



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015

No. 74

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, King of the universe, bestow upon our lawmakers understanding to know You, diligence to seek You, wisdom to find You, and a faithfulness to embrace You. Today, help them to experience the constancy of Your presence. Lord, give them a courage which shows itself by gentleness and integrity. Provide them with a wisdom which shows itself by simplicity and unity. Impart to them a power which shows itself by humility and restraint. Guide them by Your higher wisdom and fill them with Your peace.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TRADE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was glad to see our Democratic friends accept our path forward on trade yesterday. Under our plan, the Senate will avoid the poison pills that had been floated in favor of the very type of bipartisan approach we have been advocating for all along. It follows the reg-

ular order. It allows Senators to express themselves without endangering more American trade jobs for the people we represent.

So this is good news. It is good news for bipartisanship. It is good news for a new Congress that is getting back to work. And it is good news for America's middle class.

The people we represent deserve the kind of good jobs we could secure by knocking down unfair trade barriers. One estimate shows that trade agreements with Europe and the Pacific could support as many as 1.4 million additional jobs here in our country. In Kentucky, they can support more than 18,000 additional jobs.

But we can't get there without first passing the kind of legislation we will vote to open debate on this afternoon. It is the only way to enact clear standards and guidelines that our trade negotiators need to move forward, and that Congress needs to appropriately assert its authority in this area.

So yesterday's agreement is significant. I thank Chairman HATCH and his negotiating partners for the good, bipartisan cooperation that got us to where we are.

I would like to thank the President, too. No, you are not hearing things. President Obama has done his country a service by taking on his base and pushing back on some of the more ridiculous rhetoric we have heard. He was right to remind everyone that "you don't make change through slogans" or "ignoring realities." He should be recognized for it.

The American people sent a divided government to Washington. But it doesn't mean they don't want us to work together on issues where we can agree. And on this issue, we do agree.

Today's vote brings us closer to achieving a positive outcome for the people we represent. I look forward to continued positive engagement from both the President and Members of both parties as we move forward on these bills.

OBAMACARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, it is good to see forward momentum on trade. That is certainly good for the American people. But there are other issues that both parties should want to address, too, such as the broken promises of ObamaCare. It would be nice to see more bipartisan support there, and I hope we will at some point, because we all know that ObamaCare is a law filled—literally filled—with broken promises. We all keep seeing reminders of how it failed so many of the same people we were told it would help.

Back in my State in Kentucky, we are seeing how hospitals and their patients are feeling the negative effects of this partisan law. That is particularly true in the rural areas of my State. A recent report showed that ObamaCare's multibillion-dollar attack on hospitals in Kentucky is expected to result in a net loss of \$1 billion over the next few years—a net loss to Kentucky hospitals of \$1 billion over the next few years.

These hospitals are expected to lose more money under ObamaCare than they are expected to gain in new revenue from the Medicaid expansion. And, largely due to ObamaCare, these losses are forcing Kentucky hospitals to cut jobs, reduce or freeze wages, and, in some instances, even close altogether. We have lost at least two rural critical-access hospitals this year.

Officials report that Kentucky hospitals are suffering partly because more than three out of every four Kentuckians who signed up for ObamaCare were in fact put on Medicaid, and we know that Medicaid reimburses hospitals for less than it costs to treat patients.

So despite promises that greater access to coverage would decrease visits to the emergency room and the cost associated with those visits, the vast majority of emergency room doctors now say they have actually experienced a surge—a surge—in patients visiting the ER since ObamaCare came into effect.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2897

In fact, a recent survey reported that thousands of ER doctors have actually seen an increase in emergency room visits since the start of last year. One physician from Lexington was quoted as saying he had seen “a huge backlog in the ER because the volume has increased.” He went on to say that ER volume rose by almost a fifth in the first few months of this year, which is nearly double—nearly double—what he saw last year in the same period.

There are a lot of reasons for these increases, but as one ER physician put it, “visits are going up despite the ACA, and in a lot of cases because of it.”

Volume in the ER is driven as a result of coverage expansion, adding a lot of new people, that has largely been born by the Medicaid program. As I have said previously, though, increasing coverage doesn't guarantee access to care, and prior to Medicaid expansion, Kentucky already faced a shortage of physicians participating in Medicaid. Now, there are more than 300,000 additional enrollees—adding 300,000 new people to an already broken system. So when Americans on Medicaid get sick and can't find a doctor, who will treat the Medicaid patients? Where do they end up? Of course, in the emergency room.

Here is how one Kentucky newspaper described it last year:

That's just the opposite of what many people expected under ObamaCare, particularly because one of the goals of health reform was to reduce pressure on emergency rooms by expanding Medicaid and giving poor people better access to primary care.

Instead [what is happening], many hospitals in Kentucky and across the nation are seeing a surge of those newly insured Medicaid patients walking right into emergency rooms.

One Kentucky doctor described it as a “perfect storm”—a perfect storm. “We've given people an ATM card,” he said, “in a town with no ATMs.”

Given ObamaCare's most famous broken promise about Americans being able to keep the health plans they liked, it is easy to see how a person who had access to good insurance and quality care before ObamaCare would find himself or herself forced onto Medicaid and into the emergency room today. A recent report found that among certain hospitals in Kentucky, as many as one in five individuals covered by Medicaid had previously had private health insurance.

So, unfortunately, it wasn't hard to see this coming. A lot of us warned about it. We warned that providing supposed health coverage, without actually giving someone access to health care, is really just a hollow promise. You could promise coverage, but it doesn't mean anything if there is nobody there to care for the people who are covered.

The same could be said of warnings regarding the impact of ObamaCare's deep Medicare cuts and the impact of that on hospitals. I wish the politicians who rammed ObamaCare through over

the objections of the American people had heeded these warnings. We made all these warnings 6 years ago.

So this is just one more reminder why ObamaCare is bad for Kentucky, why it is bad for the middle class, and why it is bad for our country.

But here is the good news. The new Congress just passed a balanced budget this week with legislative tools that will allow us to begin to address ObamaCare's broken promises. I hope President Obama and our colleagues across the aisle will work with us to do so.

We owe the American people more than ObamaCare's broken promises. We owe them real health reform that lowers costs and increases choice.

I hope our friends across the aisle will work with us in a bipartisan way to help achieve that important outcome.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

FISA DATA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday the House of Representatives voted overwhelmingly—with approximately 330 votes—to end the bulk collection of Americans' phone records. Last week a Federal court, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals, ruled that the Federal Government's bulk collection program is illegal.

The majority leader seems prepared to lead the Senate into reauthorizing an illegal program. He has spoken here on the floor in that regard. So how can one reauthorize something that is illegal?

This is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans are united in favor of reforming the National Security Agency and how they collect their data.

The House, yesterday, as I indicated, voted in favor of reform, overwhelmingly, but Republicans in the Senate want to move forward without making any changes. I don't think so.

The Republican leader is isolated in his desire for a clean extension of illegal spying programs. For example, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives, Mr. GOODLATTE, said yesterday that if the House gets an extension of FISA—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act—it will go nowhere. It is dead, according to the chairman.

Republicans and Democrats have vowed to filibuster a clean extension if the Republican leader brings one to the floor. That is what is going to happen here in the Senate. I have heard extended statements by the junior Senator from Kentucky, who said that. There are others who feel the same way. Even if my friend plows forward in the face of what the bipartisan opposition is to this matter, it will take at

least a week to secure the vote. And maybe that isn't even possible.

We have a chance to take bipartisan action that protects Americans' civil liberties. It would be irresponsible for us to squander this opportunity.

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as I said yesterday, my heart goes out to those who suffered in the terrible accident of Amtrak's Northeast Regional Train No. 188, on Tuesday night at 9 p.m., when the accident occurred. As we now know, the train was going more than 100 miles an hour on a curve where it should have been going 50 miles an hour.

It is very tragic. Seven people died and scores are injured. There were about 250 people on the train. It is unfortunate that sometimes it takes an event such as this before policymakers learn what they need to learn. But worse still would be if policymakers fail to learn anything at all.

National Transportation Safety Board member Robert Sumwalt said there is technology available called positive train control that would have prevented this accident. That technology is in place in a few places in the Northeast corridor. This Northeast corridor, millions of people travel there, but it is not yet in place where the accident happened.

There are Members of the Republican Senate who have for years denigrated, belittled, and harmed the Amtrak system. I have watched this, and it is really unfair. They attack Amtrak every year, every appropriations process. Many on the far right regularly try to punch the Nation's train system right in the gut. They have made it a punching bag.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives approved a bill that underfunds Amtrak by another one-quarter of a billion dollars. The day after that tragic accident, they say: We are going to help Amtrak by cutting spending by another one-quarter of a billion dollars.

A nation's train system can be efficient and productive. It can be a point of national pride, but too often neglect of Amtrak has left America's train system a disappointing embarrassment. Amtrak is a vital part of our Nation's economy, and everyone should understand that. It helps—I repeat—millions and millions of people get where they need to go. It takes cars off congested highways. It takes people away from airports.

