United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 2015 No. 101

Senate

The Senate met at 10 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.

O God, You are from everlasting to everlasting. Keep us under Your watchful eyes, that we may dwell in Your eternal presence.

Lord, into Your care we entrust our lawmakers. Help them to feel the companionship of Your presence, as they labor for liberty. Give them safety from all danger and the wisdom to remember that You will never leave or forsake them.

Be with the members of their staffs. Control their thoughts as You fill them with peace. Surround them with the shield of Your Divine favor, sustaining them in all they do and say. Be present in their hearts as a Spirit of power, joy, and contentment.

We pray in Your merciful 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. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 160

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.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 160) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill will be placed on the calendar.

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the House message accompanying H.R. 644.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 644) entitled ''An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory,'' and further

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate, with an amendment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is pending.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant 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 insist upon the Senate amendment, agree to the request by the House for a conference, and authorize the Presiding Officer to appoint conferees with respect to H.R. 644.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks, the time until 11 a.m. this morning be equally divided between the leaders or their designees, and that the second-degree filing deadline for H.R. 2146 and H.R. 1295 be 10:30 a.m. this morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate's top Democrat on trade announced his support for the bipartisan trade legislation we will vote on today.

It adds to the renewed momentum we are seeing for America's workers. It is showing that Democrats can join Republicans to knock down unfair international barriers that discriminate against America's middle class—barriers that for too long have prevented American workers from selling more of what they make and American farmers from selling more of what they grow. It is demonstrating that both parties can work together to strengthen America's national security at home and America's leadership abroad, instead of simply ceding the future and one of the world's fastest growing regions to Chinese aggression.

It is proving that our friends can rally with us and support 1.4 million

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

Printed on recycled paper.

additional jobs in our country—including over 18,000 in Kentucky alone—as one study estimates new trade agreements with Europe and the Pacific could well support. These are the reasons a bill is gaining steam that would help advance all of these objectives—a bill that would enhance Congress's role in the trade process while ensuring Presidents of either party have the tools to secure strong and enforceable trade agreements.

That is the bipartisan trade bill before us today. It passed the Finance Committee with strong bipartisan support in April. It passed the full Senate with strong bipartisan support in May. It just passed the House with backing from across the political spectrum as well, gaining the support of everyone from Chairman RYAN and Representative HENSARLING on one side to Representative KIND on the other.

Now it is time for the next step.

I urge all of our colleagues to vote for cloture on this bipartisan trade bill today. That will open the way for final passage of TPA tomorrow. It will open the way for final passage of TAA and the AGOA and preferences measure the following day, too.

Earlier this morning, Speaker BOEHNER reaffirmed his commitment to taking up TAA once it passes the Senate. He stated his desire to see both TAA and TPA on the President's desk by the end of this week, and he underlined the House's readiness to go to conference on the Customs bill. Speaker BOEHNER is clearly committed to building trust across the aisle on this issue, and I am as well. That is why I just moved to go to conference on the Customs bill.

So this is where we are. Let's vote today. Let's vote today to move ahead on TPA, an important accomplishment for the country. Then we can vote to move ahead on TAA, AGOA, and preferences, and then we can vote to move ahead on Customs.

If we all keep working together and trusting each other, then by the end of the week the President will have TPA, TAA, and AGOA and preferences on his desk, with Customs in the process of heading his way as well.

Today is a very big vote. It is an important moment for the country. It sets in motion the completion of a project we set out on literally months ago, completing work on all four of the bills reported by the Finance Committee. That is what my friends on the other side have said they wanted, and that is what can be achieved by continuing to work together.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

RACISM IN AMERICA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, our Nation's heart remains broken over the senseless tragedy last week in Charleston, SC. A young man full of hate took the lives of nine worshippers after they welcomed him into their Bible study.

Once again, someone motivated by ignorance and hatred got his hands on a gun and inflicted pain on innocent Americans. Once again, we must witness the people of a community as they struggle to reconnect and put the pieces of their lives back together. Once again, we are looking at our newspapers, watching our TV screens, and talking at our dinner tables about why—why did this happen?

As the painful details emerge, we cannot turn away from the hard truth this tragedy lays bare: Racism still exists in our society.

We have to accept that reality. If we ever hope to change it, we have to accept that reality. I watched this weekend as pundits and the Nation's thought leaders attempted to address this issue by sidestepping the truth. This violent attack was racially motivated, plain and simple. It was intended to terrorize the African-American community both in Charleston and around this Nation.

Fifty years after Dr. Martin Luther King led a March in Washington, 50 years after Congress passed the Civil Rights Act, 50 years after the march for voting rights in Selma, 50 years after Congress passed the Voting Rights Act, we must still face the hard truth about race in America. The truth is that we still have much to do. We must overcome. We have no choice. One cannot ignore this underlying issue.

It deeply troubles our Nation that hatred and bigotry exist. The harsh reality of hatred and bigotry in this country, in addition to the consistent lack of opportunities in communities of color, have left far too many men and women of color feel that their lives really don't matter. It is easy to feel that your life doesn't matter when the odds are stacked against you every place you look, on every hand.

Here are some of the facts African Americans face on a daily basis. Nearly half of all African-American families have lived in poor neighborhoods for at least two generations—50 percent compared to 7 percent of White families. An African-American man is far more likely to be stopped and searched by police, charged with crimes, and sentenced to longer prison terms than a White male—10 percent longer for the same crimes in the Federal system. In the State system, the numbers are even more skewed than that.

These facts alone illustrate that countless men and women face unprecedented challenges and are still judged by the color of their skin, not the content of their character.

We have a moral obligation to change these realities. We must do everything within our power to ensure that all Americans know that their lives matter. This means standing for what is right, calling out bigotry and hatred when it is seen and felt, and then taking action to address the bigotry.

It is hard to fathom that even as the community of Charleston grapples with the devastation of this hateful act, African-American men and women have to walk under a Confederate flag when they step on the grounds of the South Carolina statehouse in Columbia, SC.

The Confederate flag is a symbol of the dark past from which our country has come. It does not and should not represent our values or the way we treat our fellow Americans. It is a symbol of slavery. It is a symbol of White supremacy. There is no other way to explain it. It often flew high as vile organizations such as the Ku Klux Klan torched African-American churches.

This symbol of the past has no place atop buildings that govern Americans. It is just not who we are, and certainly it shouldn't be who we want to be. The flag should be removed and now.

Yesterday, Governor Nikki Haley of South Carolina said that in the Capitol of South Carolina the flag should not be flown. She said: We will do this in spite of what the State legislature feels.

We have tried this in the past, and the State legislatures have said: No, we are keeping the flag flying.

So I applaud her. I appreciate her courageous act so that the Confederate flag has no future in the future of South Carolina. It belongs in the past in every place in America, not just South Carolina. Anyone who desires to fly that flag on private property can do so, of course, but no State in our great Nation should allow this flag to soar above its capitol. It shouldn't soar in public places.

We must always stand for what is right. We must stand for equality and justice and act to defend them. We must preserve and protect the rights of every American, not because it is the safe thing to do, not because it is popular or because it has political benefit. We must stand and defend equality and justice because that is the right thing to do.

We must take meaningful action to ensure the safety of our citizens.

Once again, our hearts are broken as another community struggles to recover from a mass shooting. I am going to mention now just a few of them: Fort Hood, 13 Americans killed, and this was on a military base; Tucson, AZ, 6 Americans killed; Carson City, NV, 4 Americans killed; Newtown, CT, 27 Americans dead, and 22 of them were innocent little children; Aurora, CO, in a movie theater, 12 killed; the Navy Yard, maybe a mile from here at the most, in the District of Columbia, 12 killed; Charleston, SC—of course we know 9 were killed while in a Bible study class. And these are not all of the violent acts; these are but a handful. All of these violent events occurred within the past few years.

Our country, the United States, is the only advanced country where this type of mass violence occurs—the only country. Per capita, in America we kill each other with guns at a rate 297 times higher than Japan, 49 times higher than France, 33 times higher than Israel, and we outdistance every other country by far too much.

We can do something about this sad, violent reality. Let's do something. We can expand, for example, background checks for people who want to buy guns to prevent the mentally ill and criminals from buying guns. Is that asking too much—the mentally ill and criminals? More than 80 percent of the American people support this. Why can't we in Congress support it? The American people support it. It has bipartisan support. I say it over and over again. The American community is overwhelmingly in support of not giving guns to people who are mentally ill or felons. They shouldn't be able to buy guns. We should act to save lives by expanding these background checks. Isn't that the least we can do?

I know people will come and say: Well, he wasn't a felon. Maybe so. But couldn't we do something? Couldn't we at least do this minimal thing to stop people who are sick in the head and people who are criminals from purchasing guns? Couldn't we at least do that?

Einstein's definition of insanity is continuing the same thing over and over while expecting a different result, and that is what we are doing. For the future of our country, we have to change. In the face of racism and bigotry, we must act. We can't do nothing. We must prevent felons and the mentally ill from gunning down even more Americans in broad daylight. If we do not, we will be here again. Our hearts will be broken again. Again we will have to ask ourselves how we allowed another senseless tragedy to take place while we stood by doing nothing to prevent other deaths.

Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate today?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, later today the Senate will once again have an opportunity to vote on whether to renew trade promotion authority. The Senate has already considered this issue once and the House has voted on it twice, each time demonstrating strong bipartisan support for TPA. My hope is that we can get to a similar result with today's vote in the Senate.

We need to be clear about what is at stake. The United States is currently negotiating a number of trade agreements with some of our most important trading partners in the world. If the Senate fails to approve this bill, neither Congress nor the American people will have a strong voice during these negotiations. As a result, our Nation will not be able to get the best trade agreements possible, if we are able to advance any trade agreements at all. Some people, including some of our colleagues, may be fine with that result. They do not think we need trade agreements to promote a healthy economy. But nothing could be further from the truth.

As we all know, most of the world's consumers live outside our borders—95 percent of them. In addition, the vast majority of economic growth in the world is likely to occur outside of the United States over the next decade. If our workers, farmers, ranchers, and service providers are going to be able to compete in these growing markets, we must have open access to these markets and fair trade rules to boot. Without strong trade agreements, neither of these is possible.

When it comes to international trade, we cannot stand still. If we don't lead and set the rules of the game, other nations will and our economy will be left behind.

The United States continues to be a leader in agricultural exports throughout the world. In fact, we still export more agricultural goods than any other country. In addition, the United States continues to boast an enormous manufacturing base that supplies consumers in every corner of the globe.

We also lead the world in technology, digital services, and innovation. Indeed, not only do we lead the world in creation of intellectual property, America essentially created the modern digital landscape.

The United States also continues to lead in trade in services, exporting more than $700 billion in services in 2014 alone. That is more than twice as much as the United Kingdom, the world's second highest services exporter.

I ask that the Parliamentarian let me know when my 10 minutes has expired.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mr. HATCH. In other words, we know we can compete on the world stage when the rules are fair and the playing field is level. That is why I am such a strong proponent of this TPA legislation. This bill, which is the product of a great deal of work and a lot of bipartisan cooperation, will have a powerful and positive impact on industries throughout our economy, on consumers, and, of course, on American workers as well.

In an America that embraces international trade, I believe even those individuals who encounter a temporary setback can find new opportunities, can out-work, out-produce, out-think, and out-innovate our global competition so long as the groundwork has been laid to give them those opportunities. That is why we need strong trade agreements, and that is why we need TPA.

As you can surely tell, I feel very passionately about free trade, and I know many of my colleagues are just as passionate in their opposition. But as Congress has considered this legislation, I think we have had a full and fair debate on these issues. We have been transparent on the substance of the bill and in the way things have moved forward. Both sides have been able to make their case to the American people.

It is at times such as these when working in Congress is the most rewarding. We have the opportunity to hear so many different accounts, sift through mountains of data and research, meet with hundreds of interested parties representing thousands of our constituents, and work through hotly contested differences. Then, after all of that work, when circumstances are right, we are able to come up with bipartisan legislation that addresses the needs of our country, our constituents, and our economy. That is what we have been able to do with this TPA debate, which is a debate that has been going on for many years now.

I still want to work with those who may not share all my views on all these issues. One way we have agreed to do that is to help ensure that trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, will be extended. As you know, TAA has been included in the trade preferences bill the Senate will hopefully vote on later this week after we pass TPA.

I have said many times that I am not a fan of TAA. Personally, I think the program is redundant and ineffective. However, after 38 years here in the Senate, believe me, I am well aware that everything is not about me. I understand TAA is a priority for a number of my colleagues and that it continues to be the price of admission for many who want to support TPA. The Senate majority leader recognizes this as well, which is why he has committed to ensuring that TAA gets a fair vote here in the Senate and a fair opportunity to pass.

Throughout this process, we have done all we can, within reason, to accommodate the concerns of Senators. I am very appreciative of all the support we have received from Members on both sides of the aisle. We couldn't have gotten this far without that support.

Now it is time to finish the work—to pass this bill and get it to the President's desk. We need this bill to ensure that our constituents' voices are heard in the trade negotiating process. We need this bill to give our trade negotiators the tools they need to get a good deal. And we need this bill to expand access to foreign markets so that we can grow our economy and create new and high-paying jobs here at home. That is what this bill is all about and why we have been working on this process for so long. We are very close to the finish line, and we need just one more burst of energy and a few more steps to get us there.

I urge all my colleagues who support free trade, open markets, and the advancement of American values and interests abroad to join me once again in supporting TPA and working with me

and with my colleague Senator WYDEN to get all the pending trade bills passed in the Senate and signed into law.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, over the last several weeks on the floor of both this body and the House, we have heard Members, colleagues, say they are tired of the old 1990s North American Free Trade Agreement playbook on trade. They are concerned that the package which is once again before the Senate is more of the same.

Here is my message on why this legislation needs to move forward. If you believe those policies of the 1990s failed to protect American workers and strengthen our economy, this is our chance to set a new course. This is our chance to put in place higher standards in global trade on matters such as labor rights and environmental protection, to shine some real sunlight on trade agreements and ensure that our country writes the rules of the road.

The fact is, in 2015, globalization is a reality. The choice is whether to sit back and allow globalization to push and pull on our economy until in ways dictated by countries in China. So our choice is either to move now and get into the center of the ring and fight for a stronger economic future, protect our workers and promote our values, or remain tethered to many of those old policies of the 1990s.

I say to the Senate today: If you believe, like me, that it is time once and for all to close the books on the North American free-trade era in trade, this legislation deserves your support.

In my hometown paper recently, there was an opinion article, and it stated that this trade bill lays out ''a hard-and-fast checklist for the TPP, holding the Obama administration accountable for meeting its goals and conditions.'' The article goes on to say that this legislation ''will reorient priorities and improve the process for the TPP and other trade agreements in the future.'' I completely agree with that view, but the Senate doesn't have to take my word for it. Those are the words of Tim Nesbitt, the past president of the Oregon AFL–CIO, who has disagreed with me on trade often over the years. Yet now he states that this legislation we will vote on today provides a fresh opportunity for trade done right.

When it comes to core American values—labor rights, environmental protection, and human rights—this legislation raises the bar and demands more from our trade negotiators than ever before.

We have talked a lot about a race to the bottom. My view is that if our country doesn't fight to protect worker rights and the environment with tough, enforceable trade agreements, those priorities are going to wither away. China is certainly not going to take up the banner for American values in trade. So if you believe America should stop a race to the bottom on labor rights, environmental safeguards, and human rights, this legislation is our chance to lift up global standards.

I want to talk for a moment about the economic potential of this legislation. What we all understand we need to do is make things here, grow things here, add value to them here, and then ship them somewhere. My State knows how to make this happen, and so do many others. About one out of five jobs in Oregon depends on international trade. Almost 90 percent of them are small and medium sized. And what we know is that in many instances those jobs pay better.

The fact is, if our farmers want to sell their products in Japan—and this is true of agriculture all over America. A lot of our farmers face average tariffs of 40 percent. That is right. If you want to export some jam to Vietnam, it will be marked up by 90 percent. If you want to sell a bottle of wine—and we have wine growers with prosperous businesses all over the country—they have to fork over 50 percent of the value to the government. So if we believe other countries should open their markets to American exports, like the U.S. is open to theirs, this is our chance to break down the tariffs and other barriers.

I want to touch for a moment again on how different this is than the 1990s. In the 1990s, nobody could have imagined the right tools to protect the modern Internet. Twenty-five years ago, it was impossible to make a living by setting up a business online. A cell phone was as big as a brick. In fact, the NAFTA negotiations began a year before the first Web site was set up. Today, Internet commerce is at the heart of our economy. If we want to cement America's leadership in the digital economy, this is our chance to vote for trade policies that will protect a free and open Internet.

Now, I wish to mention again, apropos of how different this is, that I have felt for some time that critics of past trade policy have been spot on with respect to a lot of this secrecy which is just gratuitous. If we believe deeply in trade, as Chairman HATCH and I do, and want more of it, why should we have all this unnecessary secrecy which just makes people cynical about trade?

So we have brought sunshine to this trade debate in a way that is unprecedented. For the first time, before the President can sign a deal, the full text has to be released to the public for 60 days. Before we can have votes in the other body and in the Senate, there will be no fewer than 4 months where people can open a proposed trade deal and read it for themselves.

So picture that: For 4 months, the American people will have in their hands—starting with the TPP—what the trade agreement is all about. That is simply unprecedented.

I wish to close the question of how we are going to proceed from here. This has obviously been a complicated piece of legislation. I appreciate the Senate and House leaders have committed to moving trade adjustment assistance alongside trade promotion authority as well as a proposal that originated with Senator BROWN to strengthen our critically important trade enforcement laws. While the goal of enacting trade policies is a tool to give all Americans a chance to get ahead, trade adjustment assistance is an absolute must-pass bill, and I am confident it is going to get through Congress to the President's desk. That bill includes the vitally important program also that creates new opportunities for impoverished nations in Africa.

The Customs enforcement bill is also moving forward on a bipartisan basis, and there is important work there to be done. The Senate must resolve differences in the enforcement bill with the other body. I wish to make it clear this morning that I expect that conference to respect Democratic priorities. My Democratic colleagues and I will be laying down markers on several of our top priorities. I discussed those priorities with Chairman RYAN last night. Those priorities include provisions in the Senate bill championed by Senator SHAHEEN to help our small businesses, provisions authored by Senator BENNET to address enforcement environmental laws, and Senator CANTWELL's important trade enforcement trust fund.

In my view, the Congress has an opportunity in this legislation to show it can work in a bipartisan way to take on one of the premier economic challenges of our time. Our job is to get past the policies of the 1990s and move toward getting trade done right.

Colleagues, let's pry open foreign markets and send more of our exports abroad. Let's fight for the American brand and the Oregon brand against the trade chiefs and the bad actors who are blocking our way, and let's raise the bar for American values and open our trade policies to sunlight.

I urge all in the Senate to vote yes on cloture today and to support this package as it advances this week. In effect, we get three important bills done this week and set in motion.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. 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. BROWN. 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. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the motion to invoke cloture on TPA, the so-called fast-track legislation. I am still incredulous, as I have watched this trade nondebate, if you will, at the speed at which, time after time, the majority leader has tried to shut down debate. It has happened again and again, and that is compounded by the secrecy of this whole process.

I can't count the number of times in my State of Ohio and in meetings in Washington, with people from all over the country, that people have said we have little or no access to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. TPA, in the past—fast-track—has actually been sort of a rule book for how we should negotiate trade agreements and, at the same time, has been a direction on how to negotiate these trade agreements and a rule book on how it is presented on the Senate floor. Yet none of the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations by Ambassador Froman have been informed at all by a TPA because we haven't had a TPA yet. We haven't even had an instruction booklet in the past. At the same time, we have gotten the worst of both worlds because we are voting on TPA, and we really haven't been able to see what is in TPP. I know supporters of TPP will say we are going to have 60 days now, but Members are casting their votes now—where 60 votes are required and they have maximum leverage—to put no final point on it, just giving up the leverage they have as we are still kept in the dark on what is happening.

Let me give one example before I get to where I think we are making a mistake by moving so quickly today, in essence, fast-tracking fast-track.

One example, my office and I personally have repeatedly spoken to the President of the United States and the U.S. Trade Representative, Ambassador Froman, repeatedly asking them to fix some of the language on tobacco. Because one of the things that apparently—we really don't know for sure—the Trans-Pacific Partnership does is it gives even more power to American tobacco companies—more power to American tobacco companies to have influence over laws in particularly small countries which don't have the wherewithal and can't afford the huge legal bills a large tobacco company can afford to write public health law.

