effective. However, fewer than half of those in need receive any mental health care in the United States. This is simply unacceptable. Stigma, cost, and other barriers, such as limited capacity in some areas to serve all those in need, prevent many individuals from receiving necessary mental health care. It is imperative that we act to improve access to high-quality, evidence-based mental health care services in our country.

Several weeks ago, I had the opportunity to attend the ribbon-cutting ceremony for the Mosaic Integrated Healthcare Center, a state-of-the-art facility in Baltimore that will provide essential mental health services, substance abuse treatment, and primary care services to the community. Mosaic Community Services is the largest community-based behavioral health service provider in Maryland, serving thousands of children, adolescents, and adults annually. The new Integrated Healthcare Center will allow full implementation of Mosaic's integrated care model, which addresses patients' physical and behavioral health needs in a comprehensive, coordinated, and cost-saving manner. A pilot program based on this model, supported by a 2010 grant from Maryland's Community Health Resources Commission, resulted in an impressive 78 percent reduction in emergency room visits and urgent inpatient care. Mosaic's innovative system is a perfect example of the ways in which integrated care can improve quality of care, result in better health outcomes, and help generate long-term cost savings.

I am also excited to be working on an initiative to improve access to, and quality of, mental health care in our country by facilitating the integration of mental health care services into the primary care setting through the collaborative care model, developed by the late Dr. Wayne Katon, at the AIMS Center at the University of Washington.

In the collaborative care model, primary care providers treat patients with common mental health disorders, such as depression or anxiety, with help from a care manager and a psychiatrist who acts a consultant, reviewing patients' progress, making treatment recommendations and sharing his or her expertise with the primary care provider and care manager.

The collaborative care model not only improves patient care experiences and outcomes, it has also been shown to reduce overall health care costs. One large trial, which focused on depression care in primary care clinics in five States, found substantial reductions in overall health costs, with an overall rate of return on investment of \$6 in health care costs saved for each \$1 spent on depression care.

Mental illness affects the lives of so many Americans. This May, in honor of National Mental Health Awareness Month, let us commit to working together to improve mental health care in our country by building on the success of integrated care models like the collaborative care model and the innovative system at Mosaic's Integrated Health Center.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY ARFT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize and salute Larry Arft, the city manager for Beloit, WI, on the occasion of his retirement. It has been my pleasure to work closely with Larry since he started in this role in 2003. Throughout that time, he has been a tireless and effective leader of the community. He has been a model public servant, and his talent and passion will be missed by all who have worked with him.

A Missouri native, Larry served in the U.S. Army in Vietnam. Following his military service, he graduated magna cum laude from the University of Missouri—St. Louis. It was there that his interest in local government was sparked by an internship with a St. Louis-area municipality. Since then, Larry has served with distinction in multiple communities in three States for more than 40 years.

As Beloit city manager, Larry Arft has been the driving force behind extensive economic development. During his tenure, Beloit has experienced strong and sustained revitalization of its downtown, in the Gateway Business Park, and along its riverfront. He has always been an enthusiastic partner with the business community, and Larry proved that Beloit was—and continues to be—a good place to do business. He also engaged other government leaders in the area, around the State, and in the Federal Government. He set an example of how things should be done and how people could come together to address challenges.

I had the privilege of working closely with him in efforts to secure Federal funding for the construction and improvement of local roads and bridges, allowing for safer and more rapid transport and economic development. In addition, I had the pleasure of working with him as he led efforts to create good jobs and attract visitors to the area through the development of a Beloit casino.

Larry's work extended well beyond the city limits. He actively engaged other communities in the region and

served as the president of the Wisconsin League of Municipalities, advocating for issues important to cities and villages.

I am grateful for Larry Arft's contributions to the people of Beloit and to the people of Wisconsin, and I thank him for his service. I know his presence and personal commitment will be missed. I wish him and his wife Karen all the best in the years ahead.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

NATIONAL SEERSUCKER DAY

• Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, today I rise in appreciation of seersucker manufacturers and enthusiasts across the country. I extend a Happy Seersucker Day. This uniquely American fashion has a storied history dating back to 1909. Louisiana is proud to have played an important part in introducing the country to seersucker apparel. The first seersucker suit was designed by Joseph Haspel at his Broad Street facility in New Orleans, LA.

This lightweight cotton fabric, known for its signature pucker has been enjoyed by Americans from all walks of life during our hot summer months. Mr. Haspel said it best, "hot is hot, no matter what you do for a living." In the 1990s, Seersucker Day was established by members of this chamber to honor this unique American fashion. I proudly resumed this tradition last year in the U.S. House of Representatives by designating Wednesday, June 11 as National Seersucker Day. I wish to continue this tradition in U.S. Senate by designating Thursday, June 11 as National Seersucker Day once again. I encourage everyone to wear seersucker on this day to commemorate this iconic American clothing.●

RECOGNIZING THE OPENING OF THE UCI-FRED HUTCH CANCER CENTRE

• Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, today I want to congratulate the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center and the Uganda Cancer Institute for officially opening the UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre in Kampala, the first comprehensive cancer center jointly constructed by U.S. and African cancer institutions in Sub-Saharan Africa.

The 25,000-square-foot regional cancer center is a state-of-the-art-facility that can treat up to 20,000 patients a year and includes an adult and pediatric outpatient clinic, a specimen repository, training center, conference rooms, and a pharmacy.

Uganda has a substantial cancer burden, and 6 out of 10 of the most common cancers there are caused by infectious diseases. To address this unique health need, Uganda has invested in cancer research, training, and clinical care. The UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre will significantly increase patient

access to cancer diagnosis and treatment while furthering study of cancers in Uganda, particularly those that are infection related.

This alliance brings together two international leaders in the field of oncology care, training, and research and is ideally positioned to provide American and Ugandan physician scientists with in-depth training in the treatment of infection-related malignancies in both the United States and Sub-Saharan Africa.

The relationship between Fred Hutch and the UCI dates back to 2004, and the UCI/Hutchinson Center Cancer Alliance was formally established in 2008. The program was formed to support the development of a strong biomedical infrastructure in Uganda that would contribute to the prevention, early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer and related health concerns.

In 2008, Uganda had just one oncologist who treated more than 10,000 patients a year. In response, Fred Hutch spearheaded an extensive medical training program that has trained more than 300 Ugandans and Americans to date in the treatment of infection-related cancers, including physicians, nurses, laboratory technicians, pharmacists, data specialists, and experts in regulatory affairs and fiscal management. Today, the number of practicing oncologists in Uganda has increased twelvefold.

The UCI-Fred Hutch Cancer Centre is funded in part by two grants for which I was proud to advocate totaling \$1.4 million from the U.S. Agency for International Development (through the American Schools and Hospitals Abroad Program), as well as an \$8.6 million investment from Fred Hutch. The Ugandan Government has supported the collaboration through donations of land, provision of funding for personnel and equipment, and technical support.

I am proud to work with Fred Hutch in their effort to bring cutting-edge cancer care to patients and families all around the globe. This joint venture with UCI has the potential to drastically improve the lives of many people, both in Uganda and worldwide. I am proud that my State of Washington is home to Fred Hutch, and I applaud them and the Uganda Cancer Institute for their cross-national effort to effect this critical change.●

LEONARD SCHOOL OF MUSIC 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor the Leonard School of Music in North Charleston, SC, for their 70th anniversary. In 1945, the Leonard School of Music was founded by Mr. Patrick Leonard, who became a Charlestonian early in his life. He was a trombonist for the prestigious Armco Band and the Circus Corporation of America. After traveling to Charleston with the circus, he fell in love with the city and ul-

timately started the Leonard School of Music. Mr. Patrick Leonard eventually retired from his leadership role at the school and passed it on to his son, Dan Leonard.

Mr. Dan Leonard is a recognized expert in the field of music education. His work has received State, national, and international acclaim. He has taught and directed bands of all levels: elementary, junior high, high school, and college. Many of Mr. Leonard's students are accomplished musicians and teachers. His specialized rhythm approach has inspired Leonard School instructors' teaching strategies.

The Leonard School of Music became a nonprofit organization in 2010. The school's mission is to provide solid music education for all Lowcountry youth regardless of race, creed, or financial standing. On May 23, 2015, the Leonard School of Music will celebrate 70 years of music excellence. I applaud Patrick and Dan Leonard for their expertise in music education, and therefore recognize the Leonard School of Music's accomplishment.●

REMEMBERING SID McDONALD

• Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Sid McDonald of Arab, AL, who passed away on May 15, 2015. He will be remembered as a skilled businessman who was committed to bettering his community and State through public service.

Sid was born in Springfield, AL. He earned a degree from the School of Commerce and Business at the University of Alabama in 1961. However, his time at the University of Alabama goes well beyond his days as a student. He was a member of the University of Alabama board of trustees from 1992 to 2008, and served as the pro tempore of the board from 1999 to 2002.

Sid began his career in public service when he was named to the Alabama Commission on Higher Education in 1970, the year that it was created. He had a passion for education and was instrumental in establishing the Arab City School system where he became the first board chairman. Sid served the people of Marshall County in the Alabama House of Representatives for two terms and also served in the Alabama Senate from 1975 to 1979. He later served as Alabama's finance director under Governor Fob James from 1980 to 1982.

After graduating from the University of Alabama, Sid began his successful business career. He became president of Brindlee Mountain Telephone Company, which he managed until it was sold in 2000. In 1983, he founded DeltaCom, a statewide long-distance telephone company, serving as its chairman until it was sold in 1996. He was one of the first outside members of the board of directors of Intergraph Corporation from 1997 until 2006. Most recently, he led the start-up of CBX Holding, LLC (Cold Box), an Arab producer and marketer of temperature

controlled cargo containers. In addition to his many business adventures, he was very active in commercial and residential real estate development.

Sid's accomplishments and contributions to the State of Alabama have not gone unnoticed. He was elected in 2001 to the Alabama Academy of Honor's One Hundred Living Alabamians and was elected to the Alabama Business Hall of Fame in 2010. The University of Alabama also dedicated a facility on campus in his honor, Sid McDonald Hall.

I offer my deepest condolences to Sid's wife Jane Plunkett McDonald, and to all of their loved ones as they celebrate his many life accomplishments and mourn this great loss.●

RECOGNIZING DOWNS ENTERPRISE, LLC

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, in order to pursue the American dream in today's regulatory climate, small businesses owners and entrepreneurs require a variety of administrative and support services. Often, they are able to offer a helping hand to each other, building important relationships and creating economic opportunity across the board. Small Business of the Week, Downs Enterprise of Bastrop, LA, is providing these crucial services to fellow small businesses, entrepreneurs, and veterans throughout northeast Louisiana.