For the safety of rail passengers, for the business it helps to foster, and for the reputation of our great Nation, I hope we can learn to invest more in this important national resource. They need more, not less.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend, the Republican leader, must be in denial to come to the floor and talk

about ObamaCare the way he did. He is neglecting the facts. I will only repeat a few of them.

No. 1, there are 17 million people who now have health insurance who didn't. Using his own numbers, he said: One out of every five people who went to the emergency room in Kentucky had insurance, private insurance. Four-fifths of them had no insurance. They have it now. That says it all.

Rather than cut Medicare and cut Medicaid, as in the Republican budget—they should not be doing that. The reason there are long waiting lines is because Republicans are not helping us fund Medicare and Medicaid in an appropriate fashion.

The late Senator Ted Kennedy once said: "An essential part of our progressive vision is an America where no citizen of any age fears the cost of health care."

We are not there yet, but since the Affordable Care Act became law, that vision has become more of a reality every day. The facts are indisputable. Health care costs are growing at a historically low rate.

The overall health of Americans is improving, and health care providers are now finding innovative ways to reduce health care spending while improving the quality of care that patients have.

Last week, the Department of Health and Human Services announced that a key pilot program created by the Affordable Care Act saved Medicare almost \$400 million in 2 years. This is good news.

The Pioneer accountable care organization model was launched by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services in an effort to improve health care delivery and payment options.

An independent evaluation of this model shows an average of about \$300 in savings per beneficiary every year. Rather than being a model, it should cover all patients. Right now this model is serving more than 600,000 Americans.

The idea is called accountable care. Accountable care organizations tie provider reimbursements to quality metrics and reductions in the total cost of care for patients—better care, less costs.

What is most remarkable about this program is that huge savings are being achieved without threatening the quality of care the patients receive. In fact, the quality of care is improving.

Medicare beneficiaries within the Pioneer accountable care organization model have reported more timely care and improved communication with the health care providers. They now have an ability to understand what is happening to their health care. Their questions are being answered. These patients use inpatient hospital services less and have fewer tests and have fewer procedures. That is what it is all about.

Last week's announcement shows that the Affordable Care Act is working, to the tune of \$400 million.

Can you imagine the impact this pilot program will have on health care costs when it is expanded? It is true that we have more work to do to ensure quality affordable health care for every American. These reports show Senator Kennedy's vision for America's health care system is beginning to become a reality.

Mr. President, would you be kind enough to announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 10 a.m.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I see no one on 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. TESTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF JOE DUNN

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise to honor Cascade County Deputy Sheriff Joe Dunn, a dedicated public servant who died in the line of duty on August 14, 2014.

On behalf of all Montanans, I want to thank Deputy Dunn for his service to our Nation and to the community of Great Falls, MT. Before enlisting to serve and protect his neighbors as a deputy sheriff, Joe Dunn served our Nation in the U.S. Marine Corps and deployed to the battlefields of Afghanistan.

Upon returning to Montana, Deputy Dunn married the love of his life, Robynn. They had two children, Joey and Shiloh, who were the center of his universe. Deputy Dunn's deep commitment to Jesus and his love for his family were the guiding principles in which he lived his life.

Montana's leaders have permanently honored the life and service of Deputy Dunn by naming an 8-mile stretch of Interstate 15 outside of Great Falls, MT. It is named the Joseph J. Dunn Memorial Highway.

On May 15, 2015, Peace Officers Memorial Day, Deputy Dunn's name will be enshrined forever alongside 273 other brave peace officers who were killed in the line of duty.

During his lifetime of service, Deputy Dunn always went beyond the call of duty to ensure the safety of those he

served, often working the evening shift and long hours away from his family. Deputy Dunn always put others above himself, and he is the kind of leader every Montanan can be proud of.

Everyone who knew Deputy Dunn has been touched by his commitment to serve others and his passion for making his community a better place to call home. But above all, Joe Dunn was a family man. Regardless of the length of his shift or the difficulty of his day, his top priority was that of being a father.

Today, as a body, we offer our deepest thoughts and prayers to his family, Robynn, Joey, and Shiloh. The State of Montana and this country are endlessly grateful for his service.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644 en bloc, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1295) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code.

A bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Service of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1223 AND 1224

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Hatch amendments, amendment No. 1223 to H.R. 1295 and amendment No. 1224 to H.R. 644, are considered and agreed to.

(The amendment (No. 1223) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

(The amendment (No. 1224) in the nature of a substitute is printed in the RECORD of May 13, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 noon will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today, at this moment, we begin the debate on one of the most important bills to come in front of the Senate this year, to guarantee that Americans can find a more level playing field as we compete in the world economy to show that Americans should not be patsies for other countries that are cheating and altering records and information they submit to trade authorities.

This is an opportunity to close an 85-year-old loophole that has allowed us to import products produced by slave labor and child labor and to fix our currency system so countries and their companies, especially in East Asia and South Asia—mostly East Asia—cannot continue to cheat and sell into our country with a bonus and penalize us when we try to sell our products to their countries.

This body delivered one strong message this week which was unprecedented. I can't think of the last time the Senate spoke with such an emphatic voice on a trade issue. The simple message: We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement.

We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing, which the Senate tried to do on Tuesday, but the Senate stood up and said no. We should not be passing new agreements while doing nothing to enforce existing laws and support American companies dealing with unfair competition.

We need to stand up particularly for our small businesses, which are always hurt to a much greater degree than large businesses. When a large company in Cleveland, Toledo or Lima shuts down production and moves overseas to Xi'an, Beijing or Wuhan, China, so they can get a tax break from our government—amazingly enough, this body will not close that tax loophole—and sell products back to our country, that company's bottom line may be a bit better, but the supply chain for those large companies—the companies in our communities in Lima, Toledo, Mansfield, and Wooster—that sell to those big companies have lost their biggest customers in far too many cases. Those businesses go out of business, those workers get laid off, those plants close, and we know what happens. That is why we especially need to stand up for those small businesses that play by the rules and are drowning from a set of imports from countries that manipulate their currency and practice illegal dumping. Dumping is when companies subsidize water, capital, land, labor costs or other inputs, such as energy, and sell under the real cost of production into the United States—that kind of illegal dumping.

It is one thing to talk about statistics, but I want to stop and think about the costs of imports to our companies, communities, and families.

In the State of Pennsylvania, as the Presiding Officer knows, especially between Pittsburgh and Philly or Western Pennsylvania, the area I am more

familiar with because I represent the adjoining State, we see time after time companies in small towns—when a company shuts down in a place like Jackson, OH, or Chillicothe, OH, so often because of the size of the town, both the husband and wife each lose their jobs because they both work at that company, their entire family income is wiped out, and they are likely to lose their home to foreclosure. We know all of those problems that happen because we don't enforce our trade rules. That is why I want us to stop and think about the real costs to families, communities, and companies.

In Ohio, we have seen how dumping by Korean companies has hurt our steel industry. Neither President Bush nor President Obama has stepped up on trade the way each had promised in their campaigns, and neither has stepped up the way that they should to preserve our workers, our businesses, and our livelihoods. We both promised, on Korea, thousands—that there would be tens of thousands of new jobs, billions in increased exports for our companies. Yet the reality of the Korea trade agreement was absolutely the opposite of that. We had major job loss and a major loss in the import-export ratio because of that South Korea trade agreement they pushed on the U.S. Congress, and the people here too willingly passed.

Natural gas production has increased demand. I will explain Korea for a moment. Natural gas production has increased demand for the world-class tubular steel made in plants such as U.S. Steel in Lorain, Youngstown, and Trumbull County. Tubular steel is the steel piping that is particularly strong and durable. It is subjected to great pressure and great heat as they drill for natural gas—in so-called fracking—or they drill for oil.

Mr. President, 8,000 workers in 22 States make these Oil Country Tubular Goods. Each one of those jobs supports another seven positions in the supply chain. We know when we talk about manufacturing, it is never just the manufacturing jobs, as important as they are, it is the jobs in the entire supply that go into the assembly of the airplane or the automobile or the steel production of Oil Country Tubular Goods. These producers increasingly lose business to foreign competitors that are not playing by the rules. Imports for OCTG, Oil Country Tubular Goods, have doubled since 2008. By some measures, imports account for somewhat more than 50 percent of the pipes being used by companies drilling for oil and gas in the United States.

Korea has one of the world's largest steel industries, but get this, not one of these pipes that Korea now dumps in the United States—illegally subsidized—is ever used in Korea for drilling because Korea has no domestic oil or gas production. In other words, Korea has created this industry only for exports and has been successful because they are not playing fair. So

their producers are exporting large volumes to the United States, the most open and attractive market in the world, at below-market prices. That is clear evidence that our workers and manufacturers are being cheated, and it should be unacceptable to the Members of this body. It hurts our workers, our communities, and our country. It is time to stop it.