If a small country wants to write a law to protect their children from marketing of tobacco products—which is what we have done in this country—the U.S. tobacco company or British tobacco company can—let's keep it here. The U.S. tobacco company can threaten a lawsuit against those countries, and those countries are probably going to back off because they probably can't afford to go to court with the big American tobacco company. Even something as clearly violative of the public interest and of public health as what damage Big Tobacco inflicts on children has not, to our knowledge, been addressed. Again, so much of this is secretive that we don't even know that.

That is why there is anger in this country and why there is—so many people in this country tell me, so many in my State: Why are you moving so fast? Why is this coming up right now? Why don't we know more about this whole process?

Yet again, the majority leader is shutting down debate. He will be joined, I assume, by a small number, a distinct, small number of minority Democrats, getting up over the 60-vote margin so they can shut down debate, so they can move the TPA—the fast-track—forward, so they can get the Trans-Pacific Partnership down the road.

No matter which side of the TPP debate, no matter which side of the trade promotion authority, TPA, fast-track—no matter which side you are on, it is clear that our trade policy creates winners and losers. It is clear. Even the most vigorous cheerleaders for free trade—the Wall Street Journal editorial board, for instance—even the strongest free-traders, even though people who reflectively support these free-trade agreements acknowledge there are winners and losers.

They will argue that these trade agreements create more jobs than they lose. I don't agree with that. They argue that. Put that aside. But they also acknowledge that people lose jobs because of decisions we make.

We are about to pass fast-track here. We are about to pass trade promotion authority, leading probably to the Trans-Pacific Partnership having a reasonable chance of passage. We are about to do that. We are making that decision here. Members of Congress, people who are well paid, with government-financed retirements and health care—we are about to make those decisions, and we know—we are knowingly making that decision, acknowledging that some people will lose their jobs because of a decision we make, but we are not going to take care of those workers. We are going to pass today the TPA, the trade promotion authority, fast-track. We are going to pass that and ignore those workers. How shameful is that that we know the decisions we are making in this body—we are making the decisions, the President of the United States makes this decision, the House of Representatives has made this decision, the Senate is about to make this decision, we are making this decision, knowing people will lose their jobs because of our actions. Yet we are unwilling to provide for those workers who lose their jobs.

Let me give a little history, a special message to Congress. In January of 1962, President Kennedy said:

> When considerations of national policy make it desirable to avoid higher tariffs, those injured by that competition should not be required to bear the full brunt of the impact. Rather, the burden of economic adjustment should be borne in part by the Federal Government.

That is President Kennedy at the advent, at the beginning, at the creation of the trade adjustment assistance, the support for workers who lose their jobs because of—again, I repeat—decisions we make in this body, in the House of Representatives, in the White House. We make decisions on trade. We know people will lose their jobs. We should help them. It should be our moral responsibility to help them.

Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana said: ''No small group of firms and workers should be made to bear the full burden of the costs of a program whose great benefits enrich the Nation as a whole.''

This is as true today as it was 53 years ago. It is not a Democratic idea. It is not a Republican idea. Everyone from the Cato Institute—a libertarian-oriented think tank in Washington, a bunch of well-paid scholars who make pronouncements from on high about various kinds of public policy issues—to the Wall Street Journal—a similar body but one with greater ability to disseminate information—even those two venerable institutions admit the trade agreements do not create winners everywhere.

A Cato Institute trade briefing says, ''All of those job losses are a painful but necessary part of the larger process of innovation and productivity increases.''

I am always a bit amused when people who—again, well-educated, good pay, dress like this, good benefits, good retirement, good health care—make pronunciations saying: Well, job losses are painful—not to us, of course. The same as editorial writers who make these decisions, these pronouncements on trade, they are not losing their jobs. People in my State are losing jobs on these fair trade agreements. We are going to inflict this pain. As the Cato Institute and the Wall Street Journal say, by the decisions we make, we are going to inflict pain on these workers. People are going to lose jobs in my town of Mansfield, OH. People are going to lose jobs where I grew up. People are going to lose jobs in Cleveland where I live now. People are going to lose jobs in Zanesville and Newark because of decisions we make today on fast-track, because of decisions we will make next year on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. People are going to lose their jobs, but we are going to vote today to cut off debate, and we are going to forget, at least temporarily, about helping those workers who lose jobs because of decisions we make. How immoral is that? How shameful is that? What a betrayal we are inflicting on those workers if we make this decision today.

Former Wall Street Journal economics editor David Wessel writes, ''Even [free trade's] most fervent admirers concede trade creates winners and losers.''

I will debate until the cows come home the net benefits of these trade agreements. I think they are net job loss. But even if you believe these trade agreements are net job-gainers—I don't think there is a lot of evidence of that—but even if you believe that, we know people lose their jobs because of decisions we make. That is why Republicans in the past have supported trade adjustment assistance in principle and in policy going back decades.

Fifteen years ago, President George W. Bush said, ''I recognize that some

American workers may face adjustment challenges''—that means they get thrown out of work. It is a nice way a President might talk about people he has left behind. Put that aside. ''I recognize that some American workers may face adjustment challenges as a result of trade.''

At least to President Bush's credit—I wish his words would be followed today on this floor by the majority leader, by Republican Leader MCCONNELL as he cuts off debate and leaves behind trade adjustment assistance. President Bush said, ''I support helping these workers by reauthorizing and improving trade adjustment assistance programs that will give workers impacted by trade new skills, help them find new jobs quickly, and provide them with financial assistance.''

I can give lots of stories about people I know in Youngstown, Lima, Dayton, Hamilton, and people in Portsmouth who lost their jobs because of trade, but at least they have gotten a helping hand from a government that used to have their backs and believe in them—at least until today—from a government that actually will extend that hand and help them retrain. Maybe they can become a nurse, maybe they can work in information technology, maybe they can become a radiology technologist at the local hospital.

Earlier this year, my colleague JOHN CORNYN—Republican from Texas, the senior Senator and assistant Republican leader—told reporters that ''there is no doubt that the benefits of more trade do not fall uniformly. There are some segments of the economy that don't prosper as well.''

We know that. We have seen that acknowledgement across the board. Yet today Leader MCCONNELL is going to cut off debate, even though decisions we have made have cost people their jobs. That is why we have a moral obligation. It is not a new idea. It is not a partisan idea. It is universally accepted. Trade deals don't benefit everybody. That is why this moral obligation to include trade adjustment assistance in any package with TPA is so important.

We can't send a framework for a new trade deal to the President's desk without assistance for the workers who will be left behind, but that is not what we are doing today. Today, it is full-speed ahead, cut off debate, move ahead on fast-track, move ahead on trade promotion authority.

I assume a number of my Democratic colleagues are going along with it. I hope the wrath of people in this country—if the House and Senate refuse to do what some of their leaders say they will, that they will pass trade adjustment assistance, that they will take care of those workers—if they don't live up to that promise—and many times in the past they haven't lived up to similar promises—a lot of my colleagues are going to go home and face people who say: Wait. You made a decision. I got thrown out of a job because of a decision you made, because of a decision you made as a House Member, because of a decision you made as a Senator, because of a decision you made, Mr. President. I was thrown out of work, and you passed on June 23—or whatever today is—fast-track without taking care of me, even though it was your decision that I lose my job.

What kind of government—what kind of principles do we live under here?

In March, conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote in National Review Online:

> To be sure, any trade deal, while a net plus overall, produces winners and losers. But the TPP will be accompanied by so-called Trade Adjustment Assistance, training and subsidies to help those negatively affected.

Again, Krauthammer, as he is about 95 percent of the time, is wrong. He is wrong that it is going be accompanied by the trade adjustment assistance. The assumption all along, even among TPP proponents, has been that TPA would be passed in tandem with aid for workers. But you know, even though that is what we did first here, Republicans in the House of Representatives are unwilling to vote for them together. They are just not going to vote. Speaker BOEHNER, for some reason, acquiesced to the President of the United States, pulled them apart, and had separate votes. Think about the message we will send. If we put another huge trade deal—parenthetically, once-majority leader, Republican leader Trent Lott said: You can't pass a trade agreement in an even-numbered year. Do you know why he said that? He said that because people don't like trade deals in this country. People know NAFTA sold them out. They know CAFTA sold them out. They know PNTR with China sold them out. They know Korea sold them out. We heard these promises over and over.

With NAFTA, we were promised 200,000 jobs in 2 years. Thank you, President Bush 1, and thank you, President Clinton, for that. We lost 680,000 net jobs. Central America Free Trade Agreement—thank you, President Bush 2, for that. Promises were made, big promises about job increases, big promises about wages going up. It didn't happen. Wages stayed flat. Jobs were lost. Thank you, President Bush 2, for that.

Korea, South Korea Free Trade Agreement, negotiated in part by President Bush, pushed through the Senate by President Obama—thank you, Mr. Presidents of both parties, for that. They told us 70,000 jobs would be created out of the South Korea Free Trade Agreement. No, we have lost 75,000 jobs.

Using the same formula that we have—we have seen this over and over. We know what happens. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that between 2009 and 2012, two-thirds of displaced manufacturing workers who did find new jobs ended up taking lower paying jobs. Most of those workers saw wage losses of more than 20 percent.

You can debate whether the gains others experienced make these losses worth it. I don't think they do. I think if you have traveled darned near anywhere—if Members of Congress spent a little more time with people who can't contribute to them, with people who don't belong to a local rotary club, with people who might just work hard, play by the rules, not make a lot of money, barely make it, sometimes have their house foreclosed on, sometimes lose their job—if we would spend a little more time with people like that, I think we would see how these trade agreements are working.

There is a debate to be had. I will cede it is debatable, whether these trade agreements—whether the evidence is that they create jobs or lose jobs. I think it is pretty clear they lose jobs. But there is no debate. There is no debate on what actually happens here. Because of decisions—I will repeat—before this vote coming up in about 60 seconds, because of decisions we make in this body—the President makes, Senators make, Congress men and women make—because of decisions we make in this body, people in our States, whether it is Arkansas or Arizona, Oregon, Utah or my State of Ohio, people lose jobs because of decisions we make. There is no question people lose jobs because of decisions we make. Anything short of providing for those workers who lose their jobs today, not doing this on a promise—we are basically trusting the majority leader who doesn't really like, I understand, the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program. We are relying on the word of Speaker BOEHNER, who doesn't particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We know most of the Members of his party in the House of Representatives do not particularly like trade adjustment assistance. We are going to rely on their promise.

We are voting today on the fly. We are saying to workers in this country: Yes, we have made decisions that may have cost you your job. We are going to try to help you when you lose that job, but we are still going to go ahead today and do that. That is why I asked my colleagues to vote no on this motion today to invoke cloture on trade promotion authority.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). 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.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 218 Leg.]

YEAS—60

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

NAYS—37

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

NOT VOTING—3

Corker	Lee	Menendez

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 218, the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, trade promotion authority. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.•

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with amendment No. 2060 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2061 (to amendment No. 2060), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2062, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2063 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2062), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2064 (to amendment No. 2063), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer falls.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would just like to announce that Senator CORKER was inadvertently detained in getting to the floor of the Senate. Had he been here, he would have voted yea on the cloture motion.

Mr. President, I also just want to say to our colleagues that this is a very important day for our country. We have demonstrated we can work together on a bipartisan basis to achieve something that is extremely important for America. Not only when we confirm this trade promotion authority will we have the mechanism in place for the President to finalize an extraordinarily important deal with a number of different Asian countries, but it will indicate that America is back in the trade business. It will also send a message to our allies that we understand that they are somewhat wary about Chinese commercial and potentially military domination and that we intend to still be deeply involved in the Pacific.

So I want to congratulate Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN. This has been a long and rather twisted path to where we are today, but it is a very important accomplishment for the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I would like to mention that as to the other two absences, Senator MENENDEZ had voted no on cloture before, and Senator LEE had voted no on cloture before. So the vote would have been 61 to 39.

More importantly, this is a day of celebration in the corporate suites of this country, to be sure, because they have another corporate-sponsored trade agreement that will mean more money in some investors' pockets. It will mean more plant closings in Ohio, Arizona, Delaware, Rhode Island, West Virginia, Maine, and all over this country.

Most importantly, what I didn't understand about the vote today is that even though the Wall Street Journal, the CATO Institute, and others acknowledge that, as to the decisions we make here on trade agreements—while they say it is a net increase in jobs—people lose their jobs because of the decisions we make. So we make decisions here today that throw people out of work. We know that. Across the political spectrum that is acknowledged. But we today don't do anything to help those workers that lose their jobs. We make a decision to throw people in Mansfield, OH, and Cleveland, OH, out of work, but then we don't take care of those workers that lost their jobs because of our decisions. It is shameful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me just concur with the Senator from Ohio. This trade agreement was supported by virtually every major corporation in this country, the vast majority of whom have outsourced millions of jobs to low-wage countries all over the world. This trade agreement is supported by Wall Street. This trade agreement is supported by the pharmaceutical industry, which wants to charge people in poor countries higher prices for the medicine they desperately need.

This agreement was opposed by every union in this country, working for the best interests of working families, and by almost every environmental group and many religious groups.

In my view, this trade agreement will continue the policies of NAFTA, CAFTA, and Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—agreements that have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs.

We need a new trade policy in America—a policy that represents working families and not just the big money interests.

I strongly disagree with the majority leader, who called this a great day for America. It is not a great day. It is a great day for the Big Money interests, not a great day for working families.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly conference meetings, as well as from 4 p.m. to 5 p.m. today for an all-Senators briefing, and that all time in recess count postcloture.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it is no secret that Republicans on this side of the aisle don't agree with President Obama about everything. In fact, I would say that on balance most Republicans disagree with the policy choices made by this President. But occasionally—occasionally—even the leader of the Democratic Party, the President of the United States, gets things right.

Occasionally, the President of the United States gets his policy choices right, and he did so with regard to trade promotion authority.

I would point out to our friends and to anybody listening that this actually is a 6-year trade promotion authority. This extends well beyond the tenure of the current occupant of the White House, and it will be available for the next President of the United States to negotiate trade deals that are in the best interests of the United States.

So I agree with the majority leader. This latest vote is just another example of the Senate getting back to work and restored to regular working order. This is a dramatic departure from the old Senate, because there has actually been a lot of time for consideration of important pieces of legislation—from the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act to the Justice for Victims of Human Trafficking Act to the budget.

By moving this trade promotion authority bill forward, we can ensure that American workers and businesses can get the best deal in trade agreements with countries from Asia to South America to Europe.

I believe we have actually kept the campaign promises we made last year that, if the American people entrusted the Republicans with the new majority, we would work together with our allies where we could on the other side of the aisle where we have common cause to deliver results for the American people, to legislate in their best interest—not just to obstruct for obstruction's sake or gain some temporary tactical or political advantage but to promote a functioning, deliberative Senate. I see one of the leaders of this effort, the Senator from Delaware, who has done great work trying to find that common cause and producing a result, as exemplified by the TPA. I am going to yield for him in just a moment.

But let me just talk briefly about my response to the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Ohio, who said there is nothing good to be had out of this trade promotion authority or any potential trade deals that we might negotiate.

My home State of Texas relies heavily on international trade. We are the number one trading State in the Nation, which is just one reason why our economy grew at the rate of 5.2 percent in 2014. Our economy in Texas grew at the rate of 5.2 percent in 2014. Do you know the rate at which the U.S. economy grew? The U.S. economy grew at just 2.2 percent. So why wouldn't we want to do anything and everything we can to stimulate the growth of the economy to benefit people looking for work and people looking for higher wages? This important trade promotion authority is the first step to doing that.

I will conclude because the distinguished Senator from Delaware is here and others who want to speak.

Trade is an engine of growth. It keeps our economy growing. These upcoming trade agreements, whether it is the Trans-Pacific Partnership or the transatlantic investment treaty, serve as a great opportunity to turbo-charge that growth.

Our economy actually contracted last quarter by 0.7 percent. As long as our economy is shrinking and not growing, we are not going to be able to create the jobs to put America back to work. We are not going to be able to create the sorts of wages that we want for all working Americans. This legislation represents an important step in that direction. I am glad that in the exercise of a little mutual trust and comity, we have reached this important point.

We are not through yet because there are other parts of this trade package that we are going to need to process this week. But the promise and commitment we made on this side of the aisle was that if our colleagues across the aisle trust us to move through the trade promotion authority bill, we will continue to work with them and keep our commitments to them, and, hopefully, more than just the trust that produces these pieces of legislation will result from this increased confidence and trust in one another.

We know we are going to find measures we will disagree on, and we will fight like cats and dogs when we need to. But when we actually agree on the policy and can find it within ourselves to work together, the American people are the beneficiaries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, while the Senator from Texas is still on the floor, let me say, if I could—he mentioned the word ''trust'' a number of times. It is an important word in Congress. One of my favorite sayings is ''Integrity—if you have it, nothing else matters. Integrity—if you don't have it, nothing else matters.'' The same is true for trust.

In order to get things done here—there is a lot we need to get done. Everybody realizes that.

My takeaway from the election last November was threefold: No. 1, people want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get stuff done; and No. 3, they want us to get things done that will actually strengthen the economic recovery.

One of the ways to strengthen the economic recovery, frankly, is to make sure that those markets overseas will actually allow us to sell into them, whether it is products or goods or services, that we have access to those markets.

The other thing is that my colleague from Texas is as big believer, as am I, in the Golden Rule, and that is to treat people the way we want to be treated. And I think most of the people in this country support what we are doing. Most of the Democrats in our country support what their President has proposed, and the Republicans as well.

But what we need to do while we move forward with trade promotion authority is we need to keep in mind that not everybody will be helped by this and that there are some people who will to be disadvantaged, and we have an obligation to them to treat them how we would want to be treated if we were in their shoes.

There is a sister piece of legislature to go along with trade promotion authority, and I would ask the Republican whip from Texas to give us some assurance or reassurance so we build trust around this issue. When we are contacted by folks from around the country today, tomorrow, or the next day, what are we going to do to provide assistance to those people who may be disadvantaged because of trade promotion authority and the trade deal that is going to be negotiated? Can you give us some assurance there? Is this like the end of the road or are there some more pieces to follow this week?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would respond to the question by our colleague from Delaware that assurances have been given that we understand that the trade promotion authority and the trade adjustment assistance travel together.

I think we have seen examples where the benefits of trade are not uniformly felt across the country. There are some people who will be displaced. But the importance of trade adjustment assistance—I wish we could negotiate something a little more frugal that would actually get the job done. But a negotiation took place between Chairman RYAN in the House and the ranking member, Senator WYDEN, in the Senate on this important piece of the package.

We all recognize that these travel in pairs and that trade adjustment assistance is part of the price you pay for getting trade promotion authority done. But most importantly to my colleague's point from Delaware, for those people who are displaced, this guarantees that they will have access to the sort of job training and skills enhancement that they will need in order to get even better jobs in this economy

that, on net, will benefit the entire country. That is the intent on this side of the aisle and I think the intent of trade adjustment authority and making sure that we finish our work—not here today but through the rest of the week—on this important package of pieces of legislation.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I thank the Republican whip for those words and for his work on this. I would just close with this thought: Whenever I talk to people who have been married a long time—like 50, 60, 70 years—I always ask them, what is the secret to being married a long time? I get some very funny answers, and I get some very poignant ones as well. The best answer I have ever heard to that question, what is the secret to being married 50, 60, or 70 years, is the two c's—not ''Cornyn'' and ''Carper'' but ''communicate'' and ''compromise.'' I would add maybe a third to that, and that is ''collaborate.''

We need to demonstrate the ability to communicate and to compromise and to collaborate. And those aren't always the secret to a vibrant marriage, but they are the secret to a vibrant democracy.

This is a confidence-building measure. I think we have taken an important step here, working with Democrats and Republicans and working with a Democratic President, and the next step is one we have just talked about, trade adjustment assistance. We need to do that. If we can actually work through these issues this week and produce a bipartisan product that the President is going to sign, we will actually build some trust. And when we turn to the issue of transportation and having a robust, vibrant transportation system and how to fund that, how to pay for that, what to do, this will be helpful.