Troy Downs, founder of Downs Enterprise, LLC, has been assisting small business owners in northeast Louisiana for nearly 14 years. In 2001 Downs opened his namesake consulting business, focusing on managing, consulting, and developing local small businesses through financial, real estate, and logistical services. After nearly 10 years of success, Downs visited the Louisiana Small Business Development Center, LSBDC, at the University of Louisiana-Monroe, located in Monroe, LA, with a financial management and business development and expansion plan. Downs took advantage of all the LSBDC had to offer, attending every seminar and networking event available to him, even if not directly related to his business. Downs believed that just his being there would put him in a position to learn, and it worked—a sentiment that he now passes along to the businesses he consults. Through Downs Enterprise, LLC, Troy and his team have assisted in starting and managing over 25 successful businesses, created 50 jobs, and counseled over 100 individuals in the process of starting and maintaining a healthy business.

After years of successfully guiding individuals through the hoops of starting and maintaining a business, Downs, a 25-year serviceman of the U.S. Army, saw the need for such a consulting service geared towards our Nation's brave servicemen and women. After experiencing the difficulties servicemen and women have in adjusting back to a civilian lifestyle, the Downs Founda-

tion was born. Today, the Downs Foundation continues their original goal of assisting veterans in small business development, while also providing services in credit restoration, preparation for jobs, and counseling services. Down's work in northeast Louisiana has earned him the distinguished honor of being recognized as the 2015 Veteran Small Business Champion by Louisiana Economic Development and the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Congratulations again to Downs Enterprise for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your continued commitment not only to your community, but also to your fellow brothers and sisters of the military.●

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.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:15 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 880. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify and make permanent the research credit.

H.R. 1806. An act to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 202(a) of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following individuals on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Care: Mr. David P. Blom of Columbus, Ohio, Mr. Darin Selnick of Oceanside, California, and Dr. Toby Cosgrove of Cleveland, Ohio.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. POLIS of Colorado, Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas, and Mrs. TORRES of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4412, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker reappoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 1:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 2:36 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. 2496. An act to extend the authorization for the replacement of the existing Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center in Denver, Colorado, to make certain improvements in the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014, and for other purposes.

At 6:28 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, 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. 1735. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 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.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1806. An act to provide for technological innovation through the prioritization of Federal investment in basic research, fundamental scientific discovery, and development to improve the competitiveness of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 2353. An act 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.

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1735. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for

military construction, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 21, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 178. An act to provide justice for the victims of trafficking.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled "Report on the Legislative Activities of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation During the 113th Congress" (Rept. No. 114-50).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 143. A bill to allow for improvements to the United States Merchant Marine Academy and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-51).

S. 808. A bill to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-52).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 615. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Under Secretary for Management of the Department of Homeland Security to take administrative action to achieve and maintain interoperable communications capabilities among the components of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-53).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2028. A bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-54).

By Mr. COCHRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals from the Concurrent Resolution for Fiscal Year 2016" (Rept. No. 114-55).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 335. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve 529 plans (Rept. No. 114-56).

By Mr. KIRK, from the Committee on Appropriations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2029. A bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-57).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 87. A resolution to express the sense of the Senate regarding the rise of anti-Semitism in Europe and to encourage greater cooperation with the European governments, the European Union, and the Organization

for Security and Co-operation in Europe in preventing and responding to anti-Semitism.

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 802. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to provide assistance to support the rights of women and girls in developing countries, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 1417. An original bill to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Paul A. Folmsbee, of Oklahoma, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Mali.

Nominee: Paul A. Folmsbee.

Post: Mali.

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; and donee:

Self: 0.

Spouse: 0.

Children and Spouses names: 0.

Parents Names: 0.

Grandparents Names: 0.

Brothers and Spouses Names: 0.

Sisters and Spouses Names: 0.

*Cassandra Q. Butts, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

Nominee: Cassandra Q. Butts.

Post: The Bahamas (Commonwealth).

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; and donee:

1. Self: \$250.00; 2004; Barack Obama (Senate); \$250.00; 2006; DCCC.

2. Spouse: N/A.

3. Children and Spouses: N/A.

4. Parents: Mae A. Karim: \$500.00; 2008; Barack Obama (President).

5. Grandparents: N/A.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Deidra & Frank Abbott: \$200.00; 2008; Barack Obama (President).

*Stafford Fitzgerald Haney, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Costa Rica.

Nominee: Stafford Fitzgerald Haney.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to Republic of Costa Rica.

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, and Donee:

1. Self: \$5,200, 2014, Kaine for Virginia; \$10,000, 2014, Democratic National Committee; \$2,600, 2014, Menendez for New Jersey; \$49,000, 2013, Presidential Inaugural.

Committee 2013: \$2,000, 2012, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$1,104, 2012, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$644, 2012, Colorado Democratic Party; \$1,380, 2012, Democratic Executive.

Committee of Florida: \$920, 2012, Iowa Democratic Party; \$920, 2012, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$276, 2012, New Hampshire Democratic.

Party: \$2,208, 2012, Ohio Democratic Party; \$276, 2012, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; \$40,000, 2012, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$30,800, 2012, Democratic National Committee; \$644, 2012, N Carolina Democratic Party; \$2,500, 2012, Menendez for Senate; \$5,000, 2011, Obama for America; \$35,800, 2011, Obama Victory Fund 2012; \$30,800, 2011, Democratic National Committee; \$5,000, 2011, Gillibrand for Senate; \$5,000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$2,500, 2011, Menendez for Senate; \$30,400, 2010, Democratic National Committee; \$500, 2010, Ben Chandler for Congress.

2. Spouse: Andrea R Haney: \$5,000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$30,400, 2010, Democratic National Committee.

3. Children and Spouses: Asher D. Haney—none; Nava S. Haney—none; Eden N. Haney—none; Shaia A. Haney—none.

4. Parents: Sandra Haney Hogan—deceased; William Chester Haney—deceased.

5. Grandparents: Della Mae Scott—deceased; James D Brabson—deceased; Oliver Joseph Haney—deceased; Grace Tuggelle—deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Joseph M. Haney—deceased.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

*Charles C. Adams, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Nominee: Charles C. Adams, Jr.

Post: Ambassador to the Republic of Finland.

(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, and donee:

1. Self: \$32500, 2009, Democratic Nat'l Committee; \$1000, 2009, Evan Bayh Committee; \$500, 2009, Eric Massa for Congress; \$30400, 2010, Democratic Nat'l Committee; \$1000, 2010, Bennet for Colorado; \$2400, 2010, Friends for Harry Reid; \$30800, 2011, Democratic Nat'l Committee; \$5000, 2011, Obama for America; \$9200, 2011, Swing State Victory Fund; \$5000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$2500, 2011, Akin Gump PAC; \$30800, 2012, Obama Victory Fund; \$1000, 2012, Gillibrand for Senate; \$600, 2012, Clyde Williams for Congress; \$5000, 2012, Akin Gump PAC; \$1000, 2012, DSCC; \$1000, 2012, Andrei Cherny for Arizona; \$1000, 2014, Mark Warner for Virginia; \$2000, 2014, Common Ground PAC; \$500, 2014, Nunn for Georgia; \$2600, 2014, Friends of Don Beyer; \$1000, 2014, Democrats Abroad; \$1000, 2014, DSCC; \$5000, 2014, Akin Gump PAC.

2. Spouse: Vera Risteski-Adams: None.

3. Children and Spouses: Matthew Andrew Adams: \$5000, 2011, Kaine for Virginia; \$1000, 2011, Obama for America; \$9000 2012 DNC; \$13000, 2012, Obama Victory Fund; Maya Adrian Adams, None.

4. Parents: Charles C. Adams: Deceased. Florence Adams: Deceased.

5. Grandparents: Charles C. Adams: Deceased. Nellie M. Adams: Deceased. David Schneider: Deceased. Mary Schneider, Deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Andrew M. Adams: Deceased. Kenneth A. Adams: None. Joanne K. Adams: None.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Adrian Adams Sow: Deceased. Diabé Sow: None. Christine Adams: None. Peter De Bolla: None.

*Mary Catherine Phee, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Sudan.

(The financial disclosure information for Mary Catherine Phee may be found on page S3309 of the May 22, 2015, Congressional Record.)

*Matthew T. McGuire, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

*Gentry O. Smith, of North Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, and to have the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nomination of Douglas A. Koneff.

Foreign Service nomination of Judy R. Reinke.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Brian C. Brisson and ending with Catherine M. Werner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 4, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Peter J. Olson and ending with Nicolas Rubio, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Craig A. Anderson and ending with Henry Kaminski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Anthony S. Amatos and ending with Elena Zlatnik, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 15, 2015.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1409. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require States to suspend, rather than terminate, an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while such individual is an inmate of a public institution; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1410. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve the treatment of substance use disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1411. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. KING):

S. 1412. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to qualify homeless youth and veterans who are full-time students for purposes of the low income housing tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1413. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve compliance in higher education tax benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1415. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of large employer for purposes of applying the employer mandate; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. LEE, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1416. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to limit the authority to reserve water rights in designating a national monument; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

S. 1417. An original bill to reauthorize the United States Grain Standards Act, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1418. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. HEITKAMP):

S. 1419. A bill to promote the academic achievement of American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian children with the establishment of a Native American language grant program; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1420. A bill to amend the Department of Energy Organization Act to provide for the collection of information on critical energy supplies, to establish a Working Group on Energy Markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1421. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize a 6-month extension of certain exclusivity peri-

ods in the case of approved drugs that are subsequently approved for a new indication to prevent, diagnose, or treat a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1422. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a comprehensive program to improve education and training for energy- and manufacturing-related jobs to increase the number of skilled workers trained to work in energy and manufacturing-related fields, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER:

S. 1423. A bill to designate certain Federal lands in California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1424. A bill to prohibit the sale or distribution of cosmetics containing synthetic plastic microbeads; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CAPITO:

S. 1425. A bill to promote new manufacturing in the United States by providing for greater transparency and timeliness in obtaining necessary permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 1426. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of physical therapists in the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 1427. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to facilitate increased coordination and alignment between the public and private sector with respect to quality and efficiency measures; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1428. A bill to amend the USEC Privatization Act to require the Secretary of Energy to issue a long-term Federal excess uranium inventory management plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COCHRAN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1429. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the deductibility of charitable contributions to agricultural research organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1430. A bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and coastal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1431. A bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CANTWELL:

S. 1432. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study on the technology, potential lifecycle energy savings, and economic impact of recycled carbon fiber, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1433. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to improve highway safety and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 1434. A bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1435. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to promote awareness of organ donation and the need to increase the pool of available organs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1436. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. BURR):