I toured Lorain's best U.S. Steel plant in 2013 and saw the No. 6 quench and temper finishing line, which was part of a \$100 million expansion project.

The naysayers who talk about our country, workers, and businesses say we cannot compete because we are not up-to-date or our workers are not producing—all the whining from these naysayers who support these trade policies is insulting to our workers, insulting to our communities, and insulting to our small businesses. They say we are not modern enough.

Well, look at the investment. I have seen the \$100 million investment in Lorain, for instance, and what that means. The first time in the history of steel production in this world, ArcelorMittal workers created about 1 ton about 5 years ago. When they passed this threshold, 1 person-hour created 1 ton of steel. They are the most productive steelworkers in the world, working in the most productive steel company in the world.

The expansion project with Lorain's U.S. Steel plant was made possible, in part, because we were able to crack down on Chinese steel pipe imports that flooded the market with illegal and cheap products. They made this investment because we won that trade case. Then, along came Korea to again try to inflict the same damage on our producers and our workers. It is clear that once again we need to ensure that other Nations don't unfairly dump steel into the U.S. market.

Last year, I visited the same plant and joined in with workers, managers, and union leaders to send one message: It is time for America to stand up to these lawbreakers; pure and simple, strip it all away—these countries are lawbreakers.

Here is the bad news: In January, U.S. Steel—in part because of Korea's dumping—announced 614 temporary layoffs at the plant in Lorain on Lake Erie. Those layoffs began in March.

I spoke on the floor before about one of the U.S. steelworkers I met, Ryan, who has been out of work for weeks. He has four kids at home and doesn't know when or if he will be back at work. Will his home be foreclosed down the road if he can't go back to work? He has played by the rules. He has been living a responsible life, by taking care of his kids, paying his mortgage, engaged in the union and community as a good, strong, productive worker. There are hundreds more like Ryan in Lorain and around Ohio.

In March, Republic Steel in Lorain announced 200 temporary layoffs. I say

“temporary” because the company is hopeful that our government will enforce trade rules and that the dumping of steel will abate a bit.

TMK is one of the largest producers of oil country tubular goods in the world, with a facility in Brookfield, OH, north of Youngstown. Since 2008, the company has invested \$2 billion in their U.S. operations. They are keeping up on technology and modernizing their plant with very productive workers. But how do they compete with Korea or China or other nations that are cheating?

Other companies make similar investments to stay on the cutting edge, but instead of expanding production to keep up with increasing demand, these companies operate under tighter and tighter margins and lay off workers. Last week, TMK announced plans to reduce operating hours at three of its facilities and completely idled another one.

I visited Byer Steel in Cincinnati. I spoke with Mr. Byer just yesterday when I met with some steel company executives, many of them from small businesses like his, where I first announced the Level the Playing Field Act to his company in Cincinnati.

American companies—Byer, TMK, U.S. Steel, Republic Steel, so many others—know firsthand that they are not in a fair fight. These manufacturers across Ohio and all over our country suffer enough from unfair trade practices distorting the market. It is their workers who suffer even more. Think about what even a temporary layoff can do to a family. They are facing mounting bills, facing mounting uncertainty. They may have to start to turn to credit cards and payday lenders to get by, and then the downward spiral begins.

I don't think too many in this body who are dressed like this and who have good-paying jobs and titles and far too often an adoring staff end up—we don't think much about this, but think about the laid-off worker who has for 7 years—she and her husband have lived in Lorain, where I used to live, which is an industrial city west of Cleveland—they have lived in Lorain and paid their mortgage. They are involved in their kids' activities in soccer and school and go to the programs at school. They are living lives the way we hope they would. But then she loses her good-paying, 18-dollar-an-hour job. She has a mortgage she meets every month. She has bills she pays every month. Then she loses her job. She faces the uncertainty of what happens next, and she faces a sharply declined income. At some point, her kids understand their mom lost her job and their dad's hours have been cut back. Then they face the question—and this is what we don't think much about in this body, people who dress like us and make good incomes and have good benefits and have a staff who helps them—then she has to sit down with her kids and say: We may lose our home because

we can't keep up with these bills. It is not because they speculated, not because they stole, not because they are morally inadequate in some ways; simply because they lost their job.

My State—and the Presiding Officer's State is not too far behind this, I don't think—my State for 14 years in a row had more foreclosures than the year before. That is not because Ohioans are irresponsible; it is because Ohioans have lost so many of these manufacturing jobs. They were paying their bills and meeting their obligations and raising their kids, and then all of a sudden they couldn't.

So they have to face their 12-year-old daughter and say: Honey, we are going to have to move. We can't afford to keep this house anymore. I don't know where we are going to move. I don't know what school you are going to go to. I am sorry.

I don't think people around this place think very much about the human face of these kinds of decisions. That is why this is so important.

We can do something about this. When jobs are lost due to cheap, flooded, illegal imports and at the same time we aren't increasing our exports, we need to do all we can to stop this practice and protect our workers.

The other side will say we are increasing our exports. We are a bit, but the imports are much higher in almost every one of these cases. That is why we need to pass this Customs bill that incorporates the Level the Playing Field Act to crack down on foreign companies that are cheating. We welcome competition. We are a competitive country. We succeed in competing among ourselves and around the world. But it has to be fair; it has to be a level playing field. That is why the Level the Playing Field Act, title V of this Customs bill, is so very important.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls be equally divided between the parties.

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

Mr. BROWN. 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. UDALL. 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. UDALL. Thank you, Mr. President.

PATRIOT ACT

Today, I rise to express my long-standing concerns about the PATRIOT Act and in particular section 215, which is set to expire on June 1. A major use of this section—the bulk collection of Americans' phone records—has just been ruled illegal by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. If we didn't already have enough concern about reauthorizing section 215, this

decision should raise alarm bells. Yet, the majority leader is asking us to act quickly to reauthorize this law unchanged for another 5 years.

Without significant reforms to the law, I cannot support an extension of any length of time, and I urge my colleagues to listen to the court and listen to the numerous oversight groups from within the administration and the millions of citizens who are saying that Congress needs to rethink whether this program is violating our rights in the name of keeping us safe.

Ben Franklin was very fond of saying, “Those who give up liberty in the name of security deserve neither.” That is where we are today. Congress passed the PATRIOT Act over a decade ago after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Our Nation was devastated. Our security was at stake. But this legislation was hasty, it was far-reaching, and it undermined the constitutional right to privacy of law-abiding citizens. It still does.

I have made my opposition clear in the years since 2001. The major advocates of this law—primarily former President Bush and his key national security officials—used a potent combination of fear and patriotism to drive this bill through. I was one of only 66 Members to vote against the PATRIOT Act in the House of Representatives. I also voted against the reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act in 2006 and the FISA Amendments Act of 2008.

In 2011, I opposed once again the extension of three controversial provisions of the PATRIOT Act: roving wiretaps, government access to “any tangible items,” such as library and business records, and the surveillance of targets that are not connected to any identified terrorist group.

Back in 2001, I said on the House floor that I was unable to support this bill because it does not strike the right balance between protecting our liberties and providing for the security of our citizens. I went on to say: The saving grace here is that the sunset provision forces us to come back and to look at these issues again when heads are cooler and when we are not in the heat of battle.

That is exactly what we should do. To govern in a post-9/11 world, we have to strike the right balance, to fight terrorism without trampling our Constitution. We can do both. The Bill of Rights was established immediately following a war. Our Founders knew the tension between freedom and security. Our Nation was founded on the right of individual liberty, in stark contrast to the long tradition of total sovereign authority of most other governments.

I strongly believe we should not force through a reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act without a hard look at the long-term ramifications of the law. We must look at how the law is being used for things such as the collection of all Americans' phone records. We must consider whether that use is necessary

to keep us safe and whether it is in line with the Constitutional rights we are sworn to uphold.

I urge our colleagues not to be swayed by the false argument that this provision must be reauthorized urgently, that we will be vulnerable to attack if we let it expire—another false argument.

Here is the reality. This provision is being used to sweep up the phone calls of all Americans across this country. Yet there is zero conclusive evidence that it has kept us safe from attack.

What we do have, however, is ample evidence that the PATRIOT Act, section 215, has been used to violate the privacy of everyday Americans. I believe it has violated the Constitution. I certainly agree with the Federal court of appeals which last week ruled that the bulk phone record collection goes far beyond what Congress intended when the law was passed.

We have a decade of hindsight. Let's be honest in this debate and let's be thorough. The entire law bears careful scrutiny. Senators LEE and LEAHY have introduced the USA FREEDOM Act to reform the law while reauthorizing the expiring provisions. I commend their efforts, but I think we can go even further.

The House also overwhelmingly passed its version of the USA FREEDOM Act just yesterday. It deserves Senate consideration. Congress has a duty for robust oversight, to ensure real constitutional privacy rights are upheld. I pushed for this from when I was in the House. I advocated then for the creation of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, also called PCLOB.