So my applause to Senator RON WYDEN, Senator MURRAY on our side, Senator HATCH, the leader on the Republican side, and to Senator CORNYN for good work—not done but a very good start today.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for my colleagues, and I think they make compelling arguments. I just have a hard time. I really have a hard time, with this. I have not had one West Virginian—average, working West Virginian—who had a good job at one time and lost a job who thinks this type of approach to trade is good. Not one. And I am hearing them talking about how much trade we do from our States. I would like to know what type of trade. Manufactured products? I don't see many manufactured products leaving this country. I see an awful lot of resources, such as oil that has been refined into diesel fuel or gasoline. It probably comes from Texas, I would say. I think that is probably a big part of their trading, and those types of things. But how many people actually benefit from that who really have a good manufacturing job? That is all I have asked.

We talked about TAA. We are all hung up on TAA. Do you know why we are hung up? Because we all understand we are going to lose more jobs. We have already lost 6 million jobs since NAFTA. We have all lost 6 million jobs across this country. I lost 31,000 manufacturing jobs.

I understand NAFTA hasn't been enforced, and they had some rules in there. And then you take this piece of legislation, TPA—there was more security around this piece of legislation than there was around the Iran nuclear deal we were talking about. My staff could go there, they could take notes, we were briefed, and we were able to ask questions. We couldn't even take a note or take a note out.

They are telling me: Well, you know, we all depend on trade and the market shrinking. We are at $18 trillion GDP. Think about this. We in the United States of America have the greatest economy the world has ever seen—$18 trillion. Do you know that of all these 11 countries we are talking about, the closest one to us is Japan—$4.5 trillion. It falls off the Richter scale. But yet we have to be very secretive because somebody might leave us.

Well, let me tell you, I have been a businessperson all of my life. If I wanted to get into a market, I will assure you, I would be able to evaluate my competition, the people with whom I want to do business. If that was the big person on the block, I had to make more adjustments than they had to make. But yet we are so concerned about the secrecy of this deal that none of us are able to see it, work it, define it, dissect it, and improve upon it. Now we are just voting basically carte blanche and saying: OK, sure, you are going to get a 60-day review. You can't do a thing about it if you don't like it.

I didn't think we were elected to do that. I really didn't.

When you start looking at everything this stands for and you look at basically—and my father—my grandfather had a grocery store and my dad had a little furniture store, so I was raised in retail. One thing my dad always encouraged was competition. He enjoyed having it. He said: JOE, listen, good competition brings out more buyers. More buyers gives us more of a chance to sell our goods.

What he never did like and what he thought was unfair was when you had unfair competition—didn't pay their taxes, didn't live by the rules or play by the rules. And if we didn't enforce those, it gave them an unfair competitive advantage.

If you believe our past performance in our trade deals makes us an expert at enforcing and making sure people play by the rules so that America is treated right, then you probably would have voted for this. I don't. I can only judge off of our past performance, where we are today.

When you go shopping for whatever types of goods—household goods, clothing goods, furniture—the greatest furniture markets in the world were in the United States. We make very little furniture in this country today. They still want our wood products, so you know what, yes, we ship logs out of West Virginia around the world so people can make the furniture that they want to send back to America. So I guess they say: Oh, yes, that is good trade. The only reason they are buying our logs is because they don't have the quality logs we have. They don't have the quality hardwood forests.

The best coal in the world, the best metallurgical coal—coking—that makes the steel, the best in the world comes out of West Virginia. Sure they are going to buy it because they don't have it. They are going to make their products and send them back to us and come into these markets subsidized.

I would just say sooner or later we ought to do something for America. You have to rebuild this country, and you don't build the wealth of a country based on basically moving paper back and forth. Moving paper back and forth—there are some people, with the wealth they accrue from this, I am sure they are very satisfied and happy with that. And we see the income inequality over the last 20 years. We have never seen this big of a spread. Never.

You see the flatline of workers all over America, just as flatline as can be. I don't know how we can look them in the eye and say we have done the best because now we have opened up 11 new countries.

Vietnam—58 cents an hour is what they are going to pay their workers. And we said: Whoa, whoa, NAFTA is going to be basically bringing the whole North American trade up to par. Twenty-two years later, I understand that Mexico's minimum wage is still under $1 an hour, around 80 cents.

You think a person who makes 58 cents an hour or 80 cents an hour or $1.50 an hour—7 out of 11 countries make less than $2—that those people will have disposable income to buy the products we would like to sell so that we can expand our economy and our jobs? I am sorry, I don't think that is going to happen. I really don't. It doesn't make any sense to me at all how we expect a person who can barely survive to have disposable income to buy products that we in the United States of America wish to sell to really lift our manufacturing base. But I guess that is why we have TAA that we are arguing about because we know we have given that up. We just about wrote that off 22 years ago, so I guess we are going to write the rest of it off now.

Technology is great. I am all for innovation, creation, technology. I am for every bit of that. But sooner or later, you have to make something, you have to build something, you have

to reinvest, and there have to be people making these products, being able to support their families and to have a benefit package that gives them a decent life.

When I was growing up in little Farmington, WV, we had manufacturing, mining. We had people who could go to work, work hard, make a living, take their family on vacation, pay the bills. And we let all of that slip away from us. I am not saying they will be the jobs of the past, but we could have the jobs of the future—steel, manufacturing.

So I am not willing to give up on this. You don't find me chastising my colleagues on the Republican side or my colleagues on the Democratic side. I think we are all here for the right reason. Sometimes we get a little bit off track, and I think this is one time we have gotten off track. Something that would really help the United States of America, working families all over this country, we have kind of forgotten about, and I am concerned about that.

I am concerned about going home to my beautiful State of West Virginia and telling the people: I am sorry, we are going to have a harder time competing with some of these countries because there is just no way.

We have opened up our borders. We have let international trade, an international manufacturing base go wherever they get the best deal. And I guarantee you that in every developing country, they are not going to be as tough as we are on human rights and on the environmental quality they should be aspiring to. They are not going to be tough on those things. They are trying to build an economy. They are trying to build, basically, a nation, bring it up. And they are going to be a little bit lax on these things. That is unfair competition, which my dad always warned me against.

When we talk about European trade, I am not worried about European trade because they are basically on the same level playing field that we are. But when you are trying to build up a country, should you sacrifice and tear down your country? Should you give away everything you have worked hard for and built?

I want to help these countries. I have not a bit of problem helping these countries. I am not an isolationist. But I basically would have put something in there that would have protected our manufacturing base. I would have put something in that said that when we fell below certain jobs in manufacturing, it stops. You don't give it all away. It is hard to regain that and recapture it.

I am sure Wall Street is very happy today. I have a lot of friends who work on Wall Street. There are a lot of good people who work on Wall Street, but there are a lot of people who basically are just driven by the almighty dollar. They are not driven by Main Street. They are not worried about West Virginia. They are not worried about my little town of Farmington or any part of my State. And they are going to be very happy. They are not worried about 99 percent of the people who are still on Main Street trying to survive.

We talked about the Export-Import Bank. They said: Trust us; we are going to get a vote on Export-Import Bank. Maybe we will sometime. I would hope that comes to fruition. That helped a lot of small businesses. We haven't gotten that vote yet. So you would have thought there would have been a priority to get a vote on that. It has done an awful lot to get us in the market so we can compete on a more level playing field. That hasn't happened.

But here we go again. We are going to have some votes tomorrow, and the votes tomorrow are going to be based on the TAA because the House couldn't pass TPA fast-track with TAA in it. It is basically what we are dealing with. So they think we can do a backdoor. What makes you think TAA would be acceptable in any way, shape, or form in the House? What makes you think now, since we have carved this out—but we were promised a vote here on the TAA, which we know we are going to need—it is going to make it more acceptable on the House side when they made them take TAA out and couldn't pass TAA in the TPA bill? Doesn't make any sense to me.

So I think it is a sad day today. I really do. And I am concerned. I am concerned about our country. I am concerned about my hard-working people in West Virginia—and I know you are—and all the other States we have. These are good people. They deserve an opportunity. They deserve fair trade. They really deserve a fair trading country, people who will trade honestly with us and who have a quality or standard that they have to live up to in order to get into our markets. I don't think we should sacrifice our markets basically just to build them up. I think we should assist them, but they are going to have to find their own markets to the point where we don't sacrifice.

So I think this could be a troubling thing. I am hoping it is not, but it could be. I have concerns. And I have said that if I can't explain it back home, I can't vote for it. And this is one I could not explain back home. I could not make the people feel comfortable that this is really going to improve quality of life and opportunities for them and their families. I couldn't do it because I don't see it. I don't believe in it. And I said I wouldn't vote for it, and I didn't.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I just want to say a few things about the vote we just took on cloture to proceed with TPA.

The Senator who just spoke talked about some of the problems with the deal and the dislocations that happen when we have trade. We all recognize there are dislocations. There are dislocations whenever an economy adjusts and moves ahead with or without trade. But trade overall is necessary. It is good. Free trade is good.

Ninety-five percent of the world's consumers live outside our boundaries. Seventy percent of the world's economic output happens outside of our boundaries. We need to trade. We can't just say: Well, we are just going to live within ourselves here, have an economy that doesn't reach out or pull in. We benefit. We benefit from better services and cheaper goods when we trade. Our manufacturers benefit when we are able to export our products.

It was said before that we haven't seen any good outcomes after NAFTA. We have. It is rewriting history to say that we haven't seen good outcomes as a result of NAFTA. I think the last speaker said Mexico has not improved since NAFTA. It has. I can tell you, as a representative of a State that borders with Mexico, the economy is considerably bigger and better. Arizona is one of our biggest trading partners. It has improved since NAFTA.

These trade agreements work. We haven't had a trade agreement negotiated without the TPA process—with the exception of one—I think in over 30 years. That one was a deal I believe with Jordan, and it had far more to do with defense than commerce.

So we need to have TPA—this process—in order to negotiate these trade agreements. The vast majority of our trade—I believe it is close to 90 percent of our trade—is with countries with which we have free-trade agreements.

So I applaud those who have worked so hard to bring this to pass here—Senators HATCH and WYDEN and others—and the compromises that took place. I am not a particular fan of trade adjustment assistance. When economies move forward, there are dislocations. We can't account for all of them. In fact, we have seen some of the problems with previous TAA assistance. I believe some of it went to those who were laid off at Solyndra and to some of these things that had very little to do with trade. Because of the way you seek such assistance, we don't do the best that we could to keep track of where those jobs were lost to. But having said that, we all recognize, as the Senator from Texas said earlier, that TAA is the price we pay to get TPA. We all recognize in this body that there are compromises that need to be made. That is how we move legislation, and that is how we get important legislation such as TPA passed so that we can

have more free trade, and our economy will benefit because of it.

With that, I yield the floor.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

PERMANENT INTERNET TAX FREEDOM ACT

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor today to talk about Internet tax freedom and to talk about ensuring that our online businesses remain competitive.

First of all, I commend the House of Representatives for recently passing the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, which would permanently extend the current ban on Internet access taxes. The current tax moratorium will expire on October 1, and if we fail to renew it, it could cost taxpayers nearly $15 billion in new fees and taxes next year. In addition, as importantly, it would make Internet access less affordable to hard-working families and hamper small businesses' ability to grow and create jobs using the Internet because essentially it would allow all of these jurisdictions to tax the Internet. So when you get on the Internet, you can expect many more taxes if we do not do what the House of Representatives did and extend the Internet Tax Freedom Act. In fact, I think we should make it permanent.

I am a cosponsor of a Senate companion bill of which I hope this Senate will follow the House's lead to pass and send a permanent extension to the President's desk.

Unfortunately, one of the things we have heard is that some see this extension of the moratorium on Internet taxation as an opportunity to attach another piece of legislation that, in fact, would burden our online businesses and would tremendously disadvantage a State like my home State of New Hampshire that has made the legislative decision not to have a sales tax.

We have seen this playbook before. It was called before the Marketplace Fairness Act. Of course, there is nothing fair about this act when it comes to our online businesses having to collect taxes for nearly 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. You can imagine the bureaucratic nightmare that would occur. So this so-called Marketplace Fairness Act—I always used to like to call it the ''Online Sales Tax Act'' or the ''Online Sales Tax Collection Act.'' That would be a more accurate description of that particular act.

So here we are. We have a rerun of this particular bill that would have required businesses in the State of New Hampshire—even though we do not have a sales tax—our online businesses to collect for all these other tax jurisdictions. Again, it is not even just States that have sales taxes. In some States, it goes down to the municipal level when it comes to municipalities and local jurisdictions actually collecting a separate tax, so it would have ended up being over 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. So here you have a nice online business out there having to be the tax collector for all these different jurisdictions. You can imagine that this would really be a huge burden on these online businesses.

The individuals who have been supporting this new sales tax collection scheme in this new burden on the Internet—by the way, one of the reasons I am such a strong proponent of permanently extending the tax freedom and the lack of taxes on the Internet, on Internet access, is because we have seen not only consumers' access to the Internet but the ability of businesses and the ability of us to create jobs and to see real growth on the Internet. This has allowed people to start businesses from their home. It has allowed so much creativity. It has been very positive for our economy.

So lo and behold in all of that there are some talking about attaching to this Internet Tax Freedom Act this incredibly burdensome collection scheme to require businesses to be out there collecting all these sales taxes throughout the Nation. The latest proposal the proponents of this type of tax collection scheme have come up with is one that again creates even more issues—certainly as many if not more issues—than the prior proposal that was called the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act. Of course, we know there is nothing fair about it if you are a business having to collect all these taxes.

What this rerun would do is actually create this reporting system and require businesses to purchase this software and then require States to actually have what are called certified software providers. Here is what would happen: Under this latest scheme, the certified software providers for these States would actually collect all the sales information for every sale—every online sale in a State—and then they would manage the collection of these taxes. Well, can you imagine? So now we are going to say to businesses: Yes, you have to purchase this certain software. And guess what. Every sale you make is going to be held by the central government in each State.

Can you imagine, with all the things we have seen happen in terms of breach of privacy of individuals? We have seen cyber attacks, all these issues we are facing. We have seen it in our government with OPM. We have seen it with the IRS. We have seen it with private companies in data breach.

Now this latest scheme is, let's send all the sales information to one place, and we will have some company—I guess some private companies will stand to benefit from this—they will now collect all these taxes, and they will hold all this information. Imagine how much information they would hold in each State.

So that is how we are going to create this new taxing scheme. You can imagine how a State such as New Hampshire would feel about that as a State that has decided not to have a sales tax—that suddenly our State has to keep all this information, has to hire some private company to do this, to collect all these taxes, and then that each of our online businesses has to purchase this software which is supposed to interface with its State government. What a massive bureaucracy, and how unfair it is in terms of State sovereignty that the Federal Government would impose this on a State such as New Hampshire that has made a decision not to have a sales tax.

This, to me, would be the opposite of what we are trying to accomplish under the Permanent Internet Tax Freedom Act, which I fully support, which is about Internet tax freedom, and to attach this proposal to that Internet Tax Freedom Act, which some people, I think, are scheming around here to do, which with the right hand we are going to give you Internet freedom and with the left hand we are going to take that freedom away from States like mine that have chosen not to have a sales tax. And our online businesses would now have to be part of this huge bureaucratic scheme to collect taxes for other States and other localities.

So I would hope my colleagues would not go down this road because I think the Internet should be free. I think online businesses should be able to continue to thrive and grow. I think online businesses should not be required to collect for over 9,000 taxing jurisdictions. And certainly I think all of us should have concerns about all of the sales data being collected by some kind of third party and being held in one place just so we can collect more taxes on online businesses.

In fact, what I have heard from our businesses in New Hampshire previously when the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act was on the floor of the Senate—many of the businesses in New Hampshire that have online sales told me then how unfair they thought this taxing scheme was, and those concerns

remain, great businesses such as Garnet Hill in Franconia, NH. Russ Gaitskill, who is the president and CEO of Garnet Hill, told me previously: ''It's going to be a nightmare.''

I heard in the past from E&R Laundry and Dry Cleaners, a small business founded in Manchester in 1921. About 70 percent of E&R's sales are now Internet based. The company's president said he would not have the resources to calculate, collect, and deliver sales taxes for thousands of jurisdictions across the country.

There is a great bakery, certainly, in the Nashua and Amherst area, Frederick's Pastries. Anybody who has been there—I can tell you, Frederick's is a great bakery. Susan Lozier Roberts of Frederick's expressed concern that this taxing scheme would create mass confusion, keeping up with all the individual tax codes.

There is the fact that we are going to have to have software and have some third party hold all of the sales information for all these online businesses. That creates so many other additional burdensome issues, as well as privacy issues.

Travis Adams with whaddy.com, based in Nashua, said previously: One tax audit from another State or jurisdiction would completely crush us. Because what happens under this so-called taxing scheme is now all of our online businesses can be audited in all of these taxing jurisdictions. So you can be an online business in New Hampshire, and what the proponents of this new tax scheme would like to have is this opportunity that businesses in New Hampshire can now be audited in all these other jurisdictions. You can imagine what kind of burdens that would create on businesses that are trying to focus every day on the bottom line and creating jobs.

So I would say that as we look at this new proposal that some people behind the scenes are talking about trying to attach to the Internet Tax Freedom Act—I hope we will not go down this road. It would be bad for business, it would be bad for people's privacy, it would be a big power grab, I think, from Washington to require States such as New Hampshire to collect these taxes from throughout the country, and it certainly would not be positive to create more jobs through online businesses.

In fact, the Competitive Enterprise Institute said of this latest proposal, which is a cousin to the so-called Marketplace Fairness Act:

> [This] new tax grab erodes healthy tax competition among states, puts consumers' information at higher risk, and ushers in a regime of taxation without representation. It's like the Blackwater of tax collection, state-paid mercenaries with sales tax charts. Under the Marketplace Fairness Act businesses are threatened by the prospect of being audited and prosecuted in every state into which they sell.

This issue is one I think we all should care about. I know in my home State of New Hampshire, where we have chosen not to have a sales tax, it would be completely unfair for us to consider passing this proposal which is a brandnew tax grab that erodes New Hampshire's competitive status of choosing not to have a sales tax. Also, there is the concern we all should have about a central taxing authority holding all of this private sales information in each of the States and what could be done with that information and how will consumers' information be protected. New Hampshire's residents and Internet retailers cannot afford this radical Federal invasion of our State.

I hope my colleagues will see the importance of extending the Internet Tax Freedom Act to encourage innovation and job creation, but under no circumstances should the Internet access tax moratorium be held hostage by a new and invasive sales tax that would not only undo the benefits of the tax moratorium but also burden our small businesses with becoming tax collectors for other States. That is wrong, and I hope this body will not go down that road. I certainly will be doing everything I can within my power in the Senate to make sure this new sales tax collection regime does not get attached to a very positive proposal, which is the Internet Tax Freedom Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, it is an honor to follow my colleague from New Hampshire, who has done such an eloquent job.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

I want to talk about the Export-Import Bank. I said this during the unnecessary 2013 Government shutdown, and I will say it again: Most Americans think Congress can do something to help create jobs and strengthen our economy—even if it is simply not doing any harm. Yet here we are again, willfully allowing an important tool for economic growth to expire by not taking commonsense action.

On June 30, the charter for the Export-Import Bank will expire. During its 80-plus years of existence, the Bank has garnered support from every President during that span and repeatedly been renewed by Congress, often without any objection. The Export-Import Bank is not a Democratic program or a Republican program. It is a program to help American businesses. President Reagan's words from 30 years ago still ring true:

> Exports create and sustain jobs for millions of American workers and contribute to the growth and strength of the United States economy. The Export-Import Bank contributes in a significant way to our nation's export sales.

The Gipper was right then, and he is right today.

Those who oppose the Ex-Im Bank for ideological reasons may make their case in the abstract, but I have to operate in the reality, where I have heard over and over from Indiana small business owners and workers about the importance of the Ex-Im Bank.

Jon, the vice president of Specialty Hardwoods of Indiana, in Nappannee, told me about their small company, which has around 40 employees. They got through the financial downturn of 2008 and 2009 but suffered during that time, as all small manufacturers did, not only here in this country but worldwide. As they returned to profitability, they made a decision to try to diversify markets.

Up until 2008, they mostly sold their products to the recreational vehicle industry. Since then, they have started to sell to cabinet companies that market to the kitchen and bath industry nationally and made a direct attempt to go after export sales. Lumber product exports now account at Specialty Hardwoods for more than 45 percent of their current sales. Jon told me:

> We could not have done this without the support of EXIM bank. I personally have helped other small companies in our industry contact EXIM and establish relationships with EXIM to market their products. It levels the playing field for smaller companies to enter this market segment of our industry.
>
> We have grown our business and survived because of EXIM bank and the efforts of the 40–45 people that we employ.

The stories continue.