S. 1437. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to authorize and provide flexibility for the use of the National Guard for support of civilian firefighting activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. BURR, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1438. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective contraception; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 1439. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow States that provide foster care for children up to age 21 to serve former foster youths through age 23 under the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1441. A bill to prevent the militarization of Federal, State, and local law enforcement by Federal excess property transfers and grant programs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1442. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to strike a provision relating to the budget neutrality of any renegotiated Standard Reinsurance Agreement; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1443. A bill to amend the Indian Employment, Training and Related Services Demonstration Act of 1992 to facilitate the ability of Indian tribes to integrate the employment, training, and related services from diverse Federal sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1444. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the rate of tax regarding the taxation of distilled spirits; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1445. A bill to improve the Microloan Program of the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1446. A bill to establish the Stop, Observe, Ask, and Respond to Health and Wellness Training pilot program to address human trafficking in the health care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1447. A bill to provide for the implementation of a Sustainable Chemistry Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1449. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to add certain medium-duty and heavy-duty vehicles to the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1450. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to modify the hours of employment of physicians and physician assistants employed on a full-time basis by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1451. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adjudicate and pay survivor's benefits without requiring the filing of a formal claim, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 1452. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for reimbursements for emergency medical treatment and to require that the Department of Veterans Affairs be treated as a participating provider for the recovery of the costs of certain medical care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1453. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to apply deemed enrollment to residents of Puerto Rico and to provide a special enrollment period and a reduction in the late enrollment penalties for certain residents of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1454. A bill to enhance interstate commerce by creating a National Hiring Standard for Motor Carriers; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 183. A resolution calling for suspension of construction of artificial land formations on islands, reefs, shoals, and other features of the Spratly Islands and for a peaceful and multilateral resolution to the South China Sea territorial dispute; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. Res. 184. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that conversion therapy, including efforts by mental health practitioners to change the sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression of an individual, is dangerous and harmful and should be prohibited from being practiced on minors; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. REID, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 185. A resolution recognizing the significance of May 2015 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. Res. 186. A resolution designating the week of May 17 through May 23, 2015, as "National Public Works Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. Res. 187. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the month of May 2015, as "National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 171

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 171, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for coverage under the beneficiary travel program of the Department of Veterans Affairs of certain disabled veterans for travel in connection with certain special disabilities rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 197

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 197, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to award grants to States to improve delivery of high-quality assessments, and for other purposes.

S. 241

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 241, a bill to amend title 38, United

States Code, to provide for the payment of temporary compensation to a surviving spouse of a veteran upon the death of the veteran, and for other purposes.

S. 280

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 280, a bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S. 293

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 293, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a procedure for approval of certain settlements.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 352, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 423

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 453, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to States to streamline State requirements and procedures for veterans with military emergency medical training to become civilian emergency medical technicians.

S. 607

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 607, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to increase the participation of women, girls, and underrepresented minorities in STEM fields, to encourage and support students from all economic backgrounds to pursue STEM career opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to provide for a temporary, emergency authorization of defense articles, defense services, and related training directly to the Kurdistan Regional Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1381

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1381, a bill to require the President to

make the text of trade agreements available to the public in order for those agreements to receive expedited consideration from Congress.

S. 1382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1382, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1389

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1389, a bill to authorize exportation of consumer communications devices to Cuba and the provision of telecommunications services to Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 1393

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1393, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to include in each regulatory impact analysis for a proposed or final rule an analysis that does not include any other proposed or unimplemented rule.

S. 1400

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1400, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

S. CON. RES. 17

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 17, a concurrent resolution establishing a joint select committee to address regulatory reform.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, a resolution designating September 2015 as "National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month".

AMENDMENT NO. 1246

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1246 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a

bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1273

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1273 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1299

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1299 proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1343

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1343 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1371

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

At the request of Ms. WARREN, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1371 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, supra.

AMENDMENT NO. 1387

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1387 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1314, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1414. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Manage-

ment Council; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, along with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE, I am introducing the Rhode Island Fishermen's Fairness Act of 2015.

This legislation seeks to extend simple fairness to our State's fishermen by giving Rhode Island voting representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council MAFMC. The council manages stocks, like squid, which are critically important to the fishing industry in my State. Rhode Island's commercial fishing industry depends more on MAFMC-managed stocks than those managed by the New England Fisheries Management Council, where Rhode Island is a member. More than that, Rhode Island has a larger stake in the Mid-Atlantic fishery than many of the states that currently hold seats on the MAFMC.

This is not a new proposal, nor is it unprecedented. North Carolina was added to the MAFMC through an amendment to the Sustainable Fisheries Act in 1996. In addition, the last reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act required a report on this issue. Now it is time to make this change.

I was pleased in the last Congress that this legislation was included in the Commerce Committee's discussion draft for the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, as well as in the reauthorization bill introduced by then-Oceans Subcommittee Chairman Mark Begich at the end of last year. I hope that in this Congress we can take this commonsense step to bring fairness to Rhode Island's fishermen.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 1418. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide an Inspector General for the judicial branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act, a bill that would establish within the judicial branch an Office of Inspector General to assist the Judiciary with its ethical obligations as well as to ensure taxpayer dollars are not lost to waste, fraud, or abuse. This bill will help ensure that our Federal judicial system remains free of corruption, bias, and hypocrisy.

The facts demonstrate that the institution of the Inspector General has been crucial in detecting, exposing and deterring problems within our government. The job of the Inspector General is to be the first line of defense against fraud, waste and abuse. In collaboration with whistleblowers, Inspectors General have been extremely effective in their efforts to expose and help correct these wrongs.

That is why, during my many years in Congress, I have worked hard to

strengthen the oversight role of Inspectors General throughout the Federal government. I have come to rely on IGs and whistleblowers, to ensure that our tax dollars are spent according to the letter and spirit of the law. When that doesn't happen, we in Congress need to know about it and take corrective action.

During the past fiscal year, Congress appropriated nearly \$7 billion in taxpayer money to the Federal judiciary. To put this in context, the Small Business Administration and the Corporation for National and Community Service each received a similar or less amount than the judiciary. Yet both of these entities have an Office of Inspector General. If we in Congress believed that these entities could use an Inspector General, I cannot see why the Judiciary wouldn't deserve the same assistance.

But there is an additional reason why the Judiciary needs an Inspector General. The fact remains that the current practice of self-regulation of judges with respect to ethics and the judicial code of conduct has time and time again proven inadequate. I would point out to my colleagues two recent events here in the Senate that support this conclusion.

In the past 6 years, the Senate received articles of impeachment for not one but two Federal judges. In the first case, former Judge Samuel B. Kent, although charged with multiple counts of sexual assault, pled guilty to obstruction of justice. Who did he obstruct? Who did he lie to? He did this to his fellow judges, who were assembled to investigate the allegations of his obscene and criminal behavior. But it took a criminal investigation by the Department of Justice to uncover his false statements to his colleagues as well as substantiate the horrendous claims made against him.

In the second case, the Senate found former Judge G. Thomas Porteous, Jr. guilty on multiple articles of impeachment, including accepting money from attorneys who had a case pending before him in his court and committing perjury by falsifying his name on bankruptcy filings. Once again, this Judge's misbehavior came to light through a Federal criminal investigation, after which another judicial committee had to be organized to investigate their fellow judge.

What's more, in each case the disgraced judge tried to game the system in order to retain his \$174,000 salary. Rather than resign their commissions, each first tried to claim disability status that would allow each to continue to receive payment, even if in prison. Then both played chicken with Congress daring us to strip them of their pay by impeaching and convicting them. I am pleased that we put our foot down and said "No."

This bill would establish an Office of Inspector General for the judicial branch. The IG's responsibilities would include conducting investigations of

possible judicial misconduct, investigating waste fraud and abuse, and recommending changes in laws and regulations governing the federal judiciary. The bill would require the IG to provide the Chief Justice and Congress with an annual report on its activities, as well as refer matters that may constitute a criminal violation to the Department of Justice. In addition, the bill establishes whistleblower protections for judicial branch employees.

Ensuring a fair and independent judiciary is critical to our Constitutional checks and balances. Judges are supposed to maintain impartiality. They are supposed to be free from conflicts of interest. An independent watchdog for the federal judiciary will help its members comply with the ethics rules and promote credibility within the judicial branch of government. Whistleblower protections for judiciary branch employees will help keep the judiciary accountable. The Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act will not only help ensure continued public confidence in our Federal courts and keep them beyond reproach, it will strengthen our judicial branch.

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. 1418

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 “Judicial Transparency and Ethics Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND DUTIES.—Part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 60—INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR THE JUDICIAL BRANCH

“Sec.

“1021. Establishment.

“1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General.

“1023. Duties.

“1024. Powers.

“1025. Reports.

“1026. Whistleblower protection.

“§ 1021. Establishment

“There is established for the judicial branch of the Government the Office of Inspector General for the Judicial Branch (in this chapter referred to as the ‘Office’).

“§ 1022. Appointment, term, and removal of Inspector General

“(a) APPOINTMENT.—The head of the Office shall be the Inspector General, who shall be appointed by the Chief Justice of the United States after consultation with the majority and minority leaders of the Senate and the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

“(b) TERM.—The Inspector General shall serve for a term of 4 years and may be reappointed by the Chief Justice of the United States for any number of additional terms.

“(c) REMOVAL.—The Inspector General may be removed from office by the Chief Justice of the United States. The Chief Justice shall communicate the reasons for any such removal to both Houses of Congress.

“§ 1023. Duties

“With respect to the judicial branch, the Office shall—

“(1) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the judicial branch (other than the United States Supreme Court) under chapter 16 that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

“(2) conduct investigations of alleged misconduct in the United States Supreme Court that may require oversight or other action within the judicial branch or by Congress;

“(3) conduct and supervise audits and investigations;

“(4) prevent and detect waste, fraud, and abuse; and

“(5) recommend changes in laws or regulations governing the judicial branch.

“§ 1024. Powers

“(a) POWERS.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall have the power to—

“(1) make investigations and reports;

“(2) obtain information or assistance from any Federal, State, or local governmental agency, or other entity, or unit thereof, including all information kept in the course of business by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the judicial councils of circuits, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and the United States Sentencing Commission;

“(3) require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses, and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, which subpoena, in the case of contumacy or refusal to obey, shall be enforceable by civil action;

“(4) administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit;

“(5) employ such officers and employees, subject to the provisions of title 5, governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates;

“(6) obtain services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5 at daily rates not to exceed the equivalent rate for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of such title; and

“(7) the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in advance by appropriations Acts, to enter into contracts and other arrangements for audits, studies, analyses, and other services with public agencies and with private persons, and to make such payments as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the Office.

“(b) CHAPTER 16 MATTERS.—The Inspector General shall not commence an investigation under section 1023(1) until the denial of a petition for review by the judicial council of the circuit under section 352(c) of this title or upon referral or certification to the Judicial Conference of the United States of any matter under section 354(b) of this title.

“(c) LIMITATION.—The Inspector General shall not have the authority to—

“(1) investigate or review any matter that is directly related to the merits of a decision or procedural ruling by any judge, justice, or court; or

“(2) punish or discipline any judge, justice, or court.