In June 2013, after details about NSA's bulk collection program were made public, I led a bipartisan call for the PCLOB to conduct an independent review. Their review assessed the impact of NSA's spying program on Americans' constitutional rights and civil liberties. The Board concluded what many Americans had feared: One, that the spying program is an unconstitutional intrusion on their privacy right, and, two, that it has almost no impact on safety.

The Board's oversight role is crucial. Its independent evaluation of section 215 demonstrates why. It has an important job, and it requires more support so it can do its job. That is why yesterday Senator WYDEN and I reintroduced the Strengthening Privacy, Oversight, and Transparency Act, or SPOT Act. Our bill, with bipartisan cosponsors in the House, would strengthen the Board. This is key to real oversight, and it should be included as part of any reauthorization of the PATRIOT Act.

The SPOT Act extends the Board's authority to play a watchdog role over surveillance conducted for purposes beyond counterterrorism. It also allows the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board to issue subpoenas without having to wait for the Justice Department to issue them. It makes the Board member's positions full-time.

Finally, it makes the Board an authorized recipient for whistleblower complaints for employees in the intelligence community, so they can take concerns to an independent organization, one that understands the intelligence community. I know we must protect the Nation from future attacks. But there must also be balance. We cannot give up our constitutional protections in the name of security. To do so does not protect our Constitution nor does it increase our security.

We need to have a serious debate about these issues and allow Senators to offer amendments. This is important to the American people, to our security, and to our liberties. Congress cannot just leave town and leave this work undone.

I voted against the PATRIOT Act and the FISA Act amendments, because they unduly infringed on the guaranteed rights of our citizens. I believe that time has shown that to be true, and the time has come to correct it. We all value the work of our intelligence community. Their efforts are vital to our Nation's security. But I believe these amendments are crucial.

We can protect our citizens and their constitutional rights. We acted in haste before. It was a mistake then. It would be a mistake now to approve a straight reauthorization of that law. We need to take the time this time to get it right.

I see Senator WYDEN is on the floor. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today the Senate is formally kicking off the trade debate here in the Senate. What I intend to do, starting today and in the days ahead, is to come back to what I think needs to be the central statement of this discussion; that is, the NAFTA playbook. The playbook for trade in the 1990s is gone. It is a new day in trade policy.

So I have summarized why the trade promotion act is not the trade policy of the 1990s and is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. What we are going to do today is essentially start with the question of how vigorous trade enforcement ought to be at the forefront of America's trade policy in 2015 and beyond, and how our new approach on enforcement is different than the policy of the 1990s.

The reality is, we can pass trade agreements full of lofty goals and principles. You can amass all of the enforcement ideas you might want, but it does not do any good if you do not have real enforcement tools and you make sure that they are not locked in a shed.

In my view, that has been happening for way, way too long. The status quo on trade enforcement simply no longer does the job. As I have listened for many months to Senators on both sides of the aisle, I believe there is widespread recognition that our approach to trade, particularly trade enforcement, has to change, because without

that change, we are not going to have the best possible path to creating more good-paying jobs for our people in a modern and globally competitive economy.

The bottom line is that those trade policies in the 1990s did very little—really nothing—to ensure strong enforcement of our trade laws to protect the American worker from the misdeeds of trade cheats. This bill is designed to take on the universe of aggressive tactics that our competitors have used. It upgrades trade enforcement laws to meet today's challenges.

What we have seen in recent years is that there are some overseas who play cat-and-mouse games with our Customs agents, using shell companies, fraudulent records, and sophisticated schemes. Then they bully—bully—American businesses into relocating factories and jobs or surrendering valuable intellectual property. Too often our companies are spied on, and trade enforcers may, in effect, be victimized by those who steal secrets and dodge accountability.

Our competitors often mask their activities by obscuring paper trails and perpetrating outright fraud. Now, our challenge—and I know my colleague the Presiding Officer has seen this as a member of the Finance Committee—is to get out in front of these schemes that I have just described. The enforcement legislation before the Senate is about guaranteeing that the United States has a queen on the chess board, no matter what competitive tactic it faces.

That starts with a proposal I first offered years ago called the ENFORCE Act. Now, the North American Free Trade Agreement did nothing to stop foreign companies that cheat and evade duties by concealing their identities and shipping their products on untraceable routes.

That is the way it used to be. That is why this legislation is not the North American Free Trade Agreement. The ENFORCE Act is going to give our Customs agents more tools aimed at cracking down on the behavior I have just outlined. Another major upgrade, something else that did not exist during those NAFTA days, is what I call an unfair trade alert. The new alert system would set off the warning bells long before the damage is done, when American jobs and exports come under threat.

One of the big fears we hear today is that our enforcers are incapable of stopping the trade cheats before it is too late. By the time somebody in Washington catches on to the newest unfair threat to undercut an American business, the plant has been shuttered, the factory lights are out, and the workers' lives have been turned upside down. In a lot of cases, if you are talking about the small towns that dot the landscape of Oregon and elsewhere, that abandoned facility might have been the beating heart of an entire community.

The slow pace of action in Washington, DC, should never be the reason Americans lose their jobs. The unfair trade alert—that was not part of the 1990s; that was not part of NAFTA. It is going to be part of our current policy today, helping our companies, helping our workers get there before it is too late.

Next, the Congress is going to lay down clear priorities for our trade enforcers, priorities that are centered on jobs and economic growth. There is going to be more accountability and follow-through baked into our enforcement system. In years past, trade debate in the Congress used to come down to a simple transaction of trade promotion authority for trade adjustment assistance.

What I said in developing this package of bills and what more than a dozen protrade Democrats said on Tuesday and Wednesday of this week was that the Senate needed to aim higher. The status quo was not good enough. In particular, it was not good enough in terms of enforcing the laws that are on the books. My guess is that in Pennsylvania and everywhere else—because I certainly hear it in Oregon—people say—particularly those of us who are protrade and want to tap these global markets: I hear you are talking about new trade agreements. How about enforcing the laws that are on the books?

What I started this morning—and I will be back again and again between now and the end of this debate—is to talk about why this is a very different approach than the approach taken in the 1990s. Tough, robust, effective enforcement of our trade laws is right at the core of a new and modern trade policy. It is a major part of what I call trade done right. It is how you guarantee that trade gives everybody in America a chance to get ahead.

Those are propositions, in my view, that deserve strong, bipartisan support in the Senate, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support this trade enforcement law package.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Democratic side have 20 minutes of the debate time remaining prior to noon.

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to be able to equally divide the time spent in quorum calls.

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

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

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

FREEDOM FOR AUSTIN TICE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I wish to spend a few minutes this morning

talking about a young man who can be described in many ways and one who has earned many accolades: decorated Marine Corps veteran, award-winning journalist, Houston native, and seventh-generation Texan. But most importantly, this young man, Austin Tice, is better known as a friend, brother, and son to loving and caring parents.

Almost 3 years ago, Austin decided to pause his law school studies to spend the summer in Syria as a freelance journalist. He was frustrated by the lack of reporting on Syria's civil war, a war that has claimed the lives of more than 300,000 people by some estimates—and that is just within the borders of Syria—and has displaced millions more who are living in refugee camps both in Syria and in surrounding countries. This huge refugee crisis affects many neighboring countries, such as Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon, and has tremendous potential to destabilize the entire region.

As a strong believer in freedom of the press, Austin wanted to let his fellow countrymen know what was going on in that part of the world. As a former Eagle Scout and Marine Corps captain, Austin's typical can-do attitude led him to decide that he should go to Syria himself and report on the civil war, and that is exactly what he did. Well, as with most things he tried, Austin proved to be very successful. While he was reporting from Syria, his work was published in the Washington Post, McClatchy news, and other outlets.

In August 2012, just days before he was planning to leave Syria, he was kidnapped, and no one has heard from him since. We still don't know for sure who his captors are. Sadly, we know very little. One thing we do know is that his parents, Marc and Debra Tice, and his entire family have worked tirelessly to locate him and to bring him home safely.

This week marks the 1,000th day of Austin's captivity. I really can't begin to imagine the toll this ordeal has taken on Austin's family, but I have to say I so greatly admire the courage and conviction of his parents, who said earlier this week in a statement:

We have desperately missed Austin for over 1,440,000 minutes—each new minute fuels our resolve to find him and bring him safely home.

While we often mark the number of days someone has been missing, it is important to remember that to the family and friends of someone who has been kidnapped, even the minutes that pass are almost unbearable. Austin's family is not just counting the days he has been gone and all the milestones he has inevitably missed, they are counting the minutes too.

Austin Tice has a family who is waiting for him, missing him, and laboring to find any piece of information that will lead to information about his whereabouts, while longing for his freedom. I join the Tice family in encour-

aging the Federal Government to do everything we can to possibly secure Austin's safe return home.

I also say once again to his family: We haven't given up. We will continue to stand by you, and we will never give up until we find your son and bring him safely home.

This week, we pass another milestone, this time of 1,000 days that Austin has been separated from his family. I join the Tice family in their hope that someday soon we will be able to add another milestone to this story, one that marks the day of his safe return to so many who love and miss him.