Mark, the vice president and co-owner of Agrarian Marketing Corporation, told us about his company that makes feed additives and nutritional supplements for the livestock industry. They have a very large distributor in Cairo, Egypt, that represents nearly 30 percent of their business. For this Hoosier business, nearly 30 percent of their business comes from Cairo, Egypt.

The credit insurance they purchase through Ex-Im Bank allows them to source this business by extending beneficial credit terms to their Egyptian customer. It would not be possible if they required their customer to prepay for those orders.

Mark said:

> Although we are a small business, this segment of our business is very important to us and provides excellent profitability and jobs here in Indiana as well as jobs for our contract manufacturers in Iowa, Illinois, and Ohio. All would suffer if we lost this business.

Bruce, the CEO and chairman of Sullivan-Palatek in Michigan City, noted that not only are the 140 jobs at his company impacted but several hundred more at local suppliers.

Bruce said:

> In the event that the Ex-Im Bank were to be shut down, the impact to us would be immediate. I believe we would have very much difficulty in getting any new orders.
>
> In fact, the orders that we have in house, many of them we would not be able to ship. We would have to shut them down right in the middle . . . of the order process.

Jon, Mark, and Bruce are three of many in Indiana, many around the country. In my home State, the Hoosier State, since 2010 the Export-Import Bank has directly helped more than 100 companies that have exported more than $3 billion in goods and services.

The Ex-Im Bank costs zero in taxpayer dollars. In fact, it turns a profit.

Since 1992, the Bank has returned more than $7 billion in profits to the Treasury. Last year, $675 million was returned to the Treasury. And the default rate is 0.175 percent. That is less than one-fifth of 1 percent. That is an effort to manage it in a fiscally prudent, fiscally responsible manner.

In fiscal year 2014, the Ex-Im Bank authorized around $20.5 billion for 3,746 transactions, which contributed to $27.5 billion of U.S. exports and more than 164,000 jobs right here in the United States.

These are not, for the most part, huge corporations. They are small companies that wouldn't be able to afford financing elsewhere. In 2014, 90 percent of the transactions approved by the Bank were in support of small businesses.

So what happens if Ex-Im's charter is to expire? It will be forced to shut down, unwind current obligations, and the loss of future financing could result in a significant amount of business being lost overseas. That directly affects the bottom line for many businesses, leaving them with less revenue to reinvest and less revenue to pay wages or create new jobs. It becomes difficult—if not nearly impossible—for the private sector to replace the loans, the guarantees, and the insurance provided by the Ex-Im Bank.

At a time when American companies are competing in a game that is often rigged by foreign currency manipulation, intellectual property theft, and insurmountable regulatory barriers, unilaterally eliminating our export credit agency further handcuffs U.S. job creators and allows competitors in foreign countries to pick up the business.

If Ex-Im no longer provides financing, foreign companies and countries are still going to buy their goods and products. They need the products. But instead of buying that product from Muncie, IN, they will purchase it in Russia or China.

This is, to me, the direct opposite of what Congress should be doing. It seems as if up is down and down is up in this discussion. Nearly every other major country has a credit export agency. Many are larger and much more aggressive than the Export-Import Bank. Unilaterally eliminating our export credit agency hurts not only the United States and handcuffs our job creators, but it also helps competitors in foreign countries to capitalize and seize that business.

Our global competitors, including China, Brazil, and India, are investing more in export financing every single day. They are investing in their companies and in their economy. If we take this measure, we are stepping back. They are rooting for America's Export-Import Bank to close because it means more business for them.

Even our neighbor Canada is providing far more export financing than the United States. Canada's economy is one-tenth the size of the U.S. economy, and their export-import agency already provides far more export financing than we do at the present time. The Ex-Im Bank is a tool that helps American companies compete in the global economy.

In Indiana, we pride ourselves on what we call Hoosier common sense. It does not get more common sense than creating more American jobs in a fiscally responsible way. That is what the Export-Import Bank does.

Congress needs a dose of that Hoosier common sense, which is the same as the common sense in the Presiding Officer's home State of Ohio. We should act quickly to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank to help our companies, to help our employees, to help workers around our country, and to help our Nation.

I yield the floor.

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. GARDNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, our country stands on the brink of a great opportunity in the Asia-Pacific. Since 2008, the United States and 11 other Pacific nations, including Japan and New Zealand, have worked to conclude negotiations on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. This agreement represents nearly 40 percent of the global gross domestic product, or GDP, and is the most ambitious free-trade agreement in history. By upending antiquated international tariff systems and tearing down barriers to trade, we can unleash American ingenuity and send our Nation's products from Main Street to Malaysia.

Much has been said about the national benefits of concluding TPP, but I want to focus on some of the particular benefits for my home State of Colorado. Colorado, like most States, benefits immensely from international trade, particularly with Asia. According to the Business Roundtable, more than 265,000 Colorado jobs are supported by the countries that would be affected by TPP. These trade-related jobs include the farmworker harvesting world-famous melons down in Rocky Ford and the meatpacker shipping American beef from Greeley. They are the electrical engineer designing computer systems in Boulder and the natural gas worker maintaining a rig in Parachute. Collectively, these everyday working Americans help drive the economic and trade engine of Colorado. Last year, my State exported more than $8 billion worth of goods all across the world. Approximately half of them, or $4 billion, went directly to TPP countries.

While nations like Vietnam and Japan have imposed hefty tariffs on our Colorado goods in the past, TPP presents an opportunity to level the playing field. American goods would flow more freely to the region and American workers stand to benefit. That is why I strongly support granting the President trade promotion authority, or TPA, and finalizing a high-standard TPP. A vote for TPA is a vote for the American worker. It is a vote for more active engagement in the world and a higher standard of living, and it is a vote to recognize that through increased trade, we can indeed deliver upon the promise of a better tomorrow.

Unfortunately, however, some in Congress have opted for isolationism and retreat. They have sounded the alarm over supposed failure of past trade agreements and argued in favor of taking cover rather than taking charge, and they have doubled down on the false notion that trade is always bad for the American economy and the American worker. But a quick review of the facts will dispel these myths very quickly. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, national beef exports to Colombia and Panama have more than tripled since 2011 when we enacted free-trade agreements with these countries. National wheat exports to Chile more than doubled from the enactment of our 2003 free-trade agreement through 2014, while dairy exports increased more than 20 times to that country, and our beef exports have increased more than eight times to the participant countries of the Central America and Dominican Republic free-trade agreement.

Colorado businesses have played a large role in expanding overseas as well. My State witnessed a 37-percent increase in goods exported to countries with free-trade agreements between 2003 and 2013. Exports to Korea have increased 61 percent since the conclusion of our free-trade agreement with that nation in 2011. And NAFTA, which anti-trade forces frequently dismiss as the poster child for trade deals gone awry, has resulted in a 293-percent—that is right, 293 percent—increase in Colorado exports to Canada and Mexico since 1994.

Beyond the numbers, though, it is important to meet with the workers and business owners who understand that freer trade helps their bottom line. Just a few days ago, I traveled to Eastern Colorado on my annual wheat tour. It is a tradition that Senator Wayne Allard started in the 1990s—then a U.S. Representative—and one I was excited to continue in the Senate. I invited my colleague from Colorado Senator BENNET, so we could both hear the needs directly from Coloradans and see the positive impacts that agreements such as TPP could have not only on Eastern Colorado but farmers across this country.

On the tour, we had the chance to marvel at the truly incredible production level of Colorado wheat growers. We are just about 2 weeks away from

the height of the winter wheat harvest in Colorado—a time when I have always enjoyed working at our family implement dealership in Yuma—and a reminder that Colorado helps feed the world. The vast majority of Colorado's wheat crop is exported. In fact, in 2013, we shipped more than $235 million worth of wheat across the globe. Eighty percent of the wheat we produce in Colorado is exported. Most of the wheat growers we met on the Eastern Plains aren't interested in retreating from the international marketplace. In fact, they want to expand the international marketplace. They understand that freer trade means improved opportunities to place their product. And with a high-standard TPP, Colorado wheat growers could penetrate notoriously difficult markets in countries such as Japan and begin to ship from Thurman to Tokyo and beyond.

It isn't just wheat either. Colorado farmers and ranchers already export millions of dollars in Western Slope beef, Southern Colorado onions, and San Luis Valley potatoes. In fact, according to the Department of Agriculture, Colorado potatoes represent around 70 percent of all U.S. potato exports to Mexico. That market stands to grow significantly if TPP is successfully concluded, considering that Mexico is a member nation in the negotiations.

There is no question that trade benefits rural America. We should be promoting Palisade peaches in Perth and Olathe sweet corn on the streets of Singapore. Growing up in rural Colorado, I saw the potential that our hard-working farmers and ranchers created for Colorado and for Colorado products abroad. Their determined spirit and hard-working attitude are what keep America at the top of the global economy, and TPP will expand that promise in the Asia-Pacific.

Urban and suburban America succeed with increased trade as well. As do their rural counterparts, urban and suburban Coloradans benefit from a wider selection of cheaper goods. The mechanics of free trade stretch dollars a little bit further for the teenager with a part-time summer job as well as for the family struggling to make ends meet.

Aside from the benefit of cheaper products, increased trade creates jobs here at home. A couple of months ago, I was fortunate enough to visit a company in Boulder, CO, that manufactures zip lines and other adventure equipment. This company has successfully expanded their business to Europe and Asia, helping people across the globe enjoy rain forest canopy tours, free falling, and more.

As this business expanded overseas, they had the ability to hire more employees and boost the local economy in Boulder. They doubled their Colorado office and are still looking to grow. An agreement such as TPP will open further opportunities for this company in the Asia-Pacific and beyond, perhaps facilitating world-class bungee jumping in New Zealand or advanced rock climbing in Peru, and with those new opportunities come more Colorado jobs.

That is the essence of free trade. It encourages innovation and entrepreneurship. It connects the world while growing our workforce at home, and it presents an opportunity for Colorado and our country to spread our goods and ideas across the globe.

That is why I have supported free-trade agreements in the past—agreements that have yielded significant economic and strategic benefits for our Nation. That is why I supported the latest generation of trade promotion authority and look forward to supporting it again. We will continue to support it this week as it goes to the President's desk to be signed into law. That is why I urge my colleagues to continue their support for free-trade agreements, so the United States can help grasp the great opportunity that awaits us in the Asia-Pacific.

We have held several hearings over the past couple of months in the Foreign Relations Committee and beyond talking about the benefits of free trade. A couple of weeks ago, we were joined by experts from Asia and economic leaders around this country, all of whom believe we have an important role to play in expanding trade and expanding the opportunities that the Trans-Pacific Partnership will lead to when that agreement comes to this floor, thanks to trade promotion authority. It is an important measure that we must enact. It is an important statement of good faith that the United States truly is interested in the Asia region, the Asia-Pacific region, making good on our efforts to truly pivot to Asia to rebalance policy we all support but making good on our word that we are indeed in the region to stay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, last fall, Republicans promised that if we were elected to the majority, we would get Washington working. That wasn't a campaign slogan, that was a commitment. After 6 months of Republican control, I am proud to report we are delivering on that promise.

The past 6 months in the Senate have been the most productive months in a long time. We passed bipartisan legislation to approve the Keystone Pipeline. We passed a bipartisan bill to help prevent suicides among veterans. We passed the first significant bipartisan reform of Medicare in years, which will ensure that our seniors have access to physicians and that those physicians are judged by the quality rather than the quantity of the care they provide. We passed bipartisan legislation to give law enforcement new tools to fight human trafficking and provide support for trafficking victims. We passed a bipartisan bill to authorize funding for our national defense to provide for the needs of our men and women in uniform.

Those are just some of the highlights.

Every piece of legislation I mentioned passed with bipartisan support. One reason that happened is because the Republican majority has been committed to ensuring that all Senators, whatever the party, have the opportunity to make their voices heard.

Under Democratic leadership, not only were Members of the minority party shut out of the legislative process, but many rank-and-file Democrats were as well. During all of 2014, the Democratic leadership in the Senate allowed just 15 amendment rollcall votes—15 votes in an entire year. That is barely more than a vote a month.

By contrast, the Republican-led Senate has taken more than 130 amendment rollcall votes so far this year or more than 21 votes a month. That is not only more amendment rollcall votes than last year, it is more amendment rollcall votes than the Senate has taken in the past 2 years combined. That is through the first 6 months of 2015. We have another 6 months to go.

This week, the Senate is considering what I hope is going to be our next bipartisan achievement; that is, the legislation to help expand U.S. trade with other countries and increase the opportunities that are available for American businesses and American workers.

Over the past few years, exports have been a bright spot in our economy, supporting an increasing number of American jobs each and every year. In 2014, exports supported 11.7 million U.S. jobs and made up 13 percent of our Nation's economy. We need to continue to open markets around the globe to American goods and services, and the best way to do that is through new trade agreements.

Countries with which we have free and fair trade agreements purchase substantially more from us than other countries. In fact, in 2013, free-trade agreement countries purchased 12 times more goods per capita from the United States than nonfree-trade agreement countries—12 times more goods per capita.

For American workers, increased trade means more opportunity and increased access to high-paying jobs. Manufacturing jobs tied to exports pay, on average, 13 to 18 percent more than other jobs in our economy.

Unfortunately, while trade agreements have proliferated around the globe over the past several years, the United States hasn't signed a new trade agreement in 8 years. A big reason for that is the fact that trade promotion authority expired in 2007. Since 1934, almost all of the U.S. free-trade agreements have been negotiated using trade promotion authority or a similar streamlined, expedited process.

Trade promotion authority is designed to put the United States in the

strongest possible position when it comes to negotiating trade agreements. Under TPA, Congress sets guidelines for trade negotiations and outlines the priorities the administration must follow. In return, Congress promises a simple up-or-down vote on the resulting trade agreement instead of the long amendment process that could leave the final deal looking nothing like what was initially negotiated.

That simple up-or-down vote is the key. It lets our negotiating partners know that Congress and trade negotiators are on the same page, which gives other countries the confidence they need to put their best offers on the table. That, in turn, allows for a successful and timely conclusion of negotiations.

Currently, the administration is negotiating two major trade agreements that have the potential to vastly expand the market for American goods and services in the European Union and in the Pacific. The Trans-Pacific Partnership is being negotiated with a number of Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, Japan, New Zealand, Singapore, and Vietnam. If this agreement is done right, it could have huge benefits for American agriculture, among other industries.

Agriculture producers in my State of South Dakota and in the Presiding Officer's State of Iowa understand that trade promotion authority is the most effective way to secure trade agreements that will benefit our farmers and our ranchers. One pork producer in my State of South Dakota contacted me to tell me that a successful TPP deal could increase U.S. pork exports to just one of the Trans-Pacific Partnership countries by literally hundreds of millions of dollars in a year.

Discussions of the benefits of trade tend to focus on the economic benefits, and with good reason—it helps our economy. It creates good-paying jobs and raises the standard of living for people in this country and gives access for consumers to lower cost goods and services. But new trade agreements also have the potential to result not just in economic gains for America's farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers but in national security gains for the country.

When we make trade deals with other countries, we are not just opening new markets for our goods, we are also developing and cementing alliances. Trade agreements build bonds of friendship with other nations that extend not only to cooperation on economic issues but to cooperation on security issues as well.

It is also important to remember that just because the United States isn't negotiating trade agreements doesn't mean other countries will not be. In fact, the United States hasn't signed a single new trade agreement over the past 8 years, but that hasn't prevented other countries from signing numerous trade agreements over the same period. If America fails to lead on trade, other nations such as China will step in to fill the void, and these nations will not have the best interests of American workers and American families in mind.

The bill before us today will help pave the way for the United States to cement alliances with friendly nations through trade and will help ensure that any trade deals the United States enters into will be favorable to our economic and our national security interests.

The Senate passed a version of this bill last month with a bipartisan majority, and I am hopeful we will have a similarly strong bipartisan vote yet this week. Republicans believe our Nation's problems are best solved when Members of both parties come together to find solutions for the American people.

Republicans' plans for our second 6 months in the majority are the same as those for the first 6 months of our majority; that is, to make sure we continue to move forward in a way that addresses the challenges that are facing our country. Unfortunately, last week we saw an unfortunate return to partisanship on the part of the Democrats when they blocked an appropriations bill to fund our troops. It is not that Democrats have a problem with this bill; in fact, many of them voted to support the funding this bill provides when they voted in favor of the National Defense Authorization Act last week. The authorization act is the first step in a two-step process which has to be followed by the appropriations bill that actually provides the funding. But Democratic leaders and the President, even though many of them supported the Defense authorization bill, are upset that government agencies such as the EPA and the IRS aren't receiving the Democrats' preferred level of funding, so they have decided to hold appropriations bills hostage in an effort to get what they want.

It is unfortunate that Democrats are holding money for our troops hostage in order to get more funding for the EPA and the IRS. If Democrats believe the funding levels in the appropriations bills are not acceptable, they will have the opportunity to offer amendments to increase the funding. But in order to do that, they have to allow us to actually proceed to consideration of these bills on the Senate floor. What they are, in effect, doing now is filibustering any attempt to bring any spending bill to the floor; most recently, as I mentioned, the funding bill for our troops. The bill that funds our national security interests in this country is currently being held hostage. We can't even get it on the floor to debate it. We are not only talking about ultimately passing it, we are talking about even having a discussion on the floor of the Senate about something as important as funding our troops and the important military objectives we have as a nation. Yet, right now, we have a filibuster being conducted by the Democrats—again, because they want to get more funding for their favorite agencies. Well, that is a bad way to go about this.

I am hopeful that this obstruction—which is largely driven by the Democratic leadership—that most rank-and-file Democrats will rethink a strategy that involves opposing every opportunity to fund our Nation's priorities and to get things done for the American people.

After years of stagnation in the Senate under Democratic leadership, I think even most Democrats have enjoyed governing in a functioning Senate again. We have dozens of bipartisan bills to show for the first 6 months of this year, and our record of accomplishment can continue if the Democrats abandon their strategy of obstruction and continue to work with us to solve the challenges facing our Nation. They can start by not objecting to proceeding to even getting a bill that funds our national security interests here on the floor of the Senate so we can debate it. As I said, if they don't like the funding levels in there, we will have an open amendment process in which they will be able to offer amendments to change those funding levels. But what they are doing right now is fundamentally wrong, not even allowing consideration of an appropriations bill that funds our military and pays our troops on the floor of the United States Senate. I hope that will change.

I hope that the Democrats will join us in making the next 6 months of 2015 as productive as the first 6 months have been and that we can point to bipartisan achievements that are good for the American people, that focus on their basic daily needs, and that will promote policies which will grow our economy and create jobs and lead to a higher standard of living and increased take-home pay for middle-income families across this country.

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. HATCH. Madam 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. Madam President, I would like to take a few minutes to underscore the importance of trade and trade promotion authority to the American manufacturing industry.

Despite some claims to the contrary, U.S. manufacturers have been among the principal beneficiaries of our existing free-trade agreements. One in four U.S. manufacturing jobs depends on exports. On average, the wages of those in export-supported manufacturing jobs are 18 percent higher than those of other factory workers.

Furthermore, since the last TPA bill passed through the Congress in 2002,

U.S. goods exports have more than doubled, reaching $1.6 trillion in 2013 alone. While we hear a constant drumbeat decrying our trade deficits, the United States enjoys a nearly $60 billion yearly manufacturing surplus with our 20 existing partners to the free-trade agreements. Consumers and businesses in those 20 countries purchased $658 billion of U.S. manufactured goods in 2013 alone, which represents nearly 48 percent of all exports produced by the 12 million Americans employed in manufacturing.

Clearly, in places where we have free-trade agreements, where our manufacturers can compete on a level playing field, they are winning. We need to build on that track record of success and enact more high-standard, 21st-century free-trade agreements. That is yet another reason why we need TPA.

It is no wonder, then, that our TPA bill is supported by manufacturers throughout the country. We have received letters or statements of support from groups such as the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Electrical Manufacturers Association, the Grocery Manufacturers Association, the American Forest and Paper Association, the Association of Equipment Manufacturers, the Semiconductor Industry Association, the Society of Chemical Manufacturers & Affiliates, the National Council of Textile Organizations, and many others.

On top of that, a number of iconic individual manufacturing companies have weighed in publicly in support of our bill, including Boeing, Cummins, Dow Chemical, Honeywell, Intel, Texas Instruments, Xerox, and, of course, many others.