“§ 1025. Reports

“(a) WHEN TO BE MADE.—The Inspector General shall—

“(1) make an annual report to the Chief Justice and to Congress relating to the activities of the Office; and

“(2) make prompt reports to the Chief Justice and to Congress on matters that may require action by the Chief Justice or Congress.

“(b) SENSITIVE MATTER.—If a report contains sensitive matter, the Inspector General may so indicate and Congress may receive that report in closed session.

“(c) DUTY TO INFORM ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In carrying out the duties of the Office, the Inspector General shall report expeditiously to the Attorney General whenever the Inspector General has reasonable grounds to believe there has been a violation of Federal criminal law.

“§ 1026. Whistleblower protection

“(a) IN GENERAL.—No officer, employee, agent, contractor, or subcontractor in the judicial branch may discharge, demote, threaten, suspend, harass, or in any other manner discriminate against an employee in the terms and conditions of employment because of any lawful act done by the employee to provide information, cause information to be provided, or otherwise assist in an investigation regarding any possible violation of Federal law or regulation, or misconduct, by a judge, justice, or any other employee in the judicial branch, which may assist the Inspector General in the performance of duties under this chapter.

“(b) CIVIL ACTION.—An employee injured by a violation of subsection (a) may, in a civil action, obtain appropriate relief.”

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“60. Inspector General for the judicial branch 1021”.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1430. A bill to improve the ability of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Coast Guard, and coastal States to sustain healthy ocean and coastal ecosystems by maintaining and sustaining their capabilities relating to oil spill preparedness, prevention, response, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today the U.S. Coast Guard and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration are responding to yet another oil spill in the water. In a moment, I will bring out a photograph which shows the fresh crude oil on the beach of Refugio State Park in California. This oil spill brings back the images from 5 years ago of the oil-coated pelicans and tar-stained beaches, which were once sugar white, covered with goeey mats of oil from the Deepwater Horizon oil spill. Although the spill happened in 2010, a lot of that oil is still sloshing around out there in the gulf.

Last week, the Department of the Interior told us that the oil leaking in the gulf since 2004 from Taylor Energy wells could continue for a century or more “if left unchecked.”

This is the oil spill that just happened in the last few days. It is fresh crude, and it is on the beach in California. Of course, when I see this kind of picture, it brings me back to that experience all of us on the gulf coast had 5 years ago, and we wouldn’t wish that upon anybody. Remember, to begin with, they said, Oh, it is just a few hundred barrels of oil, even though it was ruptured 1 mile beneath the surface of the water.

Then we got the streaming video. We actually put that video on my Web site. The chairman of the environment committee, Senator BOXER, put it up on her committee Web site. Once scientists could see how much was flowing, they could calculate, and then they saw that it wasn't going to be a few hundred or even a thousand barrels of oil a day; it was approaching something like 50 times that.

We know what, in fact, happened. Almost 5 million barrels of oil was spilled. The court in Louisiana—the Federal court that is hearing this case against BP—indeed has concluded that those who are going to be held responsible under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 will be responsible for somewhere around 4 million barrels. That is court-decided.

A lot of that oil is still out there. Yet, appallingly, today the economy and the environment of the State of Florida are again under attack. I have just been informed that Senators from Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas are seeking to invite oil rigs within 50 miles of Florida's coastline.

Now, of course, that goes against all logic. It is certainly not what the people of Florida want and it is not what the Department of the Interior has said is appropriate or necessary under the next 5-year leasing plan.

Florida is a unique State. This is a photo of a dead dolphin covered with oil that is just another casualty of what we are seeing that is happening this week.

The reason I am here today with these Senators who are threatening Florida is because in 2006, in a bipartisan way, the other Senator from Florida, Mr. Martinez, a Republican, and I, a Democrat, joined together to put in law that the Outer Continental Shelf off Florida is off-limits to oil drilling. We were successful in doing that, even though no other Outer Continental Shelf off the United States is off-limits. In the administration's 5-year plans, they have complied with that because the off-limits to oil drilling is until the year 2022. Therefore, in the next 5-year plan, from 2017 to 2022, the administration honored that. It is, after all, the law.

But why is Florida different than others? Well, in the first place, there is no oil off of Florida. People think of where the oil is. It is off of Louisiana. The sediment came down the Mississippi River for millions of years and was compacted by the Earth's crust, and that formed these oil deposits. There is a lot of oil in the central Gulf of Mexico and, indeed, that is what is happening. A lot of oil is being produced there. That is the first reason. There is not oil off of Florida.

But there are other reasons, not the least of which is of all the Gulf Coast States, Florida has the most beaches and, therefore, the economy is directly charged with the fact of having those pristine, sugary white beaches as such an attraction for our guests to come to Florida and enjoy nature's seaside.

Well, we found out, as a result of the gulf oilspill, that even though just a little oil reached Florida—Pensacola Beach was blackened, tar mats came into Pensacola Bay, Destin got oil on the beach, and some tar balls got as far east as Panama City Beach. So people saw those pictures of oil covering the beach and they thought that was the entire State of Florida and they didn't come. For a whole season, the guests, the visitors, the tourists did not come. So the motels were not filled and the restaurants were not filled and the dry-cleaners, and all the ancillary businesses associated with a tourism economy on the coast, they did not come.

Now, there is also, obviously, the environmental interests because we do have a lot of the bays and estuaries and marsh grasses where critters spawn so much of the marine life in the Gulf of Mexico, and it starts in these bays and estuaries. That is obviously a reason as well. But there is a special reason why we have kept oil off our shores. Bottlenose dolphins in the gulf have been dying at unprecedented rates over the last 5 years. This is one of those sick dolphins. So from the BP spill, science is showing, in fact, what we intuitively knew. And just yesterday, a team of scientists confirmed the Deepwater Horizon oilspill contributed to the highest number of dead bottlenose dolphin strandings on record in the northern Gulf of Mexico.

So it certainly makes little sense that we would seek more drilling in even riskier areas when we are still picking up the pieces from the last major oilspill.

Today, I am introducing legislation that implements many of the hard lessons learned in the wake of the Deepwater Horizon BP oilspill. This legislation is going to make sure that NOAA and the Coast Guard have the tools to prevent, to prepare for, and to respond to marine oilspills.

The bill is going to give gulf coast communities a seat at the table in the decisions about oil drilling that affects their way of life. It will strengthen State-level planning for oilspills or seismic exploration. But, most importantly, the bill will protect Florida from Big Oil's reach by keeping the eastern Gulf of Mexico off-limits beyond 2022 and in statute until 2027.

Back in 2006, we passed the bipartisan Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act. In that act, that is what we did in establishing this off-limits in law. But now, some of our neighboring States, at the behest of Big Oil, are trying to drill again and to drill off of Florida.

We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose another tourism season. We are going to do everything we can to make sure we don't lose an entire year for our recreational fishermen, charter boat fishermen, as well as the commercial fishermen. Drilling off the coast is not what the people of Florida want. We want fishing vessels hauling in prize catches, not Coast Guard vessels skimming oil.

We want dolphins rolling in the waves, not washing ashore, and we want sunbathers on the beaches, not HAZMAT workers.

By Mr. REID (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1436. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for certain Indian tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REID. 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. 1436

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 "Nevada Native Nations Land Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF SECRETARY.

In this Act, the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBES.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE FORT McDERMITT PAIUTE AND SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term "map" means the map entitled "Fort McDermitt Indian Reservation Expansion Act", dated February 21, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 19,094 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as "Reservation Expansion Lands".

(b) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SHOSHONE PAIUTE TRIBES.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term "map" means the map entitled "Mountain City Administrative Site Proposed Acquisition", dated July 29, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Shoshone Paiute Tribes of the Duck Valley Indian Reservation.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 82 acres of land administered by the Forest Service as generally depicted on the map as "Proposed Acquisition Site".

(c) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE SUMMIT LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this section, the term "map" means the map entitled "Summit Lake Indian Reservation Conveyance",

dated February 28, 2013, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Summit Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 941 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Conveyance Lands”.

(d) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE RENO-SPARKS INDIAN COLONY.—

(1) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Reno-Sparks Indian Colony Expansion”, dated June 11, 2014, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Reno-Sparks Indian Colony.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 13,434 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “RSIC Amended Boundary”.

(e) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE PYRAMID LAKE PAIUTE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Pyramid Lake Indian Reservation Expansion”, dated April 13, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 6,357 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

(f) CONVEYANCE OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE DUCKWATER SHOSHONE TRIBE.—

(1) MAP.—In this subsection, the term “map” means the map entitled “Duckwater Reservation Expansion”, dated January 12, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) CONVEYANCE OF LAND.—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in paragraph (3)—

(A) is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe; and

(B) shall be part of the reservation of the Duckwater Shoshone Tribe.

(3) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The land referred to in paragraph (2) is the approximately 31,269 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management as gen-

erally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Lands”.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) SURVEY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust for each Indian tribe under section 3.

(b) USE OF TRUST LAND.—

(1) GAMING.—Land taken into trust under section 3 shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

(2) THINNING; LANDSCAPE RESTORATION.—With respect to the land taken into trust under section 3, the Secretary, in consultation and coordination with the applicable Indian tribe, may carry out any fuel reduction and other landscape restoration activities, including restoration of sage grouse habitat, on the land that is beneficial to the Indian tribe and the Bureau of Land Management.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1440. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to exclude a loan secured by a non-owner occupied 1- to 4-family dwelling from the definition of a member business loan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, most of us have heard the metaphor that small businesses are the engines that power our economy. What we don't hear people talk about as much is the fuel that feeds the engines: capital. Without capital, entrepreneurs cannot see their ideas to fruition, successful business owners cannot expand to meet the needs of the market, and eager job seekers must take their skills elsewhere. Without capital, Main Street falters.

Today, more than 7 years after the start of the Great Recession and many policy reforms later, access to capital remains a challenge that stands in the way of small business growth, economic development and job creation in Oregon and across the country. Despite this, government regulation continues to tie the hands of many potential lenders; namely, credit unions. According to some estimates, credit unions could lend an additional \$16 billion to small businesses, helping them create nearly 150,000 new jobs in just 1 year if Congress loosened restraints on credit union business lending.

With this in mind, I am pleased to introduce today the Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act, which would increase access to capital by exempting certain loans from the member business lending cap imposed on credit unions. Currently, loans made for one- to four-person, non-owner occupied housing are treated as business loans when they are made by credit unions. As such, these types of loans count against a credit union's business lending cap, and thereby limit a credit union's ability to provide loans to small businesses. My legislation would address this issue by allowing credit unions to treat these types of loans as residential loans—as they are when

they are made by other financial institutions—therefore exempting these loans from the business lending cap. In doing so, this legislation would increase the availability of business capital, providing greater opportunities for small businesses to receive credit union loans to help them continue to grow and expand, create jobs and support our local economies.

I am hopeful that this legislation will be received by colleagues for what it is: a simple step to help ensure America's small businesses have access to the fuel they need to power our economy. It is my hope that the Senate will pass this legislation swiftly.