Today, our thoughts and prayers are with the Tice family, and I stand ready and I daresay all of us stand ready to do whatever we can to encourage and facilitate the return of this Texan, veteran, brother, and son.

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

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

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote on two pieces of important trade legislation. Both of these bills have been in the works for some time. They were among the four trade bills we reported out of the Senate Committee on Finance last month, and as a principal coauthor of both bills, I am very glad we found a way to get them to this point.

The first bill we will be voting on is the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015. This bill will reauthorize and improve three of our trade preference programs: the generalized system of preferences, or GSP; the African Growth and Opportunity Act, or AGOA; and tariff preferences for Haiti. I want to take a few minutes to talk about each of these programs individually, starting with the GSP.

The GSP promotes trade with developing nations by providing for non-reciprocal duty-free tariff treatment of certain products originating in those countries. The program helps beneficiary countries advance their economic development and encourages them to move toward more open economies and eliminate trade barriers to U.S. exports.

The GSP does more than provide assistance in the developing world; it also assists hundreds of businesses here in the United States. Across our country, manufacturers and importers benefit by receiving inputs and raw materials at a lower cost. Approximately three-quarters of U.S. imports under GSP are raw materials—parts and components—or machinery and equipment used by U.S. companies to manufacture goods here at home.

Unfortunately, because the program expired in 2013, many U.S. businesses

have had to deal with high tariffs on these imports for the last 2 years. As an example, last year alone, without the GSP program in place, American companies paid over \$600 million in tariffs. Businesses in every State have been affected by the expiration of GSP and have a vested interest in the renewal of the program. There are businesses in my own home State of Utah and around the country that have been left with difficult decisions about downsizing, hiring freezes, and employee layoffs in the absence of GSP. Today, with the passage of this bill, we will take a long-overdue step toward solving these problems.

Also included in the preferences bill are provisions for the long-term renewal of the AGOA Program, which encourages African countries to further develop their economies by lowering U.S. tariffs on their exports. Since AGOA was enacted in the year 2000, trade with beneficiary countries has more than tripled, with U.S. direct investment growing more than sixfold in that time.

This program has helped create more than a million jobs in Sub-Saharan Africa. I worked with my colleagues on the Committee on Finance to craft reauthorization language that will improve on AGOA's past success, to remove obstacles to trade in Sub-Saharan Africa and allow both that region and our job creators here at home to benefit from expanded market access.

I share many of my colleagues' belief that benefits under AGOA should go to countries making good-faith progress toward meeting the program's eligibility criteria. For example, I am very concerned that officers in the Republic of South Africa recently indicated they will attempt to renegotiate commitments made under the General Agreement on Trade in Services to require foreign-owned companies to relinquish 51 percent ownership and control to South Africans.

South Africa also developed a draft policy that proposed changes to intellectual property rights laws which contained significant shortcomings, including inadequate protections for patents, trademarks, and copyrights. These are three areas I take a tremendous interest in, among so many other things around here. I hope very much that as they redraft this policy, it will include recognition of how important protection of intellectual property is to supporting economic growth.

But it is not just South Africa. For example, I understand other beneficiaries under the program continue to impose barriers and limitations to cross-border data flow or otherwise limit digital trade. Because of these concerns, we thought it was important to create a mechanism under the AGOA Program which would allow for benefits to be scaled back if a country is found to not be making good-faith progress on these and other issues. That new tool is included in the bill, and we expect the administration to

use this tool aggressively, particularly in the case of South Africa.

The legislation also includes new consultation and notification requirements, keeping Congress informed of beneficiaries' progress.

There are new mechanisms for stakeholders to petition the administration to raise awareness about potential eligibility violations. The bill will require these petitions to be taken into account when determinations are made regarding a beneficiary's status and in regular reporting.

I know the AGOA Program has a lot of support here in Congress among Members of both parties. I think we were able to craft a bill that not only provides for the long-term extension of the program the administration was seeking but also responds to some very serious bilateral trade challenges we are facing today. With these changes, we have created a more flexible program we believe will spur greater development and economic integration and opportunity in the region, while better serving the needs of our job creators here at home. I believe it deserves strong support.

Finally, the preferences bill would also extend preferential access to the U.S. market for Haiti. Haiti is one of the poorest economies in the Western Hemisphere. The Haiti preference program supports well-paying, stable jobs in a country saddled with poverty and unemployment. I hope this extension will encourage continued economic development and support democracy in Haiti.

This is a strong preferences bill. I expect a strong vote in favor of passing it later today.

Next, the Senate will vote on the Trade Facilitation and Trade Enforcement Act of 2015, which includes important provisions to reauthorize and modernize the operations of Customs and Border Protection, or CBP, and significantly improve intellectual property rights protection in the United States and around the world.

The Customs bill will facilitate the efficient movement of merchandise destined for the United States by formalizing in statute programs such as the Centers of Excellence and Expertise. It will also ensure that U.S. customs and trade laws are uniformly implemented nationwide and help ensure that the private sector and CBP work together.

With this bill, we will also ensure that the automated commercial environment and the international data system are completed so that trade documentation can finally be submitted electronically and importers will no longer be required to submit the same information to numerous government agencies.

In addition, the bill will modernize the drawback process by moving from a labor-intensive paper-based system to an electronic claims process that will significantly free up resources in the private and the public sector, and it

will increase the de minimis level from \$200 to \$800, reducing needless burdens on small businesses importing into the United States.

Additionally, the bill strengthens our trade remedy laws and our ability to respond to imports that pose a threat to the health or safety of U.S. consumers.

When drafting this customs legislation, I was particularly interested in beefing up our enforcement of intellectual property rights. The bill includes the strongest possible provisions with regard to intellectual property rights and intellectual property rights enforcement. For example, our bill will establish in law the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center to coordinate Federal efforts to prevent intellectual property violations. It will also significantly expand CBP's tools and authorities to protect intellectual property rights at the border by requiring CBP to share information about suspected infringing merchandise with rights holders.

Our bill will provide CBP with explicit authority to seize and forfeit devices that violate the Digital Millennium Copyright Act—an act I put through a number of years ago—and require CBP to share information with rights holders who are injured by these unlawful devices.

The bill contains provisions to establish a process for CBP to enforce copyrights while registration with the copyright office is pending and to significantly improve CBP's reporting requirements to hold the Agency more accountable for its enforcement efforts with regard to intellectual property.

The bill will strengthen CBP's targeting of goods that violate intellectual property rights, improve CBP's cooperation with the private sector and with foreign customs authorities on enforcement, and require an educational campaign at the border. I am particularly fond of that last part. At my insistence, the bill includes provisions that will require all versions of the Customs Declaration Form that everyone fills out when they enter the United States to contain a warning that importation of goods that infringe on intellectual property rights may violate criminal and/or civil law and may pose serious risks to health and safety. I am not sure most Americans appreciate the danger that counterfeit products can pose, as they often are not built to the same standard of the protected product. So I hope making people more aware of these dangers will help us make sure we are doing all we can to keep Americans safe.

In addition to enhancing protection at our borders, our Customs bill will provide USTR with additional tools to improve the protection of intellectual property rights by our trading partners overseas in order to stop infringing goods at the source. For example, the bill will establish a chief innovation and intellectual property negotiator, with the rank of ambassador, to ensure

that intellectual property rights protection is at the forefront of our trade negotiation and enforcement efforts and to enhance USTR's accountability to Congress on these issues. On top of that, the bill will give USTR more tools to increase enforcement for trade secrets and to ensure that countries that consistently fail to protect intellectual property meet specified benchmarks for improvement.

I am a big fan of this bill. It includes a number of my top trade enforcement priorities, and I am very glad we will get a chance to vote on it today. Of course, it is not perfect. Some of the amendments that were added in committee leave me with some reservations. Most notably, the bill now contains provisions that purport to deal with currency manipulation that are, in my view, very problematic. One provision sets up an avenue for a countervailing duty investigation or review to determine whether some measure of a currency manipulation is effectively a subsidy, either "directly or indirectly" to a country's exports. If the government finds that the manipulation is, once again, either "directly or indirectly," an export subsidy, sanctions can follow. This provision is problematic for a number of reasons.

First of all, it is likely not compliant with our existing international trade commitments. It would effectively require the imposition of trade sanctions that, under the language of the legislation, could be based on presumptions without support. And it will almost certainly invite retaliatory trade sanctions from our trading partners, who will argue, and in fact have already argued, that actions taken by the Federal Reserve Board constitute currency manipulation.

While the authors of the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill may believe that there is a clear delineation between monetary policies used primarily for domestic economic stabilization and policies used to gain a trade advantage, there is not.

When Japan engages in quantitative easing to boost its economy and inflation expectations, sometimes at the very urging of U.S. officials, is that manipulation?

When the Federal Reserve engages in quantitative easing, with part of the expected benefit being downward exchange rate pressure and boosted exports, is that manipulation, or just domestic stabilization?