Caterpillar, which is based in Peoria, IL, is the world's leading manufacturer of construction and mining equipment, diesel engines, and gas turbines. Caterpillar knows the value of trade to a healthy economy, having exported nearly $88 billion in goods and services over the past 5 years. They know that if we pass TPA, they can do even better.

Upon introduction of our bill, the company issued a statement saying, ''Passage of TPA will provide the United States with the strongest possible hand when negotiating future trade agreements and will help eliminate the current high tariffs and trade barriers that companies like Caterpillar currently face.''

It is not just big companies that benefit. Ninety-eight percent of nearly 300,000 American exporters are small and medium-sized businesses. Let me say that again. Ninety-eight percent of all U.S. exporters are small and medium-sized businesses. There are 300,000 of them. That fact escapes many people.

Let me give an example of one of those small businesses from my home State of Utah. Kimber Kable is owned and operated by Ray Kimber. Ray's story is emblematic of the American dream. In the late 1970s, Ray figured out a way to weave audio cables to reduce unwanted noise and improve fidelity. The company he started in his garage over 35 years ago is now a driver of economic growth and a source of jobs. Today, he employs 30 people in Ogden, UT. He sells his cables to the world. Two-thirds of Ray's cables are shipped to customers overseas.

Ray is not only a friend of mine, he is also an outstanding example of a larger truth: The U.S. manufacturing sector is the most innovative in the world, and American workers are unsurpassed in manufacturing productivity. Because of U.S. innovation and productivity, where U.S. manufacturing competes on an equal footing, it always succeeds.

We can help people like Ray reach more markets and maintain healthy small businesses across America—businesses that will grow our economy and create more jobs—but we can only do that if our trade negotiators have the tools to set fair trade rules for our exporters. That is what our TPA bill provides.

For example, a big part of the ability of small companies like Kimber Kable to sell around the world is digital trade. That is why the TPA bill that is again before us directs our trade negotiators to ensure that electronically delivered goods and services are classified with the most liberal trade treatment possible and that our trading partners allow the free flow of data across borders.

Using the Internet to market, sell, and transmit digital products is only part of the story. Companies like Ray's are also innovators, and their innovations must be protected. Too many small businesses have experienced firsthand the destructive impact of intellectual property theft. Companies like Kimber Kable have to contend with counterfeiters stealing their company name to sell inferior products. This TPA bill, therefore, will also ensure that U.S. trade agreements reflect a standard of intellectual property rights protection similar to that found in our own U.S. law. The bill calls for an end to the theft of U.S. intellectual property by foreign governments, including piracy and the theft of trade secrets, and for the elimination of measures that require U.S. companies to locate their intellectual property abroad in return for market access. These are strong provisions that will help U.S. manufacturing compete and sell their products around the world.

Companies from Caterpillar to Kimber Kable recognize the importance of trade and trade agreements to the future of American manufacturing. They recognize that 95 percent of the world's consumers live outside of the United States and that if we want to sell American-made products to these customers, we need strong agreements to break down barriers and level the playing field. We simply cannot do that without the TPA.

We can do better and we must do better for American manufacturers. If we really want to support the American manufacturing industry, then we should vote today to pass this TPA legislation once and for all.

Madam 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. Madam 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. Madam President, I wish to take a few minutes to talk about the importance of international trade to my home State of Utah and how Utahns will benefit from the passage of the TPA bill.

Despite having a relatively small population, the State of Utah is a very significant player in international trade. In 2014 alone, Utah exported more than $12 billion in goods. That number has more than doubled over the past decade, despite the economic downturn that took place during that time.

Goods exports account for more than 11 percent of Utah's GDP. More than 50,000 Utah jobs are directly tied to goods exports, as more than 3,400 Utah-based companies export goods to countries around the world. By the way, nearly 86 percent of those exporting companies are small or medium-sized businesses.

These Utah exports include a number of key manufacturing exports, including primary metal products, computer and electronics products, chemicals, processed foods, and transportation equipment, just to mention a few.

There are a number of Utah companies that I could single out here today. As I said, there are more than 3,400 Utah-based exporters, but let me talk about one in particular—Albion Laboratories, which is based in Clearfield, UT.

Albion is a leading, global manufacturer of chelated minerals for human and plant nutritional applications. The company is incredibly innovative, owning more than 100 patents from manufacturing processes to food applications. Over the years, Albion has enjoyed strong growth in large part because of its expanded exports. Today, Albion exports to more than 100 different countries, which has allowed the company to regularly add new jobs to accommodate its increased output. As of right now, the company employs approximately 150 people. This is just one example of the many unique and innovative Utah companies that have benefited from international trade and will benefit even more from expanded access to foreign markets in the future.

Now, there has been a lot of talk about the potential benefits of our pending trade agreements with countries in the Asia-Pacific region and the European Union. As of right now, more than half of Utah's exports already go

to these two markets. Therefore, I think it is safe to say that Utah-based exporters will benefit greatly from the expanded market access they will undoubtedly see if we can get both the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership over the finish line.

Of course, without TPA, these two important trade agreements, which are among the largest and most ambitious agreements in our Nation's history, don't stand a chance. TPA gives our negotiators the tools they need to get the best deals possible. TPA gives Congress and our constituents a strong voice in the negotiating process, and, of course, TPA assures that once an agreement is reached, our country will be able to deliver on the deal.

Utahns depend on international trade. Utah's job creators, like those throughout the country, need greater access to foreign markets in order to compete. Put simply, they are not going to get that access without TPA.

So for the sake of the thousands of Utah companies that export goods around the world and the tens of thousands of Utahns whose jobs depend on those exports—and for the hundreds of thousands of companies all over this country and more—I urge my colleagues to join me one more time in supporting our TPA legislation.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1648 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 5 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4 p.m., recessed until 5 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. AYOTTE).

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

JASON SIMCAKOSKI MEMORIAL OPIOID SAFETY ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise not to speak about an issue that divides this Chamber but rather one that unites us; that is, the care of those who have served and sacrificed for our Nation, America's veterans.

Today, I take great pride in the fact I have worked across the aisle to introduce bipartisan VA reform legislation, the Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act. I am pleased to be joined in offering this legislation by my friend and colleague Senator CAPITO of West Virginia.

This legislation is aimed at addressing the problem of overprescribing practices at the VA and providing safer and more effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans. It is named in honor of a Wisconsin veteran, U.S. Marine veteran Jason Simcakoski.

On August 30, 2014, Jason tragically died at Wisconsin's Tomah Veterans Affairs Medical Center as a result of what was medically deemed mixed-drug toxicity. I call this a failure to serve someone who has faithfully served our country.

At the time of his death at the VA, Jason was on 14 different prescription drugs. Yet this Marine's heartbreaking story is just one example of the overprescribing problem at the VA.

After two, decade-long, wars, a large number of our servicemembers are coming home with the damage of combat, and our veterans and their families are facing the difficult challenge of physical injuries, PTSD, and other mental illnesses.

Unfortunately, I believe the VA's overreliance on powerful and highly addicting opioids has resulted in getting our veterans hooked rather than getting them help. Jason's story is a tragic example of the devastation caused by addiction—addiction whose roots are, regrettably, at the VA.

To me, overprescription of opioids at the VA is a root problem, and it is growing into a weed—a weed of addiction whose impact is being felt beyond the walls of VA facilities. The ripples are indeed being felt across America in the communities we work for every day in our Nation's Capital.

The families whom we have a responsibility to represent—families of those who have bravely served our country—are struggling with the loss of a son or a daughter, a father or a mother, a sister or a brother to addiction whose root is planted within the VA system. It is our job to make sure they do not feel alone, and I believe we have a shared responsibility to do everything we can to pull out this weed by its roots.

Jason's family is in Washington today, and I am so honored to have worked with them and others in putting these reforms together to provide the VA with the tools it needs to help prevent this type of tragedy from occurring to other veterans and their families.

I what to thank the Simcakoski family and let them know I have a tremendous amount of respect for the courage they have shown in telling theirs and Jason's story and working to make a difference in the lives of other veterans and their families.

Their story is one of a sacred trust we must have with our veterans and their families. It is a story of how that trust has been broken, and it is a tragic story of loss.

My message to my colleagues comes from Jason's widow Heather, who has said:

> When I look back at the past, I want to know we made a difference. I want to believe we have leaders in our country who care. I want to inspire others to never give up because change is possible.

Her words have inspired me, and it is my hope they will inspire my colleagues to join us in taking action. I hope I speak for all of us when I say there is no room for politics when it comes to ensuring that our Nation's veterans receive the timely, safe, and highest quality care that they have earned.

Our legislation takes steps to give veterans and their families a stronger voice in their care by strengthening opioid prescribing guidelines and other measures. It also works to improve coordination and communication throughout the VA and puts in place stronger oversight and accountability for the quality of care we are providing our veterans.

Our goal is simple: put these bipartisan reforms in place to prevent tragedies like Jason's from occurring to other veterans and their families.

I wish to thank and recognize Senators BLUMENTHAL, BROWN, HIRONO, JOHNSON, KAINE, MANCHIN, MARKEY, MORAN, MURRAY, SANDERS, and TESTER for joining Senator CAPITO and me, signing on as original cosponsors of this bipartisan effort. I also wish to thank the many veterans service organizations and medical professionals for their invaluable support, insight, and input as we crafted this legislation.

Today, I ask the rest of my colleagues to join us in working to confront the problems of overprescribing practices at the VA and to provide more safe and effective pain management services to our Nation's veterans.

Let us work together to fix what has been broken and restore that sacred trust with our veterans and their families. Let us work together to give our veterans and their families a voice—a voice that is heard, respected, and recognized. Let us be inspired by that voice to take bipartisan action on solutions to prevent these problems and tragedies from ever happening again and to provide our veterans and their families with the care they have earned and the care they deserve.

Madam President, I yield time to my coauthor on this bill Senator CAPITO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I come here before you today, joined by

my colleague Senator BALDWIN from Wisconsin—but also by colleagues from both sides of the aisle, as she mentioned—in support of legislation to provide safer and more effective pain management to our Nation's veterans.

Too many of our veterans have returned from overseas duties only to fight another battle here at home. The Jason Simcakoski Memorial Opioid Safety Act takes the necessary steps to address challenges faced by our veterans.

Again, I thank the Simcakoskis for their bravery and courage, as painful as it is for the family, in hopes that it will help—and it will help—the next generation of veterans who are being treated at the VA.

This bill reforms the overreliance on painkillers by the VA while still ensuring that veterans receive appropriate medication. This legislation not only updates and strengthens the guidelines for opioid prescriptions, but it requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to expand the scope of research, education, delivery, and integration of alternative pain management. Chronic pain should not be something our veterans are forced to live with, and the VA must be on the cutting edge of developing effective pain management.

This bill will elevate the role of patient advocates—as I am sure Jason's wife was a great patient advocate—require community meetings hosted by the VA, and establish a joint DOD-VA working group to improve coordination and communication at all levels of government.

In an era where medical research and technological advancements have led to at least a 90-percent survival rate for our wounded soldiers, we must continue to focus on the battles our veterans face when they return home, including treatment of those wounds that are not evidently visible.

One marine in my hometown, Andrew White, returned home to West Virginia after serving in Iraq. Andrew displayed signs of PTSD, including insomnia, nightmares, constant restlessness, and pain related to an injury. In addition to antidepressant and antianxiety pills, doctors placed Andrew on a strong antipsychotic drug and, over time, increased his dosage from 25 milligrams to 1600 milligrams—more than twice the dosage recommended to treat schizophrenia. Andrew White died in his sleep at the age of 23.

Andrew is a reminder of the physical and mental side effects of the war. We must work together to provide the resources and care necessary to assist our veterans in their transition into civilian life.

Expansion of the Opioid Safety Initiative and further development of the opioid therapy risk support tool will do just that. These measures will enable the VA to use the patient record database to detect those at higher risk of opioid abuse and submit information to the State prescription drug monitoring programs. We really need all hands on deck. This real-time tracking of information will enable medical professionals to better diagnose and treat patients.

This legislation calls for more accountability within the VA through internal audits, reports to Congress, and increased information sharing. We cannot allow bureaucracy to get in the way of delivering quality care to veterans, and we must prioritize the efficient delivery of care.

In my home State of West Virginia, the tragic effects of opioid abuse have left families devastated. I have met with other families who lost their loved ones who suffered from PTSD and traumatic brain injury, and I believe more can be done to find solutions.

It is incumbent upon us in a bipartisan way, as my colleague has said, to do right by our veterans. I wish to thank Senator BALDWIN. I have been at committee meeting after committee meeting with her where she has pounded the drum on the importance of this issue and how devastating it is to families across this country. I thank Senator BALDWIN.

Our best is not just the least we can do. It is our duty to those who have served, of whom we have asked so much, to do more than our best, and this bill does that.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

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

DATA BREACH AT OPM

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, earlier today the Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, conducted a hearing on the data security breach at the Office of Personnel Management. I am a member of that subcommittee, and we had several witnesses, including OPM Director Archuleta. Our goal was to learn about the latest data breach that was revealed earlier this month.

I think that in many ways the hearing was useful and in other ways it was inadequate. The hearing once again demonstrated that much more needs to be done to address the ongoing IT management issues which plague so many agencies but in particular OPM.

As our witnesses testified, the recent breach—and really, it is breaches—at OPM was not a resource issue but a management issue. Too often—and I certainly understand that how we appropriate money is important—the excuse is we don't have enough resources. Today, in my view, it was made clear that this is much more of a management issue than a resource issue.

As Director Archuleta said in her confirmation hearing as well as in today's hearing, IT security was her top priority when she entered the agency in November of 2013. But what has transpired since then has been troubling. She reminded me today that in her confirmation hearing—IT data security was her top priority when she arrived at the agency in late 2013.

Ms. Archuleta highlighted the fact that in March of 2014, OPM detected a sophisticated attack targeting sensitive information. While the hackers didn't get information in that particular instance, this should have been the first alarm to go off that somebody was trying to get access to very sensitive documents.

I will reiterate what I am talking about in this case. This was March of 2014. We are talking about a hack attempt that occurred last year, not the ones that are making the news today. Unfortunately, it happened again a year ago—in June of 2014—when a company that was involved in background checks for the government, U.S. Investigation Services, USIS, suffered a breach impacting as many as 26,000 Federal employee records. It happened again in August of 2014—a third time. So we have March, June, and August. In August of 2014, another company involved in background checks, KeyPoint, was breached, and this time over 48,000 records were stolen.

In both of these contractor breaches, OPM was required to send out notifications to Federal employees who were affected. Clearly OPM knew about these breaches. Now we have learned that the credentials stolen in those original breaches were used to enter the OPM system and this time steal highly sensitive information. The information stolen was Social Security numbers, military records, veteran status, addresses, birth dates, job and pay history, health insurance, life insurance, pension, age, gender, race, and union status. So these three separate examples should have been the stark warning to secure this highly sensitive data.

When I asked the Director today about this topic, she merely pointed to an IT modernization plan that was drafted when she entered the agency about 20 months ago. My question was: Having seen these three attempts to breach the information at OPM, what then occurred at OPM following that which was different to further and better protect information at the Office of Personnel Management? The answer was really about pointing to a plan that was developed when the Director initially arrived at OPM some 20 months ago.

In addition to those three breaches, if those were not warning enough, there were two other important reports which also could have and should have suggested that better management was

needed. In November 2014, the inspector general for OPM released its annual report on Federal information security. That report found that 11 of the 47 major information systems—23 percent—at OPM lacked proper security authorization. In fact, 5 of the 11 systems were in the office of the Chief Information Officer, the person responsible for the agency's data security.

This morning, Ms. Archuleta was proud to claim that the agency had been upgraded to just ''significant deficiency'' with regard to its IT system, up from ''material weakness.'' And the inspector general testified this morning that they had offered 29 recommendations in their November report, and to date only 3 of the 29 recommendations had been adopted.

In addition to the inspector general report in November of 2014, in December—the following month—of 2014, the General Accounting Office, or GAO, issued a report highly critical of IT management at OPM. The report identified best practices that OPM should implement to improve IT management. The report found that ''OPM's efforts to modernize retirement processing have been plagued by IT management weaknesses''—another indication that OPM desperately needed to address IT management, which our witnesses argue is critical to ensuring agency-wide security.

So my takeaway from this morning's hearing is that all the warning signs were there. OPM was aware of the persistent issues. They knew about breaches to their contractors, and the agency knew they were a target. Yet the only evidence that OPM did anything was a plan that was written in the first 100 days of the new Director's tenure at OPM. Planning is important, but execution matters a lot more.

We still need lots of answers as to what OPM did following those original breaches last year. What security plan did they put in place? Have they identified which information to secure? How did they secure these documents? Were they effective in preventing other attacks? How often did the OPM Director and the CIO, the Chief Information Officer, meet and what were their discussions?

I am encouraged to know that our Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee intends to have another hearing, and this time we will have the opportunity to present it in a secured setting so that no one can indicate that they are incapable of answering the question because of security issues. I look forward to that hearing. However, I will tell my colleagues that it is discouraging to know what I now know, and it is a discouraging time for IT security and the Federal Government.

I hope we can use this as a lesson for other agencies that they need to be vigilant. We face real and serious threats. Inaction by agencies put Federal workers, the American people, and, most importantly, our national security at risk.

In my view, this is important. These hearings matter. The information we are garnering and attempting to garner is important for those who are employees of the Federal Government. They need to know what has transpired so they can better protect themselves. Why are they at risk because of these hacks? Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, we need to know what has transpired here. Processes need to be in place to prevent additional challenges to our information technology, because it is a matter of our national security.

So for the sake of our Federal employees and their well-being but also for the sake of the American citizens and our national security, this is not an issue that we have the opportunity to avoid. Answers need to be forthcoming and decisions need to be made system-wide—not just at OPM but throughout the entire Federal Government—as we work to protect those who work for the Federal Government and as we work to protect American citizens from a national security perspective.

With that, I thank the Chair for the opportunity to address the Senate.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS PARROTT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I, as chairman of the Committee on Finance along with Ranking Member WYDEN, recognize Thomas Parrott, a distinguished executive at the Social Security Administration—or, SSA. Tom is currently the Assistant Deputy Commissioner for Legislation and Congressional Affairs at SSA. He is a dedicated public servant who has served his country for more than 40 years.

Tom began his career at SSA in January 1975 as a claims representative in the Midtown Manhattan district office, before being assigned to district offices in Rochester, NY, and later in Redding, CA. He returned to his hometown of Baltimore in 1980 as a policy analyst in the predecessor office of what is currently called the Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs. Since that time, he has been in the same component office at SSA serving as the Associate Commissioner for Legislative Development and Operations, as Acting Deputy Commissioner, and in his current position as the Assistant Deputy Commissioner.

Tom is a 1972 graduate of Denison University in Ohio, and he completed the Federal Executive Institute's Leadership for a Democratic Society program in 2005. He was appointed in 2008, by then-SSA Commissioner Michael Astrue, to the Senior Executive Service.

As testimony to Tom's devotion to public service, prior to joining SSA, he was a VISTA volunteer and a field health inspector in western New York working with migrant farm workers in the potato and apple growing regions of the State.

Sequences of staffers in the Finance Committee have had the pleasure of working with Tom on many issues relating to Social Security during his tenure at SSA. He has always been resourceful, insightful, and forthcoming.

Tom will retire from the Social Security Administration on July 3, 2015. He will be sorely missed by his colleagues and his many friends on the Hill. He will leave behind the numerous individuals he has mentored and encouraged over the years and who will now carry on this work.

Both Ranking Member WYDEN and I feel that it is important that we in Congress recognize those who devote their working lives to improving the lives of others. Career civil servants often do their work in quiet anonymity behind the scenes providing vital service to the American people. They are rarely recognized for their many contributions. Tom Parrott is one of those people. His record of leadership at the Social Security Administration and his commitment to providing the American people with effective and compassionate service is a record of which he can be justly proud.

Ranking Member WYDEN and I wish Tom all the best in his retirement from Federal service and thank him for his many years of dedicated service. Tom will continue in many ways to serve people in his community, and we are all grateful for his efforts. We wish him all the very best in his future endeavors.

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, commonly referred to as DACA. This program has played a vital role in empowering the Nation's undocumented immigrant youth population.

Many of these young people were brought to the United States at a young age, through no fault of their own, and know no other home or country. They are woven into the fabric of California and this country. At school, they are taught American history, culture, and values. They strive to achieve the American dream.