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. 1440

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 “Credit Union Residential Loan Parity Act”.

SEC. 2. TREATMENT OF A NON-OWNER OCCUPIED 1- TO 4-FAMILY DWELLING.

(a) REMOVAL FROM MEMBER BUSINESS LOAN LIMITATION.—Section 107A(c)(1)(B)(i) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a(c)(1)(B)(i)) is amended by striking “that is the primary residence of a member”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or the amendment made by this Act shall preclude the National Credit Union Administration from treating an extension of credit that is fully secured by a lien on a 1- to 4-family dwelling that is not the primary residence of a member as a member business loan for purposes other than the member business loan limitation requirements under section 107A of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757a).

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1448. A bill to designate the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to honor my friend Frank Moore, an Oregonian, World War II veteran, husband to Jeanne, father, avid fly fisherman, and tireless conservationist.

Frank Moore can be found standing in the North Umpqua River in Oregon, wearing waders and casting his fly fishing reel, for hours. He is a legendary presence on the River, even at 91 years young. A pastime he picked up from his father, fly fishing has been a business and a hobby for Frank for nearly his entire life. Not only has he enjoyed the fishing and scenery on Oregon's rivers for decades, Frank's love of Oregon and his tireless work to conserve our state's fish habitats and rivers adds up to a rich legacy that sets the standard for generations to come. Frank served on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission and has received the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award and the Wild

Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award.

Frank's commitment to the health and vitality of Oregon's rivers and fish habitat over the years is inspiring and he deserves countless thanks for his work and dedication. The Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary will serve as a tribute to the many outstanding accomplishments of Frank, both on and off the river.

It is my honor to introduce this bill today with my colleague from Oregon Senator MERKLEY on behalf of this extraordinary Oregonian.

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. 1448

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 "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary Designation Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) Frank Moore has committed his life to family, friends, his country, and fly fishing;

(2) Frank Moore is a World War II veteran who stormed the beaches of Normandy along with 150,000 troops during the D-Day Allied invasion and was awarded the Chevalier of the French Legion of Honor for his bravery;

(3) Frank Moore returned home after the war, started a family, and pursued his passion of fishing on the winding rivers in Oregon;

(4) as the proprietor of the Steamboat Inn along the North Umpqua River in Oregon for nearly 20 years, Frank Moore, along with his wife Jeanne, shared his love of fishing, the flowing river, and the great outdoors, with visitors from all over the United States and the world;

(5) Frank Moore has spent most of his life fishing the vast rivers of Oregon, during which time he has contributed significantly to efforts to conserve fish habitats and protect river health, including serving on the State of Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission;

(6) Frank Moore has been recognized for his conservation work with the National Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year award, the Wild Steelhead Coalition Conservation Award, and his 2010 induction into the Fresh Water Fishing Hall of Fame; and

(7) in honor of the many accomplishments of Frank Moore, both on and off the river, approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in Oregon should be designated as the "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary".

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MAP.**—The term "Map" means the map entitled "O&C Land Grant Act of 2014: Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary" and dated November 3, 2014.

(2) **SANCTUARY.**—The term "Sanctuary" means the Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary designated by section 4(a).

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(4) **STATE.**—The term "State" means the State of Oregon.

SEC. 4. FRANK MOORE WILD STEELHEAD SANCTUARY, OREGON.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The approximately 104,000 acres of Forest Service land in the State, as generally depicted on the Map, is designated as the "Frank Moore Wild Steelhead Sanctuary".

(b) **MAP; LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a map and legal description of the Sanctuary.

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and legal description.

(3) **AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description prepared under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Sanctuary shall be administered by the Secretary—

(1) in accordance with all laws (including regulations) applicable to the National Forest System; and

(2) in a manner that—

(A) protects, preserves, and enhances the natural character, scientific use, and the botanical, recreational, ecological, fish and wildlife, scenic, drinking water, and cultural values of the Sanctuary;

(B) protects and seeks to enhance the wild salmonid resources of the Sanctuary;

(C) maintains or enhances the watershed as a thermal refuge for wild salmonids; and

(D) preserves opportunities for primitive recreation.

(d) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction or responsibilities of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(e) **ADJACENT MANAGEMENT.**—Nothing in this section creates any protective perimeter or buffer zone around the Sanctuary.

(f) **PROTECTION OF TRIBAL RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this section diminishes any treaty rights of an Indian tribe.

(g) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Federal land within the boundaries of the Sanctuary river segments designated by subsection (a) is withdrawn from all forms of—

(1) entry, appropriation, or disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing or mineral materials.

(h) **USES.**—The Secretary shall only allow uses of the Sanctuary that are consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary is established.

(i) **USE OF MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the use of motorized vehicles within the Sanctuary shall be limited to roads allowed by the Secretary for the use of motorized vehicles.

(2) **OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE.**—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Secretary may allow off-road vehicle use in designated portions of the Sanctuary if the use is consistent with the purposes and values for which the Sanctuary was designated.

(j) **ROADS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall decrease the total mileage of system roads that are operational in the Sanctuary to a quantity less than the quantity of mileage in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **PRIORITY.**—The Secretary shall prioritize decreasing the mileage of the road

network in the Sanctuary to reduce impacts to water quality from sediment delivered to streams by forest roads.

(3) **TEMPORARY ROADS.**—If the Secretary constructs a temporary road as part of a vegetation management project, the Secretary shall close and decommission the temporary road not later than the earlier of—

(A) the date that is 2 years after the date on which the activity for which the temporary road was constructed is completed; and

(B) the date that is 1 year after the date on which the vegetation management project is completed.

(4) **NO NEW ROADS.**—The Secretary shall prohibit—

(A) any new system or nonsystem road within the Sanctuary and key watersheds under the plan entitled "Northwest Forest Plan 1994 Record of Decision for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl" after the date of enactment of this Act, except as the Secretary determines to be necessary, if the Secretary determines that no practicable alternative exists, and subject to the availability of appropriations; and

(B) the construction of any new road in any roadless area in the Sanctuary.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 183—CALLING FOR SUSPENSION OF CONSTRUCTION OF ARTIFICIAL LAND FORMATIONS ON ISLANDS, REEFS, SHOALS, AND OTHER FEATURES OF THE SPRATLY ISLANDS AND FOR A PEACEFUL AND MULTILATERAL RESOLUTION TO THE SOUTH CHINA SEA TERRITORIAL DISPUTE

Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 183

Whereas the United States Government strongly supports the peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea;

Whereas the South China Sea includes critical sea lines of communication and commerce between the Pacific and Indian oceans;

Whereas the United States Government has a national interest in freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea, as provided for by customary principles of international law;

Whereas the United States Government is also committed to upholding internationally lawful uses of the high seas and the Exclusive Economic Zones as well as to the related rights and freedoms in other maritime zones, including the rights of innocent passage, transit passage, and archipelagic sea lanes passage consistent with customary international law;

Whereas the United States has an interest in encouraging and supporting the nations of the region to work collaboratively and diplomatically to resolve disputes without coercion, intimidation, threats, or the use of force;

Whereas the United States further supports the efforts of states to resolve their disputes in accordance with international

law, including through internationally recognized legal dispute settlement mechanisms, and urges the full implementation of any decisions rendered by the relevant courts and tribunals which are binding on them;

Whereas the South China Sea potentially contains great natural resources, and their stewardship and responsible use offers immense potential benefit for generations to come;

Whereas Brunei, Malaysia, China, Taiwan, Vietnam, and the Philippines have overlapping territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional claim to all or some of the Spratly Islands;

Whereas, on January 23, 2013, the Philippines launched an arbitration process under an existing international mechanism challenging China's claim of a 'nine dash line' around the South China Sea;

Whereas, although the United States does not take a position on competing territorial claims over land features and maritime boundaries of the Spratly Islands, it does have a strong and long-standing interest in the manner in which disputes in the South China Sea are addressed and in the conduct of the parties;

Whereas, even while the Government of the People's Republic of China has refused to participate in formal arbitration with the Government of the Philippines, it should comply with any international ruling on competing territorial claims with the Philippines in the South China Sea;

Whereas, in recent years, the Government of the People's Republic of China has engaged in unilateral land reclamation and construction activities in the Spratly Islands that undermines regional stability and is counter to multilateral efforts for peaceful resolution of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the South China Sea;

Whereas, although other claimants to the Spratly Islands have built small outposts and have engaged in minor maintenance on features they already occupy, in less than one year the Government of the People's Republic of China has rapidly exceeded all preceding activities and acted on a much larger scale;

Whereas, on November 4, 2002, the governments of the member states of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and the Government of the People's Republic of China signed a Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea that, among other things, declared, "The Parties undertake to exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would complicate or escalate disputes and affect peace and stability including, among others, refraining from action of inhabiting on the presently uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, cays, and other features and to handle their differences in a constructive manner.";

Whereas China's land reclamation is estimated to cost the region's littoral states \$100,000,000 a year due to damage to the ecosystem and the degradation of fish stocks;

Whereas, on March 23, 2015, satellite imagery showed the Government of the People's Republic of China building a concrete runway on the Fiery Cross Reef that is expected to be 10,000 feet long and give the Chinese military the capability to land fighter jets and surveillance jets, which is destabilizing to regional peace and stability;

Whereas satellite imagery also showed the Government of the People's Republic of China unilaterally constructing island territory on Subi Reef that, if connected, would support an additional airstrip;

Whereas satellite imagery also showed that Woody Island and Duncan Island have grown significantly due to Chinese land reclamation activities;

Whereas, a March 16, 2015, image published by the Center for Strategic and International Studies showed that the Government of the People's Republic of China constructed a chain of artificial land formations, new structures, fortified sea walls, and construction equipment along Mischief Reef, an area claimed by the Philippines and within its Exclusive Economic Zone;

Whereas, in April 2015, the United States Office of Naval Intelligence published a report on the Chinese People's Liberation Army Navy showing that the Government of the People's Republic of China has reclaimed hundreds of acres of land at the seven features it occupies in the Spratly Islands throughout 2014 and stated that China "appears to be building much larger facilities that could support naval operations.";

Whereas, on April 6, 2015, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter noted deep concerns regarding some of the activities of the Government of the People's Republic of China, including "its behavior in places like the East and South China Seas.";

Whereas, on April 9, 2015, President Barack Obama stated, "Where [the United States gets] concerned with China is where it is not necessarily abiding by international norms and rules, and is using its size and muscle to force countries into subordinate positions. And that's the concern we have around maritime issues.";

Whereas, on April 16, 2015, the Commander of United States Pacific Command, Admiral Locklear, stated that Chinese land reclamation activities in the South China Sea "would give them de facto control in peacetime of much of the world's most important waterways"; that China could place "long-range detection radars" on the outposts in order to place more warships there; and that Southeast Asian nations are increasingly worried that China's new capabilities will allow it take de facto control of the surrounding waters;