Is Germany's persistent trade surplus somehow partially caused by ongoing quantitative easing activities at the European Central Bank?

And, with respect to detection, despite the intent of the authors of this provision, accuracy is evidently not a concern.

I am sure that everyone—or at least those who support this provision—has looked at the recent exchange rate assessments for 2013 from the International Monetary Fund External Sector Report.

For Japan, one IMF method suggested 15-percent yen overvaluation, while another method suggested 15-percent undervaluation. Yet under the currency manipulation provision in this bill, IMF models and methods are what we are supposed to use to set trade sanctions.

For South Korea, the two IMF methodologies suggested undervaluation between around 7 percent and 20 percent. So when we want to set a punitive countervailing duty, what are our authorities supposed to do? Should they assume that South Korea benefited from currency undervaluation of 7 percent or 20 percent or some random number in between? Who knows.

This provision, unfortunately, simply won't work, since it assumes the existence of accurate knowledge and abilities to determine some fundamental equilibrium exchange rates that the IMF and the economics profession simply do not have.

Under the questionable provision of the bill that allows for investigation of currency undervaluation and potential ensuing trade actions, I believe the authors of the provision were overly heroic and mistaken in their belief about the precision of currency valuation methodology. The provision would appeal to models and methodologies, as described in IMF documents.

The problem is that even the IMF does not use those models and methodologies to make definitive judgments about appropriate currency values, which are inherently some of the most difficult things for economic models to identify. It would not be difficult for our trading partners to use precisely the same models and methodologies to make countervailing cases against Federal Reserve monetary policy, resulting in retaliatory trade sanctions and perhaps defensive currency interventions.

This is a clear road to trade wars and currency wars replete with competitive devaluations. Such a road is paved by the offending provision in the Customs bill, which basically gives our trading partners a template for their own accusations about currency manipulation and ensuing trade sanctions. This is problematic.

And while Senators in this Chamber would like to simply decree that our monetary policies are just domestic economic stabilization, while foreign monetary policies that may look similar are manipulation, such self-evaluations will not be acceptable in international trade and agreements.

I understand the desire among many of my colleagues to address currency manipulation, and I want to work with them on this issue. But I am convinced that the currency manipulation provision in the Customs bill simply will not work, and, when tried, it will simply give ammunition to our trading partners to consider engagement in trade wars, currency wars, competitive devaluations, and beggar-thy-neighbor monetary policies. This isn't what we

should be shooting for with our Nation's trade policy.

In addition to the currency language, there was another provision added during the markup that would require employers to report occupational classification data to State agencies when filing their quarterly wage reports. This is an entirely new burden that would be placed on employers throughout the country, added to all the other reporting burdens they already face, and would require brand new systems for reporting and collecting information. And in the end, it is not readily apparent just how valuable this new collected information will be.

According to CBO, this new requirement would cost employers throughout the country more than \$200 million between 2016 and 2020. Now, that may not seem like much compared to the numbers that get thrown around here in the Senate. But when we are talking about small businesses who struggle from month to month to cover their payrolls, it is a burden that, at least to me, doesn't appear to be necessary.

So once again, I am concerned about this provision and the impact it might have. However, despite the reservations I have about the flawed currency manipulation concepts and language and the unfunded mandate on employers, I believe it is important that we vote to move the Customs bill forward. Overall, this is a very good bill. A lot of work has gone into it, and I know that it reflects the priorities of a number of our colleagues and Members here in the Senate, including myself. That being the case, I plan to vote in favor of passing this legislation later on today, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Once again, I am very glad to see that we are making progress on moving these bills through the Senate. I wish to thank all of my colleagues—particularly those on the Finance Committee—who worked so hard on these bills to get them to this point.

These are important votes we are going to take today. I expect that both of these bills will receive broad bipartisan support, and I hope they will.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE AMTRAK
TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I address the matter at hand, I want to say that our hearts go out to the families of the men and women who lost their lives as a result of the Amtrak derailment last Tuesday. There are many still fighting injuries, and our thoughts and prayers are with them and their loved ones.

This was a commuter train. I have ridden it personally hundreds of times,

and it is one my colleagues have ridden.

It was a train full of people on their way home—to their families, to their loved ones, to the things they like to do. So our thoughts go out to all of them.

It will be our job as lawmakers to analyze why this happened, how we could have prevented it, and how we can best move forward to ensure such a tragedy is not repeated. Some of this is already underway. But the more pressing task in this moment of tragedy is for us to show solidarity with the victims and their families, and recognize their contributions—however large or small—to our national story.

New York lost a few native sons and daughters:

Abid Gilani, a senior vice president of Wells Fargo and a father of two.

Rachel Jacobs, an industry leader in her field, was heading home to her husband and 2-year-old son as CEO of a new job at an educational software company.

Jim Gaines, a software architect for the Associated Press, a beloved member of the staff, who was heading home to Plainsboro, NJ, to see his wife, 16-year-old son, and 11-year-old daughter.

We lost Dr. Derrick Griffith, a dean of student affairs at Medgar Evers College in Brooklyn, just a stone's throw away from where I live. He spent his entire adult life working to improve urban education.

And we lost a young man named Justin Zemser, who lived in Rockaway, in my old congressional district, and was studying at the U.S. Naval Academy. He was a tremendous young man—and I know that because I nominated him to the Naval Academy.

He was a valedictorian, an earnest big brother and mentor to two children with autism, as well as being captain of the varsity football team. His family mourns his loss and so does America. He would have done so much for our country.

Today, let us remember them. Tomorrow, let us work together so that their loss is not in vain.

Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to support the Customs bill before this body, particularly because of the strong language it contains on the crackdown on currency manipulation.

I have spoken many times on this subject in the Finance Committee and here on the floor because I am passionate about finally passing enforceable mechanisms for dealing with this malicious trade tactic. Why? Because I am deeply concerned by the plight of the middle class in today's economy, where globalization and free-trade agreements have accelerated a downward pressure on middle-class wages and forced entire industries to relocate to low-wage countries.

And I believe currency manipulation is one of the most significant emerging trade challenges this country faces, because it directly impacts wages and it directly impacts jobs.

As this Congress is soon to reengage on a fast-track for a massive free-trade agreement, now is the time to think deeply and comprehensively about our country's trade policy and how it impacts the broad middle of our economy.

To me and many of my colleagues, it does not make sense to move forward on the one hand with a blank check for free trade without passing strong worker protections on a parallel track. The global economy is a rough sea. We should not pass a trade package that forces the American worker to navigate those waters with a leaky boat and a deflated lifejacket.

So to me and to many of my colleagues, this Customs bill and the currency manipulation issue is unquestionably germane to the larger debate on trade. If the goal of TPP is to lure countries away from China, it makes perfect sense that, as part of the overall effort with TPP, we also go after Chinese currency manipulation, as well.

But beyond the question of relevance to this debate—which I believe is dispatched easily—this bill is substantively good trade policy. It contains several smart, balanced, effective measures to create a level playing field with our international trading partners.

First and foremost, currency manipulation is finally attacked head-on. Companies have asked me about this. CEOs of major companies have said to me: We cannot compete if we have one hand tied behind our back, which currency manipulation does.

Mr. President, may I ask my colleague a question, the ranking member?

How much time do you wish?

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague. I will be very brief.

Mr. SCHUMER. How much time is left for the minority?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight minutes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Seven?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eight.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would you please notify me when I have taken 3 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Big companies have been hurt. Small companies have been hurt. We have lost millions of jobs because of currency manipulation, which makes the exports from China and other countries about 33 percent cheaper and imports from America to China 33 percent more expensive.

I would say this: China seems to feel they can get away with any kind of trade misdeed, whether it is stealing intellectual property by cyber security or any other means, whether it is keeping out the best of American products, which they do until they can learn how to make them themselves in their protected market and then fight us everywhere else.

This currency bill will finally be the first real shot across the bow to China that you cannot keep getting away

from it. Their unfair trade practices hurt us in low-wage industries that were very important—shoes, clothing, toys, furniture. Those industries have already suffered. But if we do nothing, it will be the cream of American industry where our innovation and hard work is lost to China through unfair means, currency and other, whether it is tech or pharmaceuticals. Talk to the CEOs of these companies, and they will tell you China does not play fair. Talk to them, and they will tell you that the Chinese shrug their shoulders at what we have done up until now. We must do something—if not in the TPA bill, alongside it—that shows China once and for all they cannot get away with it. I fear that if we do not, in 10 years we will be saying the same thing about the industries that we say today. The customs measure, currency measure is bipartisan. The currency measure passed our committee with an overwhelming bipartisan vote, 18 to 8, and was supported by our ranking member, which I most appreciate. It passed the Senate in 2011 with 63 votes. It passed the House of Representatives with 348 votes. And a year and a half ago, in 2013, 60 Senators sent a letter to the President imploring the inclusion of enforceable currency provisions.