The DACA Program enables such youth to fulfill their potential and thus to maximize their contribution to their families, communities, and this country. President Obama announced the DACA Program in June 2012 to protect

eligible young people from deportation for a 2-year period, while Congress considered comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

The Senate passed the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act with a strong bipartisan majority, 68 to 32. This bill would have provided a pathway to citizenship for DACA grantees and others similarly situated. But the House failed to act, and so here we are today without comprehensive immigration reform. Although we have not yet succeeded in fixing our broken immigration system through congressional action, at least the DACA Program provides some temporary reprieve for these young immigrants so that they do not live in constant fear of deportation.

The program enables them to get work authorization, and thus to seek higher education and contribute to the American economy. To qualify, an individual must have come to the United States when they were under 16 years of age and lived in the country continuously for at least 5 years. The individual must also receive an education, pass a background check, and pay an application fee.

The State of California is home to over a quarter of the estimated 1.8 million young immigrants who potentially meet the criteria of the DACA Program. Of the approximately 660,000 DACA applications that have been approved since the program's inception in 2012, about 30 percent reside in California. This is more than any other State. To help those who are eligible, nonprofits, religious organizations, pro bono legal networks, and other volunteers in California and nationwide have risen to the occasion. They have helped, and continue to help, hundreds of thousands of DACA applicants to navigate the filing process.

The benefits of DACA for these young individuals and for this country are undeniable. A recent report published by the University of California, Berkeley School of Law found that 66 percent of students granted DACA noted a positive change in post-graduate plans and greater hope for their future. All of the study's participants come from low-income households, with 88 percent living below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. Many students reported that parents could not assist them with educational costs; and, in some instances, students contributed a portion of their own earnings to provide for their families. Several students had suffered the deportation of a close relative, and over a quarter had a parent or sibling with an active case in immigration court.

Imagine the day-to-day stresses of being a college student: trying to excel in the classroom, paying for food and housing, and finding future employment. For these students, they must also consider additional financial, psychological, and emotional challenges because they—despite spending their lives in this country—are undocumented. The DACA Program gives these young people a measure of stability so they can focus on their school work and professional growth and development, not on whether they or a loved one will be deported. The DACA Program allows them to do just that and look forward.

The economic impacts of the 2012 DACA Program show that the United States has much to gain from enabling eligible undocumented individuals to work lawfully within our borders. According to the University of California, Los Angeles' North American Integration and Development Center ''The DACA program of 2012–2014 appears to have spurred extraordinary growth in the earnings of DACA beneficiaries. According to the results of two recent surveys, this wage growth surpassed 240 percent, a number that far exceeds the expectations in the literature.''

All around the country, this time of year is punctuated by graduation ceremonies. Parents and grandparents beam as their children and grandchildren earn their high school, college, and graduate degrees. This year, I was one of those grandparents. My granddaughter, Eileen, graduated from Stanford, my alma mater, and I was so proud to attend the ceremony. DACA recipients and their families should have that feeling too—a feeling of hope for the future, accomplishment, and growth, and they should have it without fear of deportation right around the corner. That is what this is about.

So I am pleased to commemorate the 3-year anniversary of the DACA Program, and I very much hope we can renew our commitment to passing comprehensive immigration reform legislation.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to take this opportunity to recognize the 70th anniversary of the United Nations.

As World War II came to a close, representatives of 50 nations met in San Francisco to sign the United Nations' founding charter, officially establishing an international forum to prevent war, support human rights, respect international law, and promote social progress. These delegates hoped the creation of this new organization would prevent another devastating global conflict by addressing diplomatic challenges and humanitarian crises around the world.

Over the past seven decades, the United Nations has engaged in peacekeeping operations throughout the world, with more than 120 nations contributing military personnel, police, and civilians to these humanitarian efforts. Although there continue to be areas where armed conflict is all too prevalent, I am proud of the many successes achieved through this global mission.

The United Nations has also played an important role in addressing the needs of the world's most vulnerable populations by promoting health, nutrition, and education. Through the work of the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme, and many other bodies, the United Nations has led efforts worldwide to reduce poverty and save lives.

As United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and leaders from around the world gather in San Francisco on June 26 to celebrate the 70th anniversary of the United Nations Charter, I want to congratulate the United Nations for its incredible achievements and dedicated commitment to fostering consensus, partnership, and unity among the nations of the world.

NEFFENGER CONFIRMATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday I missed Senate rollcall vote No. 217, the nomination of Peter V. Neffenger, of Ohio, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, because of flight delay issues due to weather. Had I been here, I would have voted in favor of this nomination.

I support the Senate's confirmation last night of Coast Guard VADM Peter V. Neffenger who was confirmed to be the next Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, TSA.

The TSA has been without Senate-confirmed leadership for too long. John Pistole, the previous TSA Administrator, announced on October 16, 2014, that he would be resigning in December. Since the end of 2014, the TSA Administrator position has been vacant. In January, I along with Ranking Member NELSON, and Senators AYOTTE, CANTWELL, and FISCHER, called on President Obama to send us a qualified, experienced, and dedicated individual to serve as TSA Administrator. Unfortunately, President Obama did not nominate Admiral Neffenger until April 28, 2015, over 6 months after John Pistole informed the administration that he would be leaving. I was disappointed at the length of time it took for the President to send us a qualified nominee. Even the New York Times editorial page, normally quite deferential to the President, expressed the opinion that ''the Obama Administration has been disturbingly slow to give the TSA strong leadership at the top.''

By comparison, the Senate has very rapidly moved the Neffenger nomination, despite two separate committees being involved with his formal vetting. Since the TSA was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security, the Senate has abided by an understanding that TSA Administrator nominees would be vetted by the Commerce Committee, which has primary jurisdiction over TSA, and also by the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, which oversees the Department of Homeland Security where TSA is organizationally housed. Some could

say that this protocol could lend itself to unnecessary delay. However, Admiral Neffenger received three votes in less than 3 weeks, first by the Commerce Committee on June 4, 2015, the second one on June 15, 2015, by the Homeland Security Committee, and last night when he was confirmed by a vote of 81 to 1. So the Senate has moved swiftly to confirm this important nomination, in comparison to the time the Obama administration has taken to send the Senate a qualified nominee.

While I am disappointed at the length of time it took for the President to send the Senate a qualified nominee, I applaud the President's selection of Admiral Neffenger to be the next TSA Administrator. Admiral Neffenger has served ably and well for 34 years in the U.S. Coast Guard, rising through the ranks to become the Vice Commandant when the Senate confirmed him last year for that distinguished position.

During an assignment to Mobile, AL, he helped to lead the multi-agency response to the 1993 Amtrak Sunset Limited train derailment into a remote waterway in the Mobile River Delta, which killed 47 people. Admiral Neffenger also has substantial experience serving right here in the Senate, having been a Coast Guard fellow and detailee for 3 years at the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Admiral Neffenger also served as Deputy National Incident Commander for the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. In that role, Admiral Neffenger coordinated and led over 50,000 people from Federal, State, and local agencies, tribal representatives, non-governmental organizations, and the private sector throughout five Gulf Coast States in the clean-up and response effort. Clearly, Admiral Neffenger has the requisite background and experience to lead reforms at the TSA.

Admiral Neffenger has proven himself as a leader, and the TSA is an agency in dire need of strong, capable leadership. In May, the Department of Homeland Security's Inspector General testified in the House of Representatives that, ''[u]nfortunately, although nearly 14 years have passed since TSA's inception, we remain deeply concerned about its ability to execute its important mission.'' Then, earlier this month, news broke that undercover investigators from the Inspector General's office had penetrated TSA security checkpoints while carrying illegal weapons or simulated bombs on 67 of 70 attempts. In other words, TSA failed 95 percent of the time to prevent illegal weapons or simulated bombs from being smuggled through TSA security checkpoints. This is unacceptable, and it is clear that the Inspector General is right to be concerned about TSA's ability to execute its important mission in a rapidly changing threat environment.

TSA has also experienced a number of other troubling failures about which I have written to the agency. I have been concerned about the TSA's oversight of Secure Identification Display Area, SIDA, badges at the Nation's airports. In December 2014, it was revealed that a Delta ramp agent in Atlanta allegedly used his SIDA badge to bypass TSA security and facilitate an interstate gun smuggling operation via commercial aircraft. TSA's response to my letter of inquiry about its oversight of SIDA badges stated that TSA does not issue or manage SIDA badges and that this responsibility falls to airport operators—which raised even more concerns about TSA's awareness about lost SIDA badges at our Nation's airports.

Another issue I have raised with TSA relates to the potential security gaps in its PreCheck initiative raised in reports by the inspector general. On January 28, 2015, the inspector general released an unclassified summary of a classified report concluding that PreCheck is a positive step towards risk-based security screening as a concept, but that TSA needs to modify its PreCheck vetting and screening processes and improve its PreCheck communication and coordination. The Department of Homeland Security Office of the Inspector General report also stated that, ''TSA did not concur with all recommendations and all recommendations remain open.''

In response to the conclusions and recommendations, I wrote to TSA along with Ranking Member NELSON on March 25, 2015, asking a series of questions about potential security gaps in TSA PreCheck. TSA responded to this letter on April 14, 2015, but the issue of potential security gaps in PreCheck and other expedited screening initiatives must still be addressed as TSA seeks to continue these initiatives, let alone expand them.

Admiral Neffenger's proven leadership throughout the course of his service in the U.S. Coast Guard will undoubtedly afford valuable perspective in his role as TSA Administrator. Admiral Neffenger understands the need for TSA to continuously evolve to meet the challenges presented by an ever-changing threat environment. Obviously, the TSA is an agency that needs a strong leader who will bring cultural change to the agency. I am hopeful that Admiral Neffenger can be a leader who can fundamentally reform the TSA. He has a heavy burden, but I believe he is capable of shouldering that burden and I pledge to work with him and my colleagues here in the Senate to see that those changes occur.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING ARKANSAS ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE VOLUNTEERS

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the work of 12 power linemen from nine electric cooperatives in Arkansas for their work to bring reliable electricity to citizens in Guatemala.

The Arkansas linemen dedicated more than 2 weeks to completely change the lives of more than 1,390 residents in 2 villages in rural Guatemala—Jolom I'Jix and Zapotal. Through construction activities such as installation of poles, distribution transformers, household connections, and meters, these volunteers extended the electric distribution system 4 miles, connecting homes to an electric grid powered by a small hydroelectric plant.

Since 2013, Electric Cooperatives of Arkansas volunteers have worked to improve the lives of Guatemalans by providing electricity. The significance of this project stretches to impact numerous aspects of daily life for these residents. Electricity is a critical element in improving the quality of life and to providing health care, education, access to clean water, and economic growth. Equipped with this newfound source of electricity, hope for a brighter future exists for subsistence farmers whose main worry is simply providing food for their family.

This effort, funded by participating co-ops and supporters in Arkansas, continues the State's storied history of making an impact. By being a beacon of good for these villagers, the linemen were able to engrave a lasting impact, which will help future generations of Guatemalans.

I offer my sincere gratitude to all those who contributed to make a difference for those who are truly in need. Doug Evans, Will Glover, Kyle Metcalf, Andy Caywood, Michael Counts, Andy Ward, Brent Hufstedler, Kirk Kempson, Joey Burk, Kris Rankin, Paul Garrison and Ryan Hayes, thank you for your dedication and service to helping connect citizens of Guatemala to electric service.•

RECOGNIZING ALAN LEVIN

• Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I rise on behalf of the Delaware Delegation to honor the exemplary service of Alan Levin, director of the Delaware Economic Development Office, upon his retirement. Alan became director in January 2009 and continued to serve with distinction in that capacity for 6 years. He assumed that position at a time when tens of thousands of Delawareans were losing their jobs, and the State's top priority was putting them back to work. Throughout this tumultuous time, he has been a tremendous leader and true advocate for the State.

Alan has a lifetime of experience when it comes to knowing what it takes to make a business successful. In 1987, he took over Delaware's homegrown pharmacy chain Happy Harry's, the business his father started, and grew it to become an iconic brand with 76 stores throughout the state. Prior to taking over the family business, he worked for United States Senator Bill Roth as his executive assistant and counsel. He is a graduate of Tulane

University and Widener University Law School.

When Delaware Governor Jack Markell tapped him to head the Delaware Economic Development Office, unemployment in Delaware was soaring. The State's automotive plants were shuttering, and the State's major oil refinery announced plans to idle operations. Alan got straight to work, and over the next 6 years, the Delaware Economic Development Office awarded more than $213 million in job creation grants and loans to corporations through its strategic fund, and courted big firms such as Amazon, Barclays, Capitol One, JP Morgan Chase, Kraft Foods, Purdue and Sallie Mae to expand its current operations or relocate to Delaware. Alan was also instrumental in reopening the shuttered Delaware City Oil Refinery, putting hundreds of people back to work at one of the State's most significant industrial sites.

Alan has been lauded as a bold risk-taker whose experience and innovative planning has helped Delaware have the fastest job growth in the Mid-Atlantic over the last 2 years. He can also be credited with helping to level the playing field for minority, women, and veteran business owners, as well as those with disabilities. On behalf of Senator CHRIS COONS and Congressman JOHN CARNEY, I wholeheartedly thank Alan Levin for his service to the State of Delaware. His model leadership and dedication has improved the quality of life for countless residents and businesses in our great State. We offer our sincere congratulations on a job well done, and wish him and his wife Ellen, their children Andrew, Daniel and Jason, and their granddaughter Hannah, many happy, healthy and successful years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DETECTIVE CORPORAL MARK W. THALHAMMER

● Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to honor Mark W. Thalhammer, Pueblo, CO, police detective corporal, and recognize his retirement after 34 years of service to his community and to his country. Detective Thalhammer has served with distinction in a variety of roles for the Pueblo Police Department. During his tenure, Detective Thalhammer has served as a police officer, a criminal investigator, a narcotics enforcement officer assigned to a U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration multiagency drug task force, a gang reinforcement detective, a felon enforcement officer, and a tactical officer assigned to high-risk law enforcement endeavors. His dedication to law enforcement for more than three decades has left an indelible mark on the community, the country, and the Pueblo Police Department.

Please join me in honoring Pueblo Police Department Detective Corporal Thalhammer for his devotion to his community and our State's law enforcement profession. His years of courageous service and commitment deserve great recognition and admiration.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate, and agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 160. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–2026. A communication from the Regulatory Liaison, Office of Natural Resources Revenue, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indian Oil Valuation Amendments'' (RIN1012–AA15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 17, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2027. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Summary of Benefits and Coverage and Uniform Glossary'' ((RIN1545–BM53) (TD 9724)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 22, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1645. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114–70).

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. BLUNT:

S. 1643. A bill to require a report on actions to secure the safety and security of dissidents housed at Camp Liberty, Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1644. A bill to permanently extend the private mortgage insurance tax deduction; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1645. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1646. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to make a technical correction relating to the amendments made by Public Law 113–243; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1647. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. 1649. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Sonoran Corridor connecting Interstate 19 to Interstate 10 south of the Tucson International Airport, as a future part of the Interstate System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1650. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make changes to the Medicare home health face-to-face encounter requirements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1651. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1652. A bill to designate an existing Federal officer to coordinate efforts to secure the release of United States persons who are hostages of hostile groups or state sponsors of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1653. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to enhance access for independent agents and brokers to information regarding marketplace enrollment; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1654. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. Res. 208. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the requested release of convicted terrorist Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda, also known as ''Simon Trinidad'', from prison in the United States as a part of the Colombian peace process; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. Res. 209. A resolution designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 210. A resolution celebrating the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 71

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 71, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects.

S. 163

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 163, a bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities.

S. 238

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 238, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsicum spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 267

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 267, a bill to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, supra.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 352

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) 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. 370

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 439

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 439, a bill to end discrimination based on actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in public schools, and for other purposes.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 704

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 704, a bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 827

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 827, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to ensure the integrity of voice communications and to prevent unjust or unreasonable discrimination among areas of the United States in the delivery of such communications.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 891

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from

Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 891, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to facilitate the administration and enforcement of antidumping and countervailing duty orders, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, supra.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1143

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1143, a bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeness crab fishery permanent and for other purposes.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) 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. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1324, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, and for other purposes.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. 1507

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to amend section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the visa waiver program, and for other purposes.

S. 1513

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordinated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.

S. 1617

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1617, supra.

S. 1618

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1618, a bill to reallocate Federal Government-held spectrum for commercial use, to promote wireless innovation and enhance wireless communications, and for other purposes.

S. 1640

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1640, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve immigration law enforcement within the interior of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 200

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 200, a resolution wishing His Holiness the 14th Dalai Lama a happy 80th birthday on July 6, 2015, and recognizing the outstanding contributions His Holiness has made to the promotion of nonviolence, human rights, interfaith dialogue, environmental awareness, and democracy.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1648. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss a bill I am introducing, the Rural Emergency Acute Care Hospital Act, or REACH Act.

Since January 2010, 55 rural hospitals have closed their doors. It is even more troubling that the pace of rural hospital closures appears to be accelerating.

As you can see from this chart, the number of hospital closures has increased each year over the past 5 years. These closures are creating a health care crisis for hundreds of thousands of Americans across the country.

The REACH Act will create a new rural hospital model under Medicare that will enable struggling rural hospitals to keep their doors open and maintain the most critical hospital service: emergency medicine.

When a rural hospital closes, the community loses the lifesaving capabilities of the emergency room. According to the National Conference of State Legislatures, 60 percent of trauma deaths in the United States occur in rural areas. After a traumatic event, access to an emergency room within 1

hour can make a big difference between life and death.

Take, for example, Portia Gibbs from North Carolina. At 48, Portia suffered a heart attack 75 miles from the nearest emergency room. She later died while waiting for a helicopter to arrive that would have taken her over the State line to Virginia, where the closest hospital was located. If Portia's heart attack had occurred just 1 week earlier, Portia would have been transported to a hospital in Belhaven, NC, just 30 miles away. Unfortunately, the facility in Belhaven had closed just 6 days before Portia's heart attack, citing insurmountable financial struggles.

Then there is the tragic story of 18-month-old Edith Gonzalez who choked on a grape in her hometown of Center, TX. Edith's frantic parents rushed her to their local hospital, Shelby Regional Medical Center, only to discover that it had closed just weeks earlier. By the time little Edith arrived at the next closest hospital, she had passed away.

While we can't say with certainty that both Edith and Portia would have survived if their local hospitals had not closed, we know the earlier people access care, the better their chances are.

The term used by emergency medical practitioners is the ''golden hour.'' The golden hour is the hour following a traumatic event when lifesaving intervention—like that which can be provided in an emergency room—has the best chance of impacting survival. In other words, the longer a patient has to wait to receive emergency medical care, the lower their chances will be for survival.

Rural hospital closures mean patients have to travel longer distances to access emergency medical care. Ensuring that rural communities keep their emergency care resources could make the difference between life and death. Rural hospital closures also extend beyond the loss of emergency services to include economic consequences for rural communities. Hospital closures can mean the death of a rural community. Approximately 62 million Americans live in rural areas. Rural communities play an integral role in the economic stability of this country through their invaluable contributions in food production, manufacturing, and other vital industries.

In addition to supporting the medical needs of those who participate in rural industry, rural hospitals also serve as the single largest employer in a rural community. The economic impacts of closing a hospital when no other hospital is close by are devastating. If we care about the physical and economic health of rural communities, we must make a change that will reverse the trend of accumulating rural hospital closures.

iVantage Analytics compiled a report for the National Rural Health Association which identified 283 additional hospitals at risk of closure based upon performance indicators that matched those of the 53 facilities that already closed.

Allow me to direct the Presiding Officer's attention to this map. This map depicts the approximate locations of 53 of the 55 hospitals that have closed in the last 5 years.

I would like to point out that between the printing of this chart and today, two additional rural hospitals have closed. That alone is a clear indication of the problem I am trying to convey.

Now, imagine this same map depicting five times the number of hospital closures you see here. That is what is what will happen if we do not act to protect America's rural hospitals. Furthermore, the loss of those additional hospitals would not only impact local economies but would also result in a $10.6 billion loss in GDP. It must change, not only for the health of rural Americans but also for the health and stability of our economy.

Payment cuts to hospitals are one contributing factor to rural hospital closures. More significant, however, is the current Medicare payment structure that supports rural hospitals. Today, the Medicare payment structure for hospitals is focused on inpatient volume. Emergency rooms act as a loss leader, and income is primary generated through inpatient stays.

A RAND study published in 2013 found that the average cost of an inpatient stay is 10 times the cost of an emergency room visit. Researchers at the University of North Carolina found that many of the at-risk rural hospitals around the country have an average of two or fewer patients admitted to a hospital on any given day. These hospitals can have up to 25 inpatient beds, and if only 2 or fewer of those beds are filled every day, that is a utilization rate of 8 percent or less.