Whereas adding a military dimension to the territorial dispute exacerbates the risks of misperceptions, accidents, and other dangerous incidents in the Spratly Islands;

Whereas, on April 9, 2015, Chinese Foreign Ministry spokeswoman, Hua Chunying, was quoted as saying, "After the construction, the islands and reefs will be able to provide all-round and comprehensive services to meet various civilian demands besides satisfying the need of necessary military defense.";

Whereas ASEAN has promoted multilateral talks on disputed areas without settling the issue of sovereignty, and committed with China in the 2002 Declaration on the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea to "reaffirm their respect for and commitment to the freedom of navigation in and over flight above the South China Sea as provided for by the universally recognized principles of international law" and to "resolve their territorial and jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means, without resorting to the threat or use of force";

Whereas the reclamation activities of the Government of the People's Republic of China threaten ASEAN unity and its multilateral efforts to promote peaceful reconciliation of territorial, sovereignty, and jurisdictional disputes in the Spratly Islands and the broader South China Sea; and

Whereas, on January 28, 2015, Philippine Foreign Secretary Alberto del Rosario urged ASEAN "to consider reaching out to the international community to say to China that what it is doing is wrong—that it must stop its reclamation activities at once"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of the People's Republic of China's unilateral construc-

tion of artificial land formations in the disputed Spratly Islands;

(2) strongly urges all parties to maritime and territorial disputes in the region to respect the status quo, exercise self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would undermine stability or complicate or escalate disputes, refrain from inhabiting or garrisoning presently uninhabited islands, reefs, shoals, and other features, and refrain from unilateral actions that cause permanent physical change to the marine environment in areas pending final delimitation;

(3) urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to clarify the meaning of its "nine dash line" claim and the maritime areas it claims within that space;

(4) further urges the Government of the People's Republic of China to clarify its intentions with respect to establishing "necessary military defense" on reclaimed features and condemns the militarization of disputed features;

(5) supports efforts by parties to maritime and territorial disputes to handle their differences in a constructive manner and pursue their claims through peaceful, diplomatic, and legitimate regional and international arbitration mechanisms;

(6) reaffirms the strong support of the United States for the member states of ASEAN as they seek to develop a code of conduct of parties in the South China Sea with the People's Republic of China, and urges China to enter into such negotiations in a serious manner;

(7) supports efforts to strengthen regional maritime domain awareness;

(8) supports efforts to strengthen maritime partner capacity, including through the sale and transfer of technology that promotes maritime domain awareness; and

(9) supports the continuation of operations by the United States Armed Forces in support of freedom of navigation rights in international waters and air space in the South China Sea.

SENATE RESOLUTION 184—EX-
PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE
SENATE THAT CONVERSION
THERAPY, INCLUDING EFFORTS
BY MENTAL HEALTH PRACTI-
TIONERS TO CHANGE THE SEX-
UAL ORIENTATION, GENDER
IDENTITY, OR GENDER EXPRES-
SION OF AN INDIVIDUAL, IS
DANGEROUS AND HARMFUL AND
SHOULD BE PROHIBITED FROM
BEING PRACTICED ON MINORS

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. WARREN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 184

Whereas being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or gender nonconforming is not a disorder, disease, illness, deficiency, or shortcoming;

Whereas the development of all children and adolescents into healthy and productive adults is a priority of the United States and

ending prejudice and injustice based on sexual orientation, gender identity, and gender nonconformity is a human rights issue;

Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Counseling Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the American School Counselor Association, the National Association of School Psychologists, and the National Association of Social Workers, together representing more than 480,000 health and mental health professionals, have all taken the position that homosexuality is not a mental disorder and thus is not something that needs to be or can be “cured”;

Whereas the American Psychological Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the National Association of Social Workers, the American Counseling Association Governing Council, and the American Psychoanalytic Association have not found conversion therapy to be safe or effective;

Whereas several States have enacted or are considering legislation and other measures to prohibit conversion therapy in children and adolescents; and

Whereas enacted State legislation to prohibit conversion therapy in children and adolescents has been upheld as constitutional: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This resolution may be cited as the “Stop Harming Our Kids Resolution of 2015”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING CONVERSION THERAPY DIRECTED AT MINORS.

(a) CONVERSION THERAPY DEFINED.—In this resolution, the term “conversion therapy”—

(1) means any practice by a licensed, certified, or registered mental health provider, health care provider, or counselor that seeks or purports to impose change of the sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression of an individual, including reducing or eliminating sexual or romantic attractions or feelings toward an individual of the same gender and efforts to change behaviors, gender identity, or gender expression; and

(2) does not include counseling—

(A) that—

(i) provides acceptance, support, and understanding of an individual;

(ii) facilitates the coping, social support, and identity exploration and development of an individual;

(iii) provides developmentally appropriate counseling for an individual undergoing gender transition; or

(iv) provides sexual orientation- and gender identity-neutral interventions to prevent or address unlawful conduct or unsafe sexual practices; and

(B) that does not seek to change sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that conversion therapy directed at minors is discredited and ineffective, has no legitimate therapeutic purpose, and is dangerous and harmful.

(c) STATE ENCOURAGEMENT.—The Senate encourages each State to take steps to protect minors from efforts that promote or promise to change sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression based on the premise that being lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or gender nonconforming is a mental illness or developmental disorder that can or should be cured.

SENATE RESOLUTION 185—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MAY 2015 AS ASIAN/PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AND AS AN IMPORTANT TIME TO CELEBRATE THE SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTIONS OF ASIAN AMERICANS AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS TO THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. REID of Nevada, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KIRK, Mr. HELLER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CASEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 185

Whereas the people of the United States join together each May to pay tribute to the contributions of generations of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders who have enriched the history of the United States;

Whereas the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the United States is inextricably tied to the story of the United States;

Whereas the Asian American and Pacific Islander community is an inherently diverse population, comprised of more than 45 distinct ethnicities and more than 100 language dialects;

Whereas, according to the Bureau of the Census, the Asian American population grew at a faster rate than any other racial or ethnic group in the United States during the last decade, surging nearly 46 percent between 2000 and 2010, a growth rate that is 4 times the rate of the total population of the United States;

Whereas, according to the 2010 decennial census, there are approximately 17,300,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Asian and approximately 1,200,000 residents of the United States who identify themselves as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, making up approximately 5.5 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively, of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the month of May was selected for Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month because the first immigrants from Japan arrived in the United States on May 7, 1843, and the first transcontinental railroad was completed on May 10, 1869, with substantial contributions from immigrants from China;

Whereas section 102 of title 36, United States Code, officially designates May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and requests that the President issue an annual proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, such as Daniel K. Inouye, a Medal of Honor and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient who as President Pro Tempore of the Senate was the highest-ranking Asian American government official in United States history, Dalip Singh Saund, the first Asian American Congressman, Patsy T. Mink, the first woman of color and the first Asian American woman to be elected to Congress, Hiram L. Fong, the first Asian American Senator, Daniel K. Akaka, the first Senator of Native Hawaiian ancestry, Norman Y. Mineta, the first Asian American member of a presidential cabinet, Elaine L. Chao, the first Asian American woman member of a

presidential cabinet, and others have made significant contributions in both the Government and military of the United States;

Whereas the year 2015 marks several important milestones for the Asian American and Pacific Islander community, including the—

(1) 50th anniversary of the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-236), landmark legislation that reversed restrictive immigration policies against immigrants from Asia;

(2) 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War;

(3) 40th anniversary of the Southeast Asian diasporic communities in the United States;

(4) 30th anniversary of the mission aboard the Space Shuttle Discovery of Ellison S. Onizuka, the first Asian American in space; and

(5) 25th anniversary of the date of enactment of Public Law 105-225, signed by President George H. W. Bush, designating May to be Asian Pacific American Heritage Month;

Whereas the actions of the Hmong in Laos in support of the United States during the Vietnam War saved the lives of countless people of the United States;

Whereas as a result of Hmong support of the United States, the Hmong were forced to leave Laos when the new communist regime seized control of Laos;

Whereas May 14, 2015, marks the 40th anniversary of the forced exit from Laos of Hmong people, many of whom later resettled in the United States, following the withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam;

Whereas, in 2015, the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, a bicameral caucus of Members of Congress advocating on behalf of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, is composed of 48 Members, including 13 Members of Asian or Pacific Islander descent;

Whereas in 2015, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are serving in State and territorial legislatures across the United States in record numbers, including the States of Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands;

Whereas the number of Federal judges who are Asian Americans or Pacific Islanders doubled between 2001 and 2008 and more than tripled between 2009 and 2015, reflecting a commitment to diversity in the Federal judiciary that has resulted in the confirmations of high-caliber Asian American and Pacific Islander judicial nominees;

Whereas there remains much to be done to ensure that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have access to resources and a voice in the Government of the United States and continue to advance in the political landscape of the United States; and

Whereas celebrating Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month provides the people of the United States with an opportunity to recognize the achievements, contributions, and history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, and to appreciate the challenges faced by Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of May 2015 as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month and as an important time to celebrate the significant contributions of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders to the history of the United States; and

(2) recognizes that the Asian American and Pacific Islander community enhances the rich diversity of and strengthens the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 186—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 17 THROUGH MAY 23, 2015, AS “NATIONAL PUBLIC WORKS WEEK”

Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mrs. BOXER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 186

Whereas public works infrastructure, facilities, and services are of vital importance to the health, safety, and well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas the public works infrastructure, facilities, and services could not be provided without the dedicated efforts of public works professionals, including engineers and administrators, who represent State and local governments throughout the United States;

Whereas public works professionals design, build, operate, and maintain the transportation systems, water infrastructure, sewage and refuse disposal systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities that are vital to the people and communities of the United States; and

Whereas understanding the role that public infrastructure plays in protecting the environment, improving public health and safety, contributing to economic vitality, and enhancing the quality of life of every community of the United States is in the interest of the people of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 17 through May 23, 2015, as “National Public Works Week”;

(2) recognizes and celebrates the important contributions that public works professionals make every day to improve—

(A) the public infrastructure of the United States; and

(B) the communities that public works professionals serve; and

(3) urges individuals and communities throughout the United States to join with representatives of the Federal Government and the American Public Works Association in activities and ceremonies that are designed—

(A) to pay tribute to the public works professionals of the United States; and

(B) to recognize the substantial contributions that public works professionals make to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 187—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE MONTH OF MAY 2015, AS “NATIONAL BLADDER CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 187

Whereas 500,000 families in the United States live with bladder cancer;

Whereas more than 74,000 people are expected to be diagnosed with bladder cancer and 16,000 will die due to the disease in 2015 alone;

Whereas bladder cancer affects people of all ages and backgrounds and is among the

top 10 cancers with the highest incidence rates in the United States;

Whereas bladder cancer is known as one of the most expensive cancers to treat on a per patient basis with a recurrence rate of approximately 50 to 80 percent, requiring life-long surveillance;