In conclusion, we have to think about the big picture when it comes to trade policy. If we move the ledger on one side, opening up our markets in foreign markets, we better make sure we adequately move the ledger on the other side to protect our workers, curb unfair deceptive practices, and give our small businesses the ability to compete in a global economy.

The fate of middle-class wages, middle-class jobs, and the very economy of this country hang in the balance. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I wish to also note that Senator SCHUMER has provided leadership on another very important enforcement issue. He introduced the committee to something a number of years ago known as honey laundering. What this involved was, in effect, we set up a sting operation. In particular, with respect to Senator SCHUMER's constituents and his interest in tough enforcement of the trade laws, the Chinese, as my colleagues will recall, were found guilty of unfair trading practices. In effect, they would just ship honey through other countries, such as Indonesia.

I want my colleague to know I am going to continue to work with him on a variety of issues.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. If I might, I thank the Senator for the great job he has done under very difficult circumstances. I think everyone on both sides of the aisle appreciates Senator WYDEN's intelligence, his bipartisanship, and his steadfastness.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank the Senator. I am going to wrap up as we move to this first vote in a few minutes and come back to what this debate is all about. We are starting, of course, with the issue of trade enforcement, but the big challenge is to show this country that we are putting in place a modern trade policy, a trade policy that sets aside once and for all the NAFTA playbook of the 1990s. This overall package will usher in a new and modern American trade policy. It must start with a tough, robust, effective trade enforcement package, many of the details of which I have outlined here this morning.

It is time also—and this will be part of our early work—to upgrade and renew our trade preference programs. The businesses and workers who rely on these programs are waiting for this Congress to act.

The first of these proposals enhances and extends the African Growth and Opportunity Act, referred to as AGOA. This has been the core of a close economic partnership between our country and a host of African nations for more than a decade. The proposal before the Senate will update that partnership in a way that is positive for all involved.

Back in the 1990s—once again returning to this theme, the NAFTA era—the United States had no meaningful trade policies to help African nations facing profound economic hardship climb back from the brink. This renewal of the AGOA law takes the program to the next level. AGOA will be simpler for businesses to use. There will be less redtape to worry about. African countries will be encouraged to zero in on strategies that can make the program more effective. It will be easier for the United States to crack down on the bad actors and verify that countries stay strictly in line with the criteria for eligibility. Most importantly, the proposal gives all concerned—workers, businesses, countries, and investors—a decade of certainty.

I am a real fan of this program. I believe it works for our country, for Sub-Saharan Africa, and it ought to be a cornerstone of our economic policy in the region.

The second part of this package of programs renews the program known as the generalized system of preferences. This is an economic win-win because it is a shot in the arm for developing countries, and it is a major boost for American manufacturers, including hundreds of them in my home State. One of those businesses in Oregon is Stackhouse Athletic in Salem, which will not only be able to create new jobs, they will be able to offer health benefits to their workers.

The extension of GSP will save American businesses an estimated \$2 million a day by reducing tariffs. The GSP program expired nearly 2 years ago. As a result, businesses in my home State of Oregon paid an extra \$4.9 million in tariffs. Renewing GSP would correct that issue and support as many

as 80,000 jobs with manufacturers, ports, farmers, and retail stores. That program would be extended by this legislation through 2017.

Finally, the Senate has an opportunity with this legislation to reaffirm our economic commitment to Haiti, one of our closest and most disadvantaged neighbors in the world. In my view, Senator NELSON of Florida has done very important work in this area. He has been our leader on this issue, and there is bipartisan understanding that now is the right time to extend the Haiti trade preferences to line them up with AGOA. These Haiti preferences also did not exist in the NAFTA era. Together, they support as many as 30,000 jobs in that country, and they help to drive investment and lift Haiti's economy in the long term.

I am confident the Senate will come together to extend this package of preference programs because they make economic sense for America, and they strengthen our ties with the developing countries around the world.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation with our first vote.

I will close by saying that today we begin to turn the corner on a fresh, modern trade policy for the times, a policy very different from the trade policy of the 1990s, the NAFTA era. Let's begin this effort—begin this effort—for a new 21st-century trade policy by passing the legislation we will be considering shortly, both parts.

Mr. President, 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. CRAPO. 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. Under the previous order, the clerk will now read the bills, as amended, for the third time.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bills to be read a third time.

The bills were read the third time.

VOTE ON H.R. 1295

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 1295, pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—97

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

NAYS—1

Lankford

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 1295, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

VOTE ON H.R. 644

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, H.R. 644, pass?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 20, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Ayotte	Collins	Hoeven
Baldwin	Coons	Isakson
Barrasso	Crapo	Kaine
Bennet	Donnelly	King
Blumenthal	Durbin	Kirk
Blunt	Enzi	Klobuchar
Booker	Ernst	Lankford
Boozman	Feinstein	Leahy
Boxer	Fischer	Manchin
Brown	Franken	Markey
Burr	Gillibrand	McCaskill
Cantwell	Graham	McConnell
Capito	Grassley	Menendez
Cardin	Hatch	Merkley
Carper	Heinrich	Mikulski
Casey	Heitkamp	Murkowski
Cochran	Hirono	Murphy

Murray	Roberts	Tester
Nelson	Rounds	Thune
Paul	Sanders	Udall
Perdue	Schatz	Vitter
Peters	Schumer	Warner
Portman	Scott	Warren
Reed	Sessions	Whitehouse
Reid	Shaheen	Wicker
Risch	Stabenow	Wyden

NAYS—20

Alexander	Flake	Moran
Coats	Gardner	Rubio
Corker	Heller	Sasse
Cornyn	Inhofe	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Tillis
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Daines	McCain	

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy	Sullivan
---------	----------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, H.R. 644, as amended, is passed.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO RECONSIDER CLOTURE VOTE ON MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote on which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 is agreed to.

Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, soon the Senate will vote once again on whether to begin debate on legislation that will help shape the future of America's trade policy, and, in addition, our role in the global economy. Needless to say, I was very disappointed when many of my Democratic colleagues voted to block debate on these important issues earlier this week. I am hoping for a much different result this afternoon.

This vote will set the stage for an important debate, quite likely the most significant debate that we will have in this Chamber all year. This debate will determine whether our Nation is willing and able to accept the challenges of the world economy or whether we continue in retreat and yield to the siren song of isolationism and protectionism.

It will determine whether we, as a nation, are able and willing to take the lead in setting the rules for the world economy or whether we will sit on the sidelines and let other countries create the rules that will govern trade in their regions for the foreseeable future. It should be pretty clear where I stand in this debate.

I support free trade and open markets for U.S. exporters and job creators. I support new opportunities for American farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, service providers, and the workers that they all employ. I support expanding American influence in the

most vibrant and strategic regions in the world. The best way for Congress to help our country achieve these goals is to renew trade promotion authority, or TPA, as soon as possible.

That is what we will be debating, if this vote goes the way I hope it will. TPA is the most effective tool in the Congress's trade arsenal. TPA ensures that Congress sets the objectives for our trade negotiators and that those negotiators will be able to reach the best deals possible. Without TPA we have no way of holding the administration accountable in trade negotiations and no way of making sure our country can get a good deal.

Getting TPA renewed is currently President Obama's top legislative priority. He is right and we should support our President on this issue.

As chairman of the Senate committee with jurisdiction over trade, it is a very high priority for me, as well. The TPA bill that will be brought before the Senate represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort to advance our Nation's trade interests.

The legislation we will be debating will also include provisions to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA, which I know is a high priority for many of my colleagues. It has taken a long time, a lot of work, and no small amount of compromise to get us to this point. People from both parties have put in enormous efforts just to get a chance to have this debate here on the Senate floor.

I want to thank my colleagues for their work thus far in this effort, but also to remind them that we are not there yet. Now, I am well aware that not all of my colleagues share my views on trade. I expect that they will make those views abundantly clear in the coming days, as they should. But to do that, we need to begin that debate. I am looking forward to it. The American people deserve a spirited debate on these issues.

Of course, they deserve an opportunity to see this Chamber function like the great deliberative body that it once was and under the current leadership is becoming again. Put simply, the obstruction has gone on long enough. It is time to get down to the serious business of legislating. I hope we can begin or continue that process today by voting in favor of the motion to proceed. I encourage all of my colleagues to do that so that we can get on this bill, debate it, have a full-fledged debate, and let the chips fall where they may.

If we do, I think we will all feel a lot better about what goes on around this place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE.) The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me respectfully disagree with my friend from Utah. Let me urge all Members to vote against what I believe to be a disastrous trade agreement, a trade agreement based on other trade agreements,

which, in fact, have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led to a race to the bottom.

Let me just briefly give four reasons—and there are many more. But let me just focus on four objective reasons why we should defeat this fast-track legislation and why we need to develop a whole new approach to trade that benefits American workers rather than just the CEOs of large multinational corporations.

Reason No. 1, this unfettered free-trade agreement with Vietnam, Malaysia, and 10 other countries follows in the footsteps of disastrous trade agreements such as NAFTA, CAFTA, Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China, and the South Korea Free Trade Agreement.