Instead of letting these facilities close because they do not have the needed inpatient volume to generate enough revenue, why not let go of the underutilized inpatient services in favor of sustaining life-saving emergency care. That is what the REACH Act does. It provides a voluntary pathway for rural hospitals to eliminate their underutilized inpatient services and ensure residents have access to emergency medical care that saves lives. A key component of the bill that allows the rural emergency hospital model to function is the requirement for these facilities to have protocols in place for the timely transfer of patients who require a higher level of care or inpatient admission.

The value of the rural emergency hospitals in the case of a life-threatening emergency will be their ability to administer lifesaving measures in order to stabilize a patient before they are transferred to a higher level of care.

In addition to providing lifesaving emergency care, rural emergency hospitals will have the flexibility to provide a wide array of outpatient services, including observation care, skilled nursing facility care, infusion services, hemodialysis, home health, hospice, nursing home care, population health, as well as telemedicine services. This list is not all-inclusive but is just a sample of the outpatient services rural emergency hospitals could provide to their communities. The door is left open for rural emergency hospitals to design their outpatient services to match the needs of their communities.

There are roughly 1,300 critical access hospitals in America, including 82 in Iowa, the second most just behind Kansas. I am not suggesting that 1,300 critical access hospitals will become rural emergency hospitals. Some hospitals may never consider giving up their inpatient beds, others may consider it in the future, but some critical access hospitals need this or something like it right now.

The rural emergency hospital model, with its outpatient and emergency care services, will be good for the health of rural communities and our Nation because of the critical care it will provide when and where rural Americans need it. When there is a farm accident in the afternoon or a heart attack in the middle of the night, that emergency room can be the difference between life and death. Medicare needs a payment policy that recognizes that simple fact.

I look forward to continuing to work with my cosponsor Senator GARDNER, other colleagues, and stakeholders in building a sustainable future for rural health care.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VITTER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1651. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to address America's retirement savings crisis. A 2013 survey conducted by the Governors of the Federal Reserve System found that roughly 31 percent of Americans have no retirement savings or access to a defined-benefit pension. In addition, 19 percent of respondents nearing retirement—those aged 55 to 64—reported having zero savings or pension to rely on in the coming years.

In light of these figures it is more important than ever that Congress ensure America's seniors have access to the Social Security benefits they have earned. Yet provisions such as the Windfall Elimination Provision, WEP, and the Government Pension Offset, GPO, prevent millions of Americans—including teachers, firefighters, and police officers—from receiving their full benefits. It is time Congress repealed them.

This afternoon, I, along with Senator COLLINS and a number of my Senate colleagues from both sides of the aisle,

introduced the Social Security Fairness Act. This bipartisan bill will repeal both the WEP and GPO provisions which Congress enacted in 1983 and 1977, respectively. In December 2014, these unfair provisions chipped away at more than 2 million Americans' Social Security benefits. That same month, in my State of Ohio, more than 200,000 Ohioans had their Social Security benefits reduced because of these provisions.

Over the past 35 years, fewer and fewer workers have been given access to defined-benefit plans, and, today, only about half of the total U.S. workforce is covered by an employer-sponsored retirement plan. That is why Social Security is critical for so many. Congress should make sure that every American has access to all the Social Security benefits he or she has earned. Repealing these provisions is an important step in that direction.

I ask my colleagues to join me in repealing the WEP and GPO by cosponsoring this legislation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Social Security Fairness Act of 2015, which I am joining my colleague from Ohio in introducing today. This bill would repeal both the windfall elimination provision, WEP, and the government pension offset, GPO. We believe that these two provisions in the Social Security Act unfairly penalize certain individuals for holding jobs in public service when the time comes for them to retire.

The WEP affects individuals who have worked in both the private sector and in public sector jobs for which Social Security taxes were not withheld. For such individuals, the WEP applies a special formula to calculate benefits, reducing them compared to what would otherwise be paid.

The GPO affects retired public employees whose spouses are entitled to Social Security benefits. When these individuals apply for Social Security spousal or survivor benefits, the GPO applies an offset, reducing the Social Security benefit based on the amount of that individual's public pension. In some cases, the spouse will not be entitled to any spousal or survivor benefit because of the GPO.

The WEP and the GPO have enormous financial implications for many of our teachers, police officers, firefighters, postal workers and other public employees. Given their important responsibilities, it is simply unfair to penalize them when it comes to their Social Security benefits. These public servants—or their spouses—have all paid taxes into the Social Security system. So have their employers. They have worked long enough to earn their Social Security benefits. Yet, because of the GPO and WEP, they are unable to receive all of the Social Security benefits to which they otherwise would be entitled.

The impact of these two provisions is most acute in 15 States, including Maine, which have state retirement plans that lack a Social Security component. However, it is important to point out that the GPO and WEP affect public employees and retirees in every state, including our emergency responders, other Federal employees, and postal workers. Nationwide, more than ⅓ of teachers and educating employees, and more than ⅕ of other public employees, are affected by the GPO and/or the WEP.

As of 2013, one and a half million people were affected by the WEP and 615,000 people had their benefits reduced by the GPO. Many more public employees across the country stand to be harmed in the future. Moreover, at a time when we should be doing all that we can to attract qualified people to public service, this reduction in retirement benefits makes it even more difficult for our federal, state and local governments to recruit and retain the public servants who are so critical to the safety and well-being of our families.

What is most troubling is that this offset is most harsh for those who can least afford the loss: lower-income women. In fact, of those affected by the GPO, more than 80 percent are women. According to the Congressional Budget Office, the GPO reduces benefits for more than 200,000 individuals by more than $3,600 a year—an amount that can make the difference between a comfortable retirement and poverty.

Many Maine teachers, in particular, have talked with me about the impact of these provisions on their retirement security. They love their jobs and the children they teach, but they worry about the future and about their financial security.

Roxie Brechlin of Bar Harbor, Maine, is one of many examples of the effect that the GPO and the WEP have on our teachers when they retire. Mrs. Brechlin first began paying into Social Security when she took her first summer job at age 16. After graduation, she continued to pay into Social Security for 18 more years before getting her first teaching job. Mrs. Brechlin worked as a teacher for 23 years, and for 14 of those years she worked full-time at another job during the summer, paying more and more into Social Security each year.

Mr. Brechlin recently contacted my office to explain the effect that the WEP and GPO will have on his wife. Mrs. Brechlin recently retired. When she applied for Social Security benefits, the WEP applied, and her benefit was reduced by two thirds. Mr. Brechlin is more concerned about what would happen to his wife if he were to predecease her. Normally, a widow would be eligible to continue to collect 100 percent of her husband's benefit. Mrs. Brechlin, however, would not be able to collect any survivor benefit, due to the application of the GPO. Not only does this fact worry Mr. Brechlin, he also sees it as unfair.

It is time for us to take action, and I urge all of my colleagues to join us in cosponsoring the Social Security Fairness Act to eliminate these two unfair provisions.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1654. A bill to prevent deaths occurring from drug overdoses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, in an effort to decrease the rate of drug overdose deaths, I am pleased to be joined by Senators DURBIN, WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, and LEAHY in introducing the Overdose Prevention Act. Representative DONNA EDWARDS is introducing this bill in the other body.

Throughout the country, the death rate from drug overdoses has been rapidly climbing. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC, drug overdose death rates have more than tripled since 1990, and more than 110 Americans died each day from drug overdoses in 2011. More than half of these deaths are attributable to opioids, like prescription pain relievers or heroin. Indeed, this tragic epidemic has hit particularly hard in my home state of Rhode Island, where in 2014, 239 individuals died from drug overdoses.

Americans aged 25 to 64 are now more likely to die as a result of drug overdose than from injuries sustained in motor vehicle traffic crashes. While overdoses from illegal drugs persist as a major public health problem, fatal overdoses from prescribed opioid pain medications such as oxycodone account for more than 40 percent of all overdose deaths.

It is clear that we must do more to stop these often preventable deaths. Fortunately, the drug naloxone, which has no side effects and no potential for abuse, is widely recognized as an important tool to help prevent drug overdose deaths. Naloxone can rapidly reverse an overdose from heroin and opioid medications if provided in a timely manner. Overdose prevention programs, including those that utilize naloxone, have been credited with saving more than 26,000 lives since 1996, according to the CDC.

Opioid abuse and overdose is not an abstract threat found in far-off corners. It is a national public health crisis and it's taking place right here at home in our communities and our neighborhoods.

Rhode Island is taking steps to combat this scourge and is leading the way in adopting innovative solutions. Through a ''collaborative practice agreement,'' some Rhode Island pharmacies are dispensing naloxone, along with training about its proper use, to anyone who walks in and requests the treatment, no prescription necessary. In addition, the Rhode Island State Police carry naloxone in every cruiser.

The Overdose Prevention Act, which we are introducing today, would complement these efforts and take important steps towards addressing this

issue nationally and increasing access to naloxone in our communities. The legislation aims to establish a comprehensive response to this epidemic that emphasizes collaboration between state and federal officials and employs best practices from the medical community, as well as programs and treatments that have been proven effective to combat this startling national trend. This is an emergency and it requires a coordinated and comprehensive response.

Specifically, the bill would authorize the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, to award funding through cooperative agreements to eligible entities—like public health agencies or community-based organizations with expertise in preventing overdose deaths. As a condition of participation, an entity would use the grant to purchase and distribute naloxone, and carry out overdose prevention activities, such as educating and training prescribers, pharmacists, and first responders on how to recognize the signs of an overdose, seek emergency medical help, and administer naloxone and other first aid.

As rates of overdose deaths continue to spike, public health agencies, law enforcement, and others are struggling to keep up without clear and timely information about the epidemic. Therefore, the Overdose Prevention Act would also require HHS to take steps to improve surveillance and research of drug overdose deaths, so that public health agencies, law enforcement, and community organizations have an accurate picture of the problem.

It would also establish a coordinated federal plan of action to address this epidemic. The Overdose Prevention Act seeks to bring together first responders, medical personnel, addiction treatment specialists, social service providers, and families to help save lives and get at the root of this problem.

I am pleased that the Overdose Prevention Act has the support of the American Association of Poison Control Centers, the Drug Policy Alliance, the Harm Reduction Coalition, and the Trust for America's Health. I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders, as well as our cosponsors to urge the rest of our colleagues to join us in supporting this crucial legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 208—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE REQUESTED RELEASE OF CONVICTED TERRORIST JUVENAL OVIDIO RICARDO PALMERA PINEDA, ALSO KNOWN AS ''SIMON TRINIDAD'', FROM PRISON IN THE UNITED STATES AS A PART OF THE COLOMBIAN PEACE PROCESS

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

S. RES. 208

Whereas the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia-People's Army (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia—Ejército del Pueblo (FARC-EP) is a Marxist insurgency group engaged in a bloody civil war with the Government of Colombia;

Whereas FARC-EP has been designated a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Department of State since 1997;

Whereas fighting between FARC-EP and the Government of Colombia has claimed hundreds of thousands of lives, including United States citizens, since 1964;

Whereas multiple FARC-EP terrorist have been indicted, captured, and extradited to the United States to face trial for their crimes against United States citizens;

Whereas Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda, also known as ''Simon Trinidad'', joined FARC in the 1980s and later became a rebel leader within the FARC-EP;

Whereas, on February 13, 2003, a small Cessna airplane carrying 5 people including a United States pilot named Thomas Janis, a Colombian national, Luis Cruz, and 3 other United States nationals, Marc Gonsalves, Keith Stansell, and Thomas Howes, crashed in Southern Colombia;

Whereas heavily armed FARC-EP guerrillas immediately surrounded the plane and brutally executed Thomas Janis and Luis Cruz, then took the other men hostage;

Whereas, on April 27, 2003, the FARC-EP issued a communiqué taking credit for the abduction of the three United States nationals, made demands in exchange for the release of the hostages, and appointed ''Simon Trinidad'' the spokesperson and negotiator for the FARC-EP;

Whereas ''Simon Trinidad'' was captured in Ecuador's capital of Quito 8 months later on January 2, 2004;

Whereas ''Simon Trinidad'' was convicted by a court in Colombia for aggravated kidnapping and rebellion and sentenced to 35 years in prison on May 4, 2004;

Whereas ''Simon Trinidad'' was convicted by a United States jury of plotting to hold 3 United States nationals hostage after they were captured in Colombia, and was sentenced to 60 years in prison on January 28, 2008; and

Whereas FARC-EP has reportedly named ''Simon Trinidad'' a member of their Colombian peace negotiating team and made a request for President Barack Obama to release him: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) opposes the FARC-EP's requested release of Juvenal Ovidio Ricardo Palmera Pineda, also known as ''Simon Trinidad'', who was convicted by a United States jury of plotting to hold 3 United States nationals hostage after they were captured in Colombia, and was sentenced to 60 years in prison;

(2) extends deepest sympathies to all family members of the victims of FARC-EP atrocities; and

(3) recognizes this type of action would send a negative message to terrorists groups and undermines the United States judicial system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 209—DESIGNATING THE ULYSSES S. GRANT ASSOCIATION AS THE ORGANIZATION TO IMPLEMENT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF ULYSSES S. GRANT, CIVIL WAR GENERAL AND 2-TERM PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 209

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant was born in southern Ohio on April 27, 1822, to Jesse Grant and Hannah Simpson Grant;

Whereas the first line of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant proudly states: ''My Family is American, and has been for generations, in all its branches, direct and collateral.'';

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant attended school in Georgetown, Ohio, graduated from the United States Military Academy in 1843, and entered the United States Army;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant served in a variety of military posts from the Atlantic Coast to the Pacific Coast, including posts in New York, Michigan, and California, and a post at the famous Jefferson Barracks in Missouri;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant distinguished himself in combat during the Mexican-American War and worked tirelessly to succeed in civilian life;

Whereas, as a civilian farmer in Missouri, Ulysses S. Grant—

(1) met and married his wife, Julia Dent, for whom Ulysses S. Grant built a home named Hardscrabble;

(2) worked alongside slaves and emancipated the only slave that Ulysses S. Grant owned; and

(3) continued to own land while Ulysses S. Grant was President;

Whereas when the Civil War erupted, Ulysses S. Grant left Galena, Illinois to rejoin the United States Army, gained the colonelcy of the 21st Illinois Volunteer Regiment, and began his meteoric military rise;

Whereas during the Civil War, Ulysses S. Grant led troops in numerous victorious battles including—

(1) in Tennessee, at Forts Henry and Donelson and at Shiloh and Chattanooga; and

(2) in Mississippi, at Vicksburg;

Whereas President Abraham Lincoln chose Ulysses S. Grant to be Commanding General during the Civil War, and in that role Ulysses S. Grant revolutionized warfare in Virginia to preserve the Union;

Whereas in gratitude, the people of the United States twice elected Ulysses S. Grant President of the United States;

Whereas during his Presidency from 1869 to 1877, Ulysses S. Grant worked valiantly to help former slaves become full citizens and some prominent historians consider him to be the first modern President of the United States;

Whereas after leaving the Presidency, Ulysses S. Grant became the first President of the United States to tour the world;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant established a foreign policy that the United States followed into the 20th century and beyond;

Whereas Ulysses S. Grant authored his memoirs, a significant piece of 19th-century nonfiction, while courageously battling cancer, which eventually took his voice and his life but did not silence the noble words that he left as a legacy;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was founded during the Centennial of the Civil War in 1962 by the leading historians of that era and the Civil War Centennial Commissions of New York, Illinois, and Ohio, 3 States where Ulysses S. Grant lived;

Whereas, in the years since it was founded in 1962, the Ulysses S. Grant Association—

(1) has produced 32 volumes of ''The Papers of Ulysses S. Grant'', the major source for the study of the life of Ulysses S. Grant and the 19th century in which he lived; and

(2) has worked toward the publication of the first scholarly edition of the memoirs of Ulysses S. Grant, which as of May 2015, is nearing completion;

Whereas the Ulysses S. Grant Association was first headquartered at the Ohio Historical Society located on the campus of Ohio State University, later moved to Southern Illinois University, and relocated in 2008 to Mississippi State University; and

Whereas in 2012, the Ulysses S. Grant Association established the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library, the world center for Ulysses S. Grant scholars and tourists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, military leader and President;

(2) designates the Ulysses S. Grant Association, housed at the Ulysses S. Grant Presidential Library on the grounds of Mississippi State University, as the designated institution for organizing and leading the celebration of the bicentennial; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to join in that bicentennial celebration to honor Ulysses S. Grant, one of the major historical figures of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 210—CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

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

S. RES. 210

Whereas Wyoming became a State on July 10, 1890;

Whereas Wyoming, as the Equality State, celebrates firsts for women of Wyoming, including—

(1) Louisa Swain, who in 1870, was the first woman to vote in an election in Wyoming and the United States;

(2) Esther Hobart Morris, who in 1870, was the first woman in the United States to be appointed Justice of the Peace; and

(3) Nellie Tayloe Ross, who in 1924, was the first woman in the United States to serve as governor;

Whereas Wyoming celebrates several firsts in land conservation, including—

(1) the first national park, Yellowstone National Park, established in 1872;

(2) the first national forest, Shoshone National Forest, established in 1891; and

(3) the first national monument, Devil's Tower, established in 1906;

Whereas Fort D.A. Russell, established in 1867 and proclaimed by President Hoover in 1930 as F.E. Warren Air Force Base, is the oldest continuously active military installation in the Air Force, and is located west of Cheyenne, Wyoming;

Whereas the Wyoming Air National Guard was established in 1946 and the Wyoming Army National Guard was established in 1970 to serve under the Wyoming Military Department as a federal military reserve force;

Whereas Wyoming is among the top 5 energy producers in the United States;

Whereas Wyoming is the largest coal producer in the United States, producing nearly 40 percent of all coal mined in the United States and providing nearly 40 percent of all electricity generated in the United States;

Whereas Wyoming is home to the largest reserves of uranium ore in the United States and produces more uranium than any other State;

Whereas Wyoming is a leading producer of oil and natural gas;

Whereas Wyoming, with one of the lowest tax rates in the United States, is one of the States most friendly to business;

Whereas in 1977, Wyoming was the first State to establish a limited liability corporation (LLC) statute;

Whereas in 1902, in Kemmerer, Wyoming, James Cash Penney opened his first store, the Golden Rule, which subsequently grew into the J.C. Penney chain;

Whereas in 1968, in Cheyenne, Wyoming, John ''Taco'' Turner opened up the Taco House, which one year later became Taco John's, the now popular fast food chain;

Whereas Wyoming has 15,846 miles of fishing streams and 297,633 acres of fishing lakes that support 31 species of game fish;

Whereas Wyoming provides winter habitat for nearly 1,000,000 big game animals;

Whereas the Wind River Indian Reservation in Wyoming is home to the Eastern Shoshone and Northern Arapaho tribes;

Whereas since 1897, Wyoming has celebrated cowboy heritage at Cheyenne Frontier Days, the largest outdoor rodeo in the world; and

Whereas in 2010, Wyoming was the first State to adopt an official State code of ethics: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends and celebrates Wyoming and the people of Wyoming on the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. 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 June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Oversight Review of the National Flood Insurance Program.''

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

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. 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 June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR–253 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled ''Update on the Recalls of Defective Takata Air Bags and NHTSA's Vehicle Safety Efforts.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled ''Nominations.''

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

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. 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 June 23, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing with the Committee on the Budget entitled ''Accounting for the True Cost of Regulation: Exploring the Possibility of a Regulatory Budget.''

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 1 p.m. in room SD–406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, ''The Impacts of EPA's proposed Carbon Regulations on Energy Costs for American Businesses, Rural Communities and Families, and a legislative hearing on S. 1324.''

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON MULTILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS, AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Multilateral International Development, Multilateral Institutions, and International Economic, Energy and Environmental Policy be authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate on June 23, 2015, at 2:45 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled ''American Energy Exports: Opportunities for U.S. Allies and U.S. National Security.''

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Laura Newell

on my staff be granted floor privileges for the remainder of today's session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY)

NOMINATION OF DAVID J. SHULKIN TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 146 and 147; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate; 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 to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The clerk will report the nominations.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information and Technology); and David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

VOTE ON COUNCIL NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of LaVerne Horton Council, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Information and Technology)?

The nomination was confirmed.