Whereas bladder cancer symptoms, such as blood in the urine, are easily recognized, however, many are unaware of the threat of bladder cancer, often prolonging the time to diagnosis;

Whereas if diagnosed early, bladder cancer is treatable;

Whereas military veterans are twice as likely as nonveterans to be diagnosed with bladder cancer;

Whereas women are often diagnosed at a later stage in the development of bladder cancer, and when diagnosed at the same stage as men, women have a worse prognosis;

Whereas if diagnosis and treatment are delayed, the life expectancy of an individual with bladder cancer decreases;

Whereas the quality of life of a person with bladder cancer will depend on future treatment and diagnosis developments, which will rely on research advancements;

Whereas there have been no new treatments approved by the Food and Drug Administration for bladder cancer in over 10 years;

Whereas research advancements for bladder cancer are limited by lack of awareness about the disease within the medical community and general public;

Whereas increased awareness will promote early diagnosis and increase the chances of survival;

Whereas increased awareness will bolster public support of the disease and thus increase funding for innovative research and the development of new treatment options and diagnostic tools;

Whereas traditionally on the first Saturday in May each year, survivors, caregivers, and loved ones walk together throughout the United States to raise awareness of bladder cancer;

Whereas the Bladder Cancer Advocacy Network and its community of patients, caregivers, and specialists seek—

(1) to foster a community of hope and support;

(2) to fund and conduct research for innovative treatments and diagnostic tools; and

(3) to increase public awareness and understanding of bladder cancer; and

Whereas May would be an appropriate month to designate as “National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2015, as “National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interested groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of bladder cancer and to foster understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families and caregivers;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end bladder cancer; and

(C) to observe National Bladder Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1436. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to

amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1437. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. SCHATZ) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 109, acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1436. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, line 9, insert before the end period the following: “, and does not violate the requirements of chapter 83 of title 41, United States Code (commonly known as the ‘Buy American Act’) or section 313 of title 23, United States Code, or weaken or undermine those requirements by allowing for waivers that would cause the closure of a domestic manufacturer”.

SA 1437. Mr. PERDUE (for Mr. SCHATZ) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 109, acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II; as follows:

The preamble is amended—

(1) in the 10th whereas clause, by striking “March 30, 1935” and inserting “March 20, 1935”;

(2) in the 13th whereas clause, by striking “proclaimed” and inserting “established”;

(3) in the 25th whereas clause, by striking “distracted by” and inserting “otherwise focused on”;

(4) in the 27th whereas clause—

(A) by striking “Jarvis and Enderbury” and inserting “Enderbury and Jarvis”; and

(B) by striking “on February 9” and inserting “ from February 7 to 9”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room 328A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The Financial Regulatory Improvement Act of 2015."

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. 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 May 21, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:15 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Understanding America's Long-Term Fiscal Picture."

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

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in the President's Room of the Capitol.

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 21, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my counsel detailee, Samantha Chaifetz, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session of Congress.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Amanda Clinton, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the calendar year.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 115 through 122, and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that 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; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) John D. Alexander
Rear Adm. (1h) Ronald A. Boxall
Rear Adm. (1h) Robert P. Burke
Rear Adm. (1h) Matthew J. Carter
Rear Adm. (1h) Christopher W. Grady
Rear Adm. (1h) Michael E. Jabaley, Jr.
Rear Adm. (1h) Colin J. Kilrain
Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew L. Lewis
Rear Adm. (1h) DeWolfe H. Miller
Rear Adm. (1h) John P. Neagley
Rear Adm. (1h) Patrick A. Piercey
Rear Adm. (1h) Charles A. Richard
Rear Adm. (1h) Hugh D. Wetherald
Rear Adm. (1h) Ricky L. Williamson

The following named officers 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. Eugene H. Black, III
Capt. Dell D. Bull
Capt. William D. Byrne, Jr.
Capt. Edward B. Cashman
Capt. Moises Deltoro, III
Capt. Stephen C. Evans
Capt. Gregory J. Fenton
Capt. John V. Fuller
Capt. Michael P. Holland
Capt. Hugh W. Howard, III
Capt. Jeffrey W. Hughes
Capt. Thomas E. Ishee
Capt. Stephen T. Koehler
Capt. Yancy B. Lindsey

Capt. Francis D. Morley
Capt. Cathal S. O'Connor
Capt. Jeffrey E. Trussler
Capt. William W. Wheeler, III

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jeffrey G. Lofgren

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael G. Dana

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. Matthew P. Beevers

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. John N. Christenson

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. Shoshana S. Chatfield

The following named officer for appointment as the Judge Advocate General of the Navy and for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while serving as the Judge Advocate General under title 10, U.S.C., section 5148:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. James W. Crawford, III

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN95-2 AIR FORCE nomination of RHYS WILLIAM HUNT, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN248 AIR FORCE nominations (5) beginning JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM, and ending GEORGE T. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN249 AIR FORCE nominations (429) beginning RANDALL E. ACKERMAN, and ending CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN426 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JOSHUA D. BURGESS, and ending JAMES R. CANTU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN427 AIR FORCE nomination of Michael I. Etan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN428 ARMY nomination of Erik D. Masick, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN429 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA, and ending NIKALESH REDDY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN80 MARINE CORPS nomination of Henry C. Bodden, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN82 MARINE CORPS nomination of William E Lanham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN115 MARINE CORPS nomination of Rebecca L. Wilkinson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN122 MARINE CORPS nominations (42) beginning MATTHEW F. AMIDON, and ending JOHN A. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN151 MARINE CORPS nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL J. CORRADO, and ending CRAIG C. ULLMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN152 MARINE CORPS nominations (211) beginning RORY L. ALDRIDGE, and ending MARK D. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN110 NAVY nomination of Miriam Behpour, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN111 NAVY nomination of Thomas P. Murphy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 26, 2015.

PN147 NAVY nomination of Todd S. Levant, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN148 NAVY nomination of Jennifer L. Borstelmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN150 NAVY nomination of Robert S. Thompson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 29, 2015.

PN181 NAVY nomination of Melissa C. Austin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 5, 2015.

PN438 NAVY nominations (50) beginning ANTHONY S. ARDITO, and ending RODERICK D. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN443 NAVY nomination of Garrett T. Pankow, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN444 NAVY nomination of William M. Walker, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN445 NAVY nomination of Christopher C. Meyer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN446 NAVY nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY G. BENTSON, and ending PAUL N. PORENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN447 NAVY nomination of Kevin D. Clarida, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN448 NAVY nomination of Brianna E. Jackson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN449 NAVY nomination of Jared M. Spilka, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN450 NAVY nomination of Francine Segovia, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN451 NAVY nomination of Todd W. Malory, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

COURTHOUSE NAMING BILLS

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 1690 and the Senate proceed to its consideration and the consideration of Calendar No. 64, S. 261, and Calendar No. 65, S. 612, en bloc.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. PERDUE. I further ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

JOSEPH F. WEIS JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (H.R. 1690) to designate the United States courthouse located at 700 Grant Street in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, as the "Joseph F. Weis Jr. United States Courthouse," was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (S. 261) to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 261

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

SECTION 1. WILLIAM J. HOLLOWAY, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, shall be known and designated as the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse".

GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The bill (S. 612) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse," was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 612

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

SECTION 1. GEORGE P. KAZEN FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, shall be known and designated as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

NEW MEXICO NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 81, S. 501.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 501) to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 501) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 501

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 "New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 10302 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 407 note; Public Law 111-11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "Arrellano" and inserting "Arellano"; and

(2) in paragraph (27), by striking "75-185" and inserting "75-184".

(b) DELIVERY AND USE OF NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT WATER.—Section 10603(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Public Land

Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1385) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “Article III(c)” and inserting “Articles III(c)”; and

(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “Article III(c)” and inserting “Articles III(c)”.

(c) PROJECT CONTRACTS.—Section 10604(f)(1) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1391) is amended by inserting “Project” before “water”.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10609 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1395) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by striking “construction or rehabilitation” each place it appears and inserting “planning, design, construction, rehabilitation,”;

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking “2 percent” and inserting “4 percent”; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “4 percent” and inserting “2 percent”.

(e) AGREEMENT.—Section 10701(e) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1400) is amended in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3)(A) by striking “and Contract” each place it appears.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 168.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 168) recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. 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. 168) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 5, 2015, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ACKNOWLEDGING AND HONORING BRAVE YOUNG MEN FROM HAWAII

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 109 and the Senate proceed to its consideration.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 109) acknowledging and honoring brave young men from Hawaii who enabled the United States to establish and maintain jurisdiction in remote equatorial islands as prolonged conflict in the Pacific led to World War II.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the Schatz amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, 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. 109) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1437) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

The preamble is amended—

(1) in the 10th whereas clause, by striking “March 30, 1935” and inserting “March 20, 1935”;

(2) in the 13th whereas clause, by striking “proclaimed” and inserting “established”;

(3) in the 25th whereas clause, by striking “distracted by” and inserting “otherwise focused on”; and

(4) in the 27th whereas clause—

(A) by striking “Jarvis and Enderbury” and inserting “Enderbury and Jarvis”; and

(B) by striking “on February 9” and inserting “from February 7 to 9”.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 109

Whereas in the mid-19th century, the Guano Islands Act (48 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) enabled companies from the United States to mine guano from a number of islands in the Equatorial Pacific;

Whereas after several decades, when the guano was depleted, the companies abandoned mining activities, and the control of the islands by the United States diminished and left the islands vulnerable to exploitation by other nations;

Whereas the Far East during the late 19th century and early 20th century was characterized by colonial conflicts and Japanese expansionism;

Whereas the 1930s marked the apex of the sphere of influence of Imperial Japan in the Far East;

Whereas military and commercial interest in Central Pacific air routes between Australia and California led to a desire by the United States to claim the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, although the ownership of the islands was unclear;

Whereas in 1935, a secret Department of Commerce colonization plan was instituted, aimed at placing citizens of the United States as colonists on the remote islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis;

Whereas to avoid conflicts with international law, which prevented colonization by active military personnel, the United States sought the participation of furloughed military personnel and Native Hawaiian civilians in the colonization project;

Whereas William T. Miller, Superintendent of Airways at the Department of Commerce, was appointed to lead the colonization project, traveled to Hawaii in February 1935, met with Albert F. Judd, Trustee of Kamehameha Schools and the Bishop Museum, and agreed that recent graduates and students of the Kamehameha School for Boys would make ideal colonists for the project;

Whereas the ideal Hawaiian candidates were candidates who could “fish in the native manner, swim excellently, handle a boat, be disciplined, friendly, and unattached”;

Whereas on March 20, 1935, the United States Coast Guard Cutter Itasca departed from Honolulu Harbor in great secrecy with 6 young Hawaiian men aboard, all recent graduates of Kamehameha Schools, and 12 furloughed Army personnel, whose purpose was to occupy the barren islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis in teams of 5 for 3 months;