VOTE ON SHULKIN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of David J. Shulkin, of Pennsylvania, to be Under Secretary for Health of the Department of Veterans Affairs?

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 157 through 192 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Foreign Service, 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 en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Lawrence B. Jackson
Rear Adm. (lh) Scott B. J. Jerabek
Rear Adm. (lh) Luke M. McCollum

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Christina M. Alvarado

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Katherine A. McCabe

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Grafton D. Chase, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Daniel V. MacInnis

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Captain Alan D. Beal
Captain Darren J. Hanson
Captain Brian S. Hurley
Captain Andrew C. Lennon

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) Brian K. Antonio
Rear Adm. (lh) Mark R. Whitney

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

Rear Adm. (lh) Paul A. Sohl

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) Nancy A. Norton
Rear Adm. (lh) Robert D. Sharp

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

Rear Adm. (lh) Terry J. Moulton

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

Rear Adm. (lh) Bret J. Muilenburg

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Mark L. Leavitt

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. Ann M. Burkhardt

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. James P. Downey
Capt. Stephen F. Williamson

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. Michael W. Zarkowski

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. David G. Manero

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. Paul Pearigen

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. Anne M. Swap

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. Peter G. Stamatopoulos

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. John W. Korka

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Paul E. Bauman

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Antonio A. Aguto, Jr.
Colonel Maria B. Barrett
Colonel James E. Bonner
Colonel Jeffery D. Broadwater
Colonel Xavier T. Brunson
Colonel Charles H. Cleveland
Colonel Douglas C. Crissman
Colonel Timothy J. Daugherty
Colonel Bradley K. Dreyer
Colonel John R. Evans, Jr.
Colonel Antonio M. Fletcher
Colonel Patrick D. Frank
Colonel Bradley T. Gericke
Colonel Steven W. Gilland
Colonel Karl H. Gingrich
Colonel Williams H Graham, Jr.
Colonel Charles R. Hamilton

Colonel Diana M. Holland
Colonel Gary W. Johnston
Colonel Kenneth L. Kamper
Colonel John S. Laskodi
Colonel Donna W. Martin
Colonel Joseph P. McGee
Colonel Randall A. McIntire
Colonel John E. Novalis, II
Colonel Mark W. Odom
Colonel Paul H. Pardew
Colonel Thomas A. Pugh
Colonel James H. Raymer
Colonel John B. Richardson, IV
Colonel Andrew M. Rohling
Colonel Michel M. Russell, Sr.
Colonel Thomas H. Todd, III
Colonel Joel K. Tyler
Colonel Kevin Vereen
Colonel Daniel R. Walrath

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. William W. Way

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael K. Hanifan
Brig. Gen. Daniel M Krumrei

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Hugh T. Corbett
Colonel Andrew Lawlor
Colonel Roderick R. Leon Guerrero
Colonel Gervasio Ortiz Lopez

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army 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

Lt. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Michael S. Cederholm
Colonel Dennis A. Crall
Colonel Bradford J. Gering
Colonel James F. Glynn
Colonel Gregory L. Masiello
Colonel David W. Maxwell
Colonel Stephen M. Neary
Colonel Stephen D. Sklenka
Colonel Roger B. Turner, Jr.
Colonel Rick A. Uribe

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 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

Lt. Gen. John W. Hesterman, III

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Leela J. Gray

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. Donald B. Tatum

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. Timothy E. Gowen

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

Vice Adm. William A. Brown

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army 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. Ronald F. Lewis

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robert B. Abrams

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while serving as the Chief Defense Counsel for Military Commissions under the United States Constitution, article II, section 2, clause 2, and the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014, section 1037:

To be brigadier general

Col. John G. Baker

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN521 AIR FORCE nomination of Daniel A. Lapostole, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 21, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN75 ARMY nominations (12) beginning CYNTHIA AITAHOLMES, and ending RYAN J. WANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN76–1 ARMY nominations (66) beginning DONALD W. ALGEO, and ending AMY L. H. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 13, 2015.

PN485 ARMY nominations (37) beginning ROBERT B. ALLMAN, III, and ending EDWARD J. YURUS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN486 ARMY nominations (54) beginning LYDE C. ANDREWS, and ending D012582, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN487 ARMY nomination of Elizabeth M. Libao, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN488 ARMY nomination of John J. Morris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN489 ARMY nomination of Christopher A. Wodarz, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN532 ARMY nomination of Karen M. Wrancher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN533 ARMY nomination of Susan R. Cloft, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

PN465–1 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (102) beginning Daniel L. Angermiller, and ending Laura Merritt Stone, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2015.

PN466 FOREIGN SERVICE nominations (478) beginning Bruce Matthews, and ending Brian Stephen Zelakiewicz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2015.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN557 MARINE CORPS nominations (5) beginning ROBERT A. PETERSEN, and ending GENE C. WYNNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN399 NAVY nominations (2) beginning IAN D. BRANUM, and ending BRYAN P. HYDE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN400 NAVY nominations (10) beginning JOSUE M. BELLINGER, and ending DONALD E. MESERVE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN401 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GEORGE J. EBERLY, III, and ending DAVID GARLINGHOUSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN402 NAVY nomination of Gregory K. Emery, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN403 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DANIEL B. COPELAND, and ending GEORGE W. LASKEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN405 NAVY nominations (63) beginning SCOTT W. ARNOLD, and ending KURT J. ZAHNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN406 NAVY nominations (14) beginning CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN, and ending VAN T. WENNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN407 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SABRINA J. BOBKOWSKI, and ending DIANE C. LEBLANC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN408 NAVY nominations (4) beginning KEVIN R. BOARDMAN, and ending SEAN P. MCDONALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN409 NAVY nomination of Carl O. Pistole, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN410 NAVY nomination of Jon E. Rugg, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN411 NAVY nominations (3) beginning VICTOR S. CHEN, and ending ELIZABETH A. ZIMMERMANNYOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN412 NAVY nominations (13) beginning DONALD W. BABCOCK, JR., and ending JOHN J. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN413 NAVY nominations (6) beginning GLEN A. DIELEUTERIO, and ending WILLIAM Y. PIKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 20, 2015.

PN430 NAVY nominations (7) beginning RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK, III, and ending JEFFREY J. PRONESTI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN431 NAVY nominations (3) beginning THURRAYA S. KENT, and ending WENDY L. SNYDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN432 NAVY nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL E. BIERY, and ending RICKY M. URSERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN433 NAVY nominations (4) beginning NEIL T. SMITH, and ending DOMINICK A. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN434 NAVY nominations (11) beginning JASON B. BABCOCK, and ending CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN435 NAVY nominations (12) beginning NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS, and ending VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN436 NAVY nominations (11) beginning SOWON S. AHN, and ending CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN437 NAVY nominations (8) beginning STEVEN W. CONNELL, and ending MICHAEL A. WHITT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN439 NAVY nominations (9) beginning CHRISTINE J. CASTON, and ending JAMES V. WALSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN440 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL A. HURNI, and ending ELIZABETH R. SANABIA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN441 NAVY nominations (18) beginning ROBERT C. BANDY, and ending DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN442 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DOMINIC S. CARONELLO, and ending MICHAEL J. SUPKO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2015.

PN490 NAVY nominations (5) beginning FATMATTA M. KUYATEH, and ending MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN491 NAVY nomination of Maregina L. Wicks, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN492 NAVY nomination of Nikki K. Conlin, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN493 NAVY nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL R. CATHEY, and ending ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN494 NAVY nominations (50) beginning TERESA M. ALLEN, and ending JOON S. YUN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN495 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MARTIN J. ANERINO, and ending MARTHA S. SCOTTY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN496 NAVY nominations (24) beginning DAVID J. BACON, and ending RICHARD G. ZEBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN497 NAVY nominations (11) beginning ARTHUR R. BLUM, and ending FLORENCIO J. YUZON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN498 NAVY nominations (26) beginning PATRICK K. AMERSBACH, and ending NANCY V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN499 NAVY nominations (22) beginning CRAIG L. ABRAHAM, and ending SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN500 NAVY nominations (9) beginning CHAD M. BROOKS, and ending ROD W. TRIBBLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN501 NAVY nomination of Heather J. Walton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN502 NAVY nominations (2) beginning WILLIAM A. HLAVIN, and ending BASHON W. MANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 14, 2015.

PN534 NAVY nomination of Jacky P. Cheng, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN535 NAVY nominations (209) beginning CHARLES S. ABBOT, and ending DAVID G. ZOOK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN536 NAVY nominations (23) beginning JOHN J. ANDREW, and ending MARK C. WADSWORTH, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN537 NAVY nominations (33) beginning DAVID A. BACKER, and ending SCOTT E WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN538 NAVY nominations (16) beginning ANTONIO ALEMAR, and ending JOHN L. YOUNG, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN539 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LYLE P. AINSWORTH, and ending JUAN C. VARELA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN540 NAVY nominations (4) beginning KARIN R. BURZYNSKI, and ending FRANCISCO E. MAGALLON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN541 NAVY nominations (12) beginning PAOLO CARCAVALLO, JR., and ending MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN542 NAVY nominations (9) beginning SHELLEY D. CAPLAN, and ending MIKE E. SVATEK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN543 NAVY nominations (28) beginning AUDREY G. ADAMS, and ending JOEL A. YATES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN544 NAVY nominations (21) beginning EUGENE A. ALBIN, and ending KENYA D. WILLIAMSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN545 NAVY nominations (33) beginning ALLAN M. BAKER, and ending DENNIS M. ZOGG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN546 NAVY nominations (46) beginning ROBERT E. BEATON, and ending JAMES L. WILLETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN547 NAVY nominations (24) beginning PAUL T. ANTONY, and ending PETER C. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN548 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JEFFREY M. CLARK, and ending CAROL W. WATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN549 NAVY nominations (3) beginning LAURA M. MUSSULMAN, and ending KENNETH W. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN550 NAVY nominations (16) beginning KERRY L. ABRAMSON, and ending IAN K. THORNHILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN551 NAVY nominations (10) beginning TAMBERLYNN W. BAKER, and ending ANGELIA W. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN552 NAVY nominations (15) beginning SARAVOOT P. BAGWELL, and ending KATHY M. WARREN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN553 NAVY nominations (2) beginning GREGORY T. STEHMAN, and ending RODNEY E. TUGADE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN554 NAVY nominations (2) beginning TERRY W. EDDINGER, and ending DAVID R. GLASSMIRE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN555 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DARYLL D. LONG, and ending MILTON W. WASHINGTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN556 NAVY nominations (439) beginning HOLMAN R. AGARD, and ending MARK E. ZEMATIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 2, 2015.

PN565 NAVY nomination of Natalie R. Bakan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2015.

PN566 NAVY nomination of Patrick R. O'Mara, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 4, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

DESIGNATING THE ULYSSES S. GRANT ASSOCIATION AS THE ORGANIZATION TO IMPLEMENT THE BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE BIRTH OF ULYSSES S. GRANT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 209, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 209) designating the Ulysses S. Grant Association as the organization to implement the bicentennial celebration of the birth of Ulysses S. Grant, Civil War General and 2-term President of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be 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. 209) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 210, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 210) celebrating the 125th anniversary of the State of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 210) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

TRADE FACILITATION AND TRADE ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the language of my motion and the corresponding cloture motion with respect to proceeding to conference on H.R. 644 be amended to request a conference with the House.

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

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), appoints the following Senators to the Board of Visitors of the U.S. Military Academy: the Honorable KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, designee of the Committee on Armed Services and the Honorable CHRISTOPHER MURPHY of Connecticut, designee of the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, June 24; 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; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate then resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 2146; and finally, that all time during adjournment of the Senate count postcloture on H.R. 2146.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 6:10 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 24, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 23, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY).

DAVID J. SHULKIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR HEALTH OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) LAWRENCE B. JACKSON
REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT B. J. JERABEK
REAR ADM. (LH) LUKE M. MCCOLLUM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) CHRISTINA M. ALVARADO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KATHERINE A. MCCABE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GRAFTON D. CHASE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DANIEL V. MACINNIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN ALAN D. BEAL
CAPTAIN DARREN J. HANSON
CAPTAIN BRIAN S. HURLEY
CAPTAIN ANDREW C. LENNON

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) BRIAN K. ANTONIO
REAR ADM. (LH) MARK R. WHITNEY

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

REAR ADM. (LH) PAUL A. SOHL

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) NANCY A. NORTON
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT D. SHARP

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

REAR ADM. (LH) TERRY J. MOULTON

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

REAR ADM. (LH) BRET J. MUILENBURG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MARK L. LEAVITT

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. ANN M. BURKHARDT

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. JAMES P. DOWNEY
CAPT. STEPHEN F. WILLIAMSON

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. MICHAEL W. ZARKOWSKI

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. DAVID G. MANERO

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. PAUL PEARIGEN

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. ANNE M. SWAP

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. PETER G. STAMATOPOULOS

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. JOHN W. KORKA

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. PAUL E. BAUMAN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL ANTONIO A. AGUTO, JR.
COLONEL MARIA B. BARRETT
COLONEL JAMES E. BONNER
COLONEL JEFFERY D. BROADWATER
COLONEL XAVIER T. BRUNSON
COLONEL CHARLES H. CLEVELAND
COLONEL DOUGLAS C. CRISSMAN
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. DAUGHERTY
COLONEL BRADLEY K. DREYER
COLONEL JOHN R. EVANS, JR.
COLONEL ANTONIO M. FLETCHER
COLONEL PATRICK D. FRANK
COLONEL BRADLEY T. GERICKE
COLONEL STEVEN W. GILLAND
COLONEL KARL H. GINGRICH
COLONEL WILLIAMS H. GRAHAM, JR.
COLONEL CHARLES R. HAMILTON
COLONEL DIANA M. HOLLAND
COLONEL GARY W. JOHNSTON
COLONEL KENNETH L. KAMPER
COLONEL JOHN S. LASKODI
COLONEL DONNA W. MARTIN
COLONEL JOSEPH P. MCGEE
COLONEL RANDALL A. MCINTIRE
COLONEL JOHN E. NOVALIS II
COLONEL MARK W. ODOM
COLONEL PAUL H. PARDEW
COLONEL THOMAS A. PUGH
COLONEL JAMES H. RAYMER
COLONEL JOHN B. RICHARDSON IV
COLONEL ANDREW M. ROHLING
COLONEL MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.
COLONEL THOMAS H. TODD III
COLONEL JOEL K. TYLER
COLONEL KEVIN VEREEN
COLONEL DANIEL R. WALRATH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM W. WAY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL K. HANIFAN
BRIG. GEN. DANIEL M. KRUMREI

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL HUGH T. CORBETT
COLONEL ANDREW LAWLOR
COLONEL RODERICK R. LEON GUERRERO
COLONEL GERVASIO ORTIZ LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY 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

LT. GEN. WILLIAM C. MAYVILLE, JR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL MICHAEL S. CEDERHOLM
COLONEL DENNIS A. CRALL
COLONEL BRADFORD J. GERING
COLONEL JAMES F. GLYNN
COLONEL GREGORY L. MASIELLO
COLONEL DAVID W. MAXWELL
COLONEL STEPHEN M. NEARY
COLONEL STEPHEN D. SKLENKA
COLONEL ROGER B. TURNER, JR.
COLONEL RICK A. URIBE

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 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

LT. GEN. JOHN W. HESTERMAN III

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. LEELA J. GRAY

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. DONALD B. TATUM

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. TIMOTHY E. GOWEN

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

VICE ADM. WILLIAM A. BROWN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY 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. RONALD F. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. ABRAMS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE SERVING AS THE CHIEF DEFENSE COUNSEL FOR MILITARY COMMISSIONS UNDER THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, AND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014, SECTION 1037:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN G. BAKER

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DANIEL A. LAPOSTOLE, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CYNTHIA AITAHOLMES AND ENDING WITH RYAN J. WANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. ALGEO AND ENDING WITH AMY L. H. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 13, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT B. ALLMAN III AND ENDING WITH EDWARD J. YURUS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYDE C. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH D012582, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ELIZABETH M. LIBAO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOHN J. MORRIS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER A. WODARZ, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KAREN M. WRANCHER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SUSAN R. CLOFT, TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. PETERSEN AND ENDING WITH GENE C. WYNNE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH IAN D. BRANUM AND ENDING WITH BRYAN P. HYDE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSUE M. BELLINGER AND ENDING WITH DONALD E. MESERVE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEORGE J. EBERLY III AND ENDING WITH DAVID GARLINGHOUSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF GREGORY K. EMERY, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL B. COPELAND AND ENDING WITH GEORGE W. LASKEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT W. ARNOLD AND ENDING WITH KURT J. ZAHNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. BROWN AND ENDING WITH VAN T. WENNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SABRINA J. BOBKOWSKI AND ENDING WITH DIANE C. LEBLANC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN R. BOARDMAN AND ENDING WITH SEAN P. MCDONALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CARL O. PISTOLE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON E. RUGG, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VICTOR S. CHEN AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH A. ZIMMERMANNYOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONALD W. BABCOCK, JR. AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GLEN A. DIELEUTERIO AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM Y. PIKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 20, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD A. BRAUNBECK III AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY J. PRONESTI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THURRAYA S. KENT AND ENDING WITH WENDY L. SNYDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. BIERY AND ENDING WITH RICKY M. URSERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NEIL T. SMITH AND ENDING WITH DOMINICK A. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. BABCOCK AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. SLATTERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS E. ANDREWS AND ENDING WITH VINCENT S. TIONQUIAO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SOWON S. AHN AND ENDING WITH CRAIG M. WHITTINGHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN W. CONNELL AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL A. WHITT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTINE J. CASTON AND ENDING WITH JAMES V. WALSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. HURNI AND ENDING WITH ELIZABETH R. SANABIA, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT C. BANDY AND ENDING WITH DOUGLAS L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOMINIC S. CARONELLO AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SUPKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FATMATTA M. KUYATEH AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MAREGINA L. WICKS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NIKKI K. CONLIN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. CATHEY AND ENDING WITH ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERESA M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH JOON S. YUN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARTIN J. ANERINO AND ENDING WITH MARTHA S. SCOTTY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. BACON AND ENDING WITH RICHARD G. ZEBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ARTHUR R. BLUM AND ENDING WITH FLORENCIO J. YUZON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICK K. AMERSBACH AND ENDING WITH NANCY V. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CRAIG L. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHAD M. BROOKS AND ENDING WITH ROD W. TRIBBLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF HEATHER J. WALTON, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM A. HLAVIN AND ENDING WITH BASHON W. MANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 14, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACKY P. CHENG, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES S. ABBOT AND ENDING WITH DAVID G. ZOOK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. ANDREW AND ENDING WITH MARK C. WADSWORTH, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID A. BACKER AND ENDING WITH SCOTT E. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTONIO ALEMAR AND ENDING WITH JOHN L. YOUNG III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYLE P. AINSWORTH AND ENDING WITH JUAN C. VARELA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KARIN R. BURZYNSKI AND ENDING WITH FRANCISCO E. MAGALLON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAOLO CARCAVALLO, JR. AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHELLEY D. CAPLAN AND ENDING WITH MIKE E. SVATEK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AUDREY G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOEL A. YATES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EUGENE A. ALBIN AND ENDING WITH KENYA D. WILLIAMSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALLAN M. BAKER AND ENDING WITH DENNIS M. ZOGG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT E. BEATON AND ENDING WITH JAMES L. WILLETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL T. ANTONY AND ENDING WITH PETER C. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY M. CLARK AND ENDING WITH CAROL W. WATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAURA M. MUSSULMAN AND ENDING WITH KENNETH W. WAGNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KERRY L. ABRAMSON AND ENDING WITH IAN K. THORNHILL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TAMBERLYNN W. BAKER AND ENDING WITH ANGELIA W. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAVOOT P. BAGWELL AND ENDING WITH KATHY M. WARREN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY T. STEHMAN AND ENDING WITH RODNEY E. TUGADE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TERRY W. EDDINGER AND ENDING WITH DAVID R. GLASSMIRE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DARYLL D. LONG AND ENDING WITH MILTON W. WASHINGTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HOLMAN R. AGARD AND ENDING WITH MARK E. ZEMATIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 2, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATION OF NATALIE R. BAKAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PATRICK R. O'MARA, TO BE COMMANDER.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL L. ANGERMILLER AND ENDING WITH LAURA MERRITT STONE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2015.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRUCE MATTHEWS AND ENDING WITH BRIAN STEPHEN ZELAKIEWICZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2015.