Whereas in June 1935, after a successful first tour, the furloughed Army personnel were ordered off the islands and replaced with additional Kamehameha Schools alumni, thus leaving the islands under the exclusive occupation of the 4 Native Hawaiians on each island;

Whereas the duties of the colonists while on the island were to record weather conditions, cultivate plants, maintain a daily log, record the types of fish that were caught, observe bird life, and collect specimens for the Bishop Museum;

Whereas the successful year-long occupation by the colonists directly enabled President Franklin D. Roosevelt to issue Executive Order 7368 on May 13, 1936, which established that the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis were under the jurisdiction of the United States;

Whereas multiple Federal agencies vied for the right to administer the colonization project, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, and the Navy Department, but jurisdiction was ultimately granted to the Department of the Interior;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project emphasized weather data and radio communication, which brought about the recruitment of a number of Asian radiomen and aerologists;

Whereas under the Department of the Interior, the colonization project also expanded beyond the Kamehameha Schools to include Hawaiians and non-Hawaiians from other schools in Hawaii;

Whereas in March of 1938 the United States also claimed and colonized the islands of Canton and Enderbury, maintaining that the colonization was in furtherance of commercial aviation and not for military purposes;

Whereas the risk of living on the remote islands meant that emergency medical care was not less than 5 days away, and the distance proved fatal for Carl Kahalewai, who died on October 8, 1938, en route to Honolulu after his appendix ruptured on Jarvis island;

Whereas other life-threatening injuries occurred, including in 1939, when Manuel Pires had appendicitis, and in 1941, when an explosion severely burned Henry Knell and Dominic Zagara;

Whereas in 1940, when the issue of discontinuing the colonization project was raised, the Navy acknowledged that the islands were “probably worthless to commercial aviation” but advocated for “continued occupation” because the islands could serve as “bases from a military standpoint”;

Whereas although military interests justified continued occupation of the islands, the colonists were never informed of the true nature of the project, nor were the colonists provided with weapons or any other means of self-defense;

Whereas in June of 1941, when much of Europe was engaged in World War II and Imperial Japan was establishing itself in the Pacific, the Commandant of the 14th Naval District recognized the "tension in the Western Pacific" and recommended the evacuation of the colonists, but his request was denied;

Whereas on December 8, 1941, Howland Island was attacked by a fleet of Japanese twin-engine bombers, and the attack killed Hawaiian colonists Joseph Keliihanui and Richard Whaley;

Whereas in the ensuing weeks, Japanese submarine and military aircraft continued to target the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, jeopardizing the lives of the remaining colonists;

Whereas the United States Government was unaware of the attacks on the islands, and was otherwise focused on the entry of the United States into World War II;

Whereas the colonists demonstrated great valor while awaiting retrieval;

Whereas the 4 colonists from Baker and the 2 remaining colonists from Howland were rescued on January 31, 1942, and the 8 colonists from Enderbury and Jarvis were rescued on February 7 to 9, 1942, 2 months after the initial attacks on Howland Island;

Whereas on March 20, 1942, Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, sent letters of condolence to the Keliihanui and Whaley families stating that "[i]n your bereavement it must be considerable satisfaction to know that your brother died in the service of his country";

Whereas during the 7 years of colonization, more than 130 young men participated in the project, the majority of whom were Hawaiian, and all of whom made numerous sacrifices, endured hardships, and risked their lives to secure and maintain the islands of Howland, Baker, Jarvis, Canton, and Enderbury on behalf of the United States, and 3 young Hawaiian men made the ultimate sacrifice;

Whereas none of the islands, except for Canton, were ever used for commercial aviation, but the islands were used for military purposes;

Whereas in July 1943, a military base was established on Baker Island, and its forces, which numbered over 2,000 members, participated in the Tarawa-Makin operation;

Whereas in 1956, participants of the colonization project established an organization called "Hui Panala'au", which was established to preserve the fellowship of the group, to provide scholarship assistance, and "to honor and esteem those who died as colonists of the Equatorial Islands";

Whereas in 1979, Canton and Enderbury became part of the Republic of Kiribati, but the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker remain possessions of the United States, having been designated as National Wildlife Refuges in 1974;

Whereas the islands of Jarvis, Howland, and Baker are now part of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument;

Whereas May 13, 2015, marks the 79th anniversary of the issuance of the Executive order of President Franklin D. Roosevelt proclaiming United States jurisdiction over the islands of Howland, Baker, and Jarvis, islands that remain possessions of the United States; and

Whereas the Federal Government has never fully recognized the contributions and sacrifices of the colonists, less than a handful of whom are still alive today: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) acknowledges the accomplishments and commends the service of the Hui Panala'au colonists;

(2) acknowledges the local, national, and international significance of the 7-year col-

onization project, which resulted in the United States extending sovereignty into the Equatorial Pacific;

(3) recognizes the dedication to the United States and self-reliance demonstrated by the young men, the majority of whom were Native Hawaiian, who left their homes and families in Hawaii to participate in the Equatorial Pacific colonization project;

(4) extends condolences on behalf of the United States to the families of Carl Kahalewai, Joseph Keliihanui, and Richard Whaley for the loss of their loved ones in the service of the United States;

(5) honors the young men whose actions, sacrifices, and valor helped secure and maintain the jurisdiction of the United States over equatorial islands in the Pacific Ocean during the years leading up to and the months immediately following the bombing of Pearl Harbor and the entry of the United States into World War II; and

(6) extends to all of the colonists, and to the families of these exceptional young men, the deep appreciation of the people of the United States.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 185, S. Res. 186, and S. Res. 187.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), as amended by Public Law 101-595, and further amended by Public Law 113-281, and upon the recommendation of the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Coast Guard Academy: the Honorable ROGER WICKER of Mississippi and the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 113-146, appoints the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on Care: the Honorable Tom Coburn of Oklahoma, Stuart Hickey of Pennsylvania, and Thomas Harvey of New York.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: Chiling Tong of Maryland.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable JONI ERNST of Iowa (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C., sections 42 and 43, appoints the following Senators to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas and the Honorable DAVID PERDUE of Georgia.

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Air Force Academy: the Honorable CORY GARDNER of Colorado (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), appoints the following Senator to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Naval Academy: the Honorable DAN SULLIVAN of Alaska (designee of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 22, 2015

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Friday, May 22; 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 leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of H.R. 1314; finally, that all time during the adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on the bill.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. PERDUE. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:16 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

STEPHEN C. HEDGER, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE ELIZABETH LEE KING, RESIGNED.

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

LUIS A. VIADA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2018, VICE JOHN P. SALAZAR, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

AKHLI REED AMAR, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE JAMSHEED K. CHOKSY, TERM EXPIRED.

ROBERT P. ZIMMERMAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2018, VICE MANFREDI PICCOLOMINI, RESIGNED.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

JESSICA ROSENWORCEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS FROM JULY 1, 2015. (REAPPOINTMENT)

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

W. THOMAS REEDER, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION, VICE JOSHUA GOTBAUM, RESIGNED.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

DENISE TURNER ROTH, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES, VICE DANIEL M. TANGHERLINI, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

EDWARD L. STANTON III, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR., RETIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ERIC STEVEN MILLER, OF VERMONT, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE DISTRICT OF VERMONT FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE TRISTRAM J. COFFIN, RESIGNED.

MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOSEPH ANTHONY PAPILI, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 154:

To be general

GEN. PAUL J. SELVA

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 brigadier general

COL. CLIFFORD B. CHICK

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be colonel

DANIEL A. LAPOSTOLE

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE PERMANENT COMMISSIONED TEACHING STAFF AND APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 188:

To be commander

ANNA W. HICKEY

To be lieutenant

KIMBERLY C. YOUNG-MCLEAR

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21, 2015:

THE JUDICIARY

JILL N. PARRISH, OF UTAH, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH.

JOSE ROLANDO OLVERA, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

PATRICIA D. CAHILL, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2020.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

MARK SCARANO, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN D. ALEXANDER
REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD A. BOXALL
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT P. BURKE
REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW J. CARTER
REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTOPHER W. GRADY
REAR ADM. (LH) MICHAEL E. JABALEY, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) COLIN J. KILRAIN
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW L. LEWIS
REAR ADM. (LH) DEWOLFE H. MILLER
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN P. NEAGLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) PATRICK A. PIERCEY
REAR ADM. (LH) CHARLES A. RICHARD
REAR ADM. (LH) HUGH D. WETHERALD
REAR ADM. (LH) RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS 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. EUGENE H. BLACK III
CAPT. DELL D. BULL
CAPT. WILLIAM D. BYRNE, JR.
CAPT. EDWARD B. CASHMAN
CAPT. MOISES DELTORO III
CAPT. STEPHEN C. EVANS
CAPT. GREGORY J. FENTON
CAPT. JOHN V. FULLER
CAPT. MICHAEL P. HOLLAND
CAPT. HUGH W. HOWARD III
CAPT. JEFFREY W. HUGHES
CAPT. THOMAS E. ISHEE
CAPT. STEPHEN T. KOEHLER
CAPT. YANCY B. LINDSEY
CAPT. FRANCIS D. MORLEY
CAPT. CATHAL S. O'CONNOR
CAPT. JEFFREY E. TRUSSLER
CAPT. WILLIAM W. WHEELER III

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JEFFREY G. LOFGREN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL G. DANA

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. MATTHEW P. BEEVERS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN N. CHRISTENSON

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. SHOSHANA S. CHATFIELD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5148:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JAMES W. CRAWFORD III

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RHYS WILLIAM HUNT, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES D. BRANTINGHAM AND ENDING WITH GEORGE T. YOUSTRA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RANDALL E. ACKERMAN AND ENDING WITH CLINTON R. ZUMBRUNNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 4, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA D. BURGESS AND ENDING WITH JAMES R. CANTU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL I. ETAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF ERIC D. MASICK, TO BE MAJOR. ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MUHAMMAD R. KHAWAJA AND ENDING WITH NIKALESH REDDY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF HENRY C. BODDEN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF WILLIAM E. LANHAM, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF REBECCA L. WILKINSON, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW F. AMIDON AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 26, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. CORRADO AND ENDING WITH CRAIG C. ULLMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RORY L. ALDRIDGE AND ENDING WITH MARK D. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF MIRIAM BEHPOUR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF THOMAS P. MURPHY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TODD S. LEVANT, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JENNIFER L. BORSTELMANN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ROBERT S. THOMPSON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MELISSA C. AUSTIN, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY S. ARDITO AND ENDING WITH RODERICK D. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GARRETT T. PANKOW, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM M. WALKER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER C. MEYER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY G. BENTSON AND ENDING WITH PAUL N. PORENSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF KEVIN D. CLARIDA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIANNA E. JACKSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JARED M. SPILKA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF FRANCINE SEGOVIA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TODD W. MALLORY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.