Any objective look at these trade agreements will tell us that they have cost us millions of decent-paying jobs and have led us to a race to the bottom, where American workers are forced to compete against workers in low-wage countries who are making pennies an hour.

Over and over again, supporters of these types of trade agreements have told us about how many jobs they would create, how beneficial it would be for the middle class and working class of this country. But over and over again, virtually everything they told us turned out to be wrong, and they are wrong again in terms of the TPP.

In 1993, President Bill Clinton promised that NAFTA would create 1 million American jobs in 5 years. Instead, NAFTA has led to the loss of almost 700,000 jobs. In 1999, we were promised that Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China would open the Chinese economy to American-made goods and services. Instead, as everybody who goes shopping knows—when you buy product after product made in China—that trade agreement has cost us some 2.7 million American jobs. I remember hearing all the accolades about free trade with China. They all turned out to be wrong.

In 2011, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce told us that the South Korea Free Trade Agreement would create some 280,000 jobs. Well, wrong again—instead, that agreement has led to the loss of some 75,000 jobs.

The reason for all of this is very simple. Why would an American corporation invest in this country, pay American workers 15, 18, 20 bucks an hour, provide health care, have to obey environmental regulations, and deal with trade unions, when they can go abroad, pay people pennies an hour, and not have to worry about the environment. That is, of course, what has happened.

These trade agreements have failed. TPP is based on these principles. It will be another failure. We should reject it for that reason.

Second point, in politics it is always interesting and important to know whose side different groups are on. You can learn a lot by who is supporting an agreement and by who is opposing the agreement.

Well, let's talk about who is supporting the TPP. It turns out that virtually every major multinational corporation, including many that have shut down plants in the United States and moved abroad—all of these multinationals think the TPP is a great idea. I am sure I can understand why it will be a great program for them. It will only accelerate their ability to shut down plants in America and move to low-wage countries abroad.

There is another group that is actively pushing for us to vote for the TPP. That is the pharmaceutical industry. As I think every American knows, the drug companies in this country charge our people here the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, but they love this legislation. They just love it because they think as a result of this legislation, they will be able to charge people all over the world, including in very poor countries, higher prices for their products.

Wall Street—surprise of all surprises—Wall Street loves this agreement. As we all remember, not so many years ago, the greed, recklessness, and illegal behavior of Wall Street caused the most significant economic recession since the Great Depression. But Wall Street loves this legislation because it will make it easier for them to sell esoteric, complicated financial products all over the world.

So those are some of the groups that think this legislation is wonderful, that we should vote for it.

Which are the groups and the organizations that oppose this legislation? Well, it turns out that every trade union in this country, unions representing over 20 million American workers, unions that are fighting every single day to get workers higher wages, better pay, better health care, are in strong opposition to this legislation.

This is what the trade union movement has to say about TPP:

Fast Track trade deals mean fewer jobs, lower wages, and a declining middle class. Fast Track has been used since the Nixon Administration to advance deals, like NAFTA, that are sold to the American people as job creation measures. But these deals, written largely by and for the world's largest corporations, don't create jobs; their main purpose isn't even related to trade, it's to enshrine rules that make it easier for firms to invest offshore and increase corporate influence over the global economy.

That is what the trade union movement in this country believes about this agreement. But it is not only the trade union movement that has opposed the TPP. Virtually every major environmental and scientific group in this country, groups such as the League of Conservation Voters, the Sierra Club, the Natural Resources Defense Council, the Union of Concerned Scientists, Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace, and 350.org oppose this legislation. This is what the environmental organizations have written about this bill:

As leading U.S. environmental and science organizations, we write to express our strong opposition to "fast track" trade promotion authority and to urge you to oppose any legislation that would limit the ability of Congress to ensure that trade pacts deliver benefits for communities, workers, public health, and the environment.

So we have trade union organizations representing some 20 million American workers that say we should not go forward with this agreement. We have organizations representing millions of people in the environmental community that say we should not go forward with this legislation.

Then we have religious groups, such as the Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), the United Methodist Church, and the Sisters of Mercy, that also are opposing this legislation. This is what they have written:

As people of faith, we call on all nations and government to uphold the dignity of all people. Yet modern trade agreements have harmed people, especially the most vulnerable in the United States and globally. . . . Trade, like the rest of the economy, must be a means of lifting people out of poverty and ensure a country's ability to protect the health, safety and wellbeing of their citizens and the planet. In recognition of your sacred task of stewardship over people and policies, we ask you to oppose fast track trade promotion authority for any trade agreement currently being negotiated.

So, on the one hand, you have all of the big-money organizations. You have every major multinational corporation in America. You have Wall Street, and you have the pharmaceutical industry. They say: Vote for this legislation.

On the other side, you have unions representing millions of Americans. You have environmental organizations representing millions more Americans, and you have religious organizations who say: Wait a second. This fast-track trade agreement may not be a good idea. Vote no.

So on the one hand, you have groups whose motivation is greed and profit, and on the other hand, you have organizations trying to protect working people, trying to protect the environment, trying to uphold basic religious values about human dignity saying no. Well, which side should we be on? I say we stand with those who are concerned about workers' rights, the environment, and moral values.

Let me give you another reason why we should oppose this trade agreement—and this is a provision that has gotten far too little attention—and that is the investor-state dispute settlement. That sounds like a highly technical term. What in God's Name does that mean? But let me try to explain what it does mean. What it does mean in English is that it would allow large multinational corporations to sue national, State, and local governments—not only in the United States but all over the world—if those governments pass legislation that hurts their expected future profits.

This, to me, is exactly about what this whole agreement stands for. It is not for raising wages or creating jobs.

It is to protect corporate profits. And, unbelievably, what this legislation is prepared to do is to undermine basic democracy in terms of what local communities around the world, States in the United States, and national governments do—whether it is the United States or any other government—if that undermines future profits of large multinational corporations. That is really extraordinary.

I thought that our job, as Members of the Senate, and the job of people in Australia who represent their government and people democratically elected all over the world—I had the idea that maybe their function was to represent, as best they could, the needs of the people who voted for them. I guess that is a radical and crazy idea.

What this bill says is that if legislation is passed by people who are democratically elected, those decisions—that legislation—can be brought to an independent tribunal, and those countries could have to pay huge fines if the legislation, which might protect health care or might protect the environment, undermines future profits of multinational corporations.

What an attack—not only on health and the environment—but it is an attack on the fundamental tenets of democracy. Our job is not to worry about future corporate profits. Our job is to worry about the needs of the American people. That is what elected governments all over the world are supposed to do.

Let me give you some examples—because we have not talked about this—of what is already going on around the world based on similar language to what will be in the TPP if we vote for it—similar language.

This is maybe the most outrageous example that I can give you, but there are many others. Philip Morris, one of the large tobacco companies in the world, is suing both Australia and Uruguay over labeling requirements for cigarettes.

Uruguay is this little country, and what they have done is they have been very aggressive in trying to protect their children and their people from the very harmful impacts of smoking.

Now, you know what. I happen to think that is a good thing. I think in America and all over the world we should do everything that we can to make sure that our kids are not hooked on nicotine and do not have to suffer heart disease, cancer, emphysema, and all of the other diseases related to smoking. I think our government should be very vigorous. We have done some things in our country. I think we should do more.

Uruguay, a little tiny country whose President turns out to be an oncologist, a guy who is worried about cancer, was trying to do everything it could to try to keep the kids in Uruguay from getting hooked on cigarettes. And what happened to Uruguay? Well, they were taken to this independent tribunal, composing, as I understand it, of three corporate lawyers,

because Philip Morris said: Hey, Uruguay, you are impacting our future profits. We want to get kids hooked onto nicotine. We want to sell our products to kids and to the people of Uruguay. By fighting us, passing legislation, and doing things that will make it harder for kids to smoke, you are ruining our profits.

This case is now resting in an independent tribunal. How insane is that—that a country trying to protect its kids from getting cancer is being sued by Philip Morris because it might cost them profits? So this is not only a health issue—in this case of cancer prevention—but this is an issue of basic democracy.

Do the people of Uruguay, do the people of Australia, do the people of any country have a right to be very vigorous in protecting the health of their kids and their citizens without worrying about being sued by a cigarette manufacturer that is trying to poison these kids with deadly products.

So this is not only a health issue, it is a basic democratic issue, and if Philip Morris wins this case, it will be sending a message to every government in the world that they can't be aggressive in doing things to protect their kids from cigarettes.

That is one example. Let me give another equally outrageous example. Under this investor-state provision, a French waste management firm—Veolia—is suing for \$110 million under the France-Egypt bilateral investment treaty over changes to Egypt's labor laws, including an increase in the minimum wage.

Now, let me be honest. I know nothing about Egypt's minimum wage, but I do think Egypt and every other country on Earth has a right to raise its minimum wage, if they think it makes sense, without worrying about being sued by some company that will have to pay higher wages. How crazy is that? So, again, not being terribly knowledgeable about domestic policies in Egypt, the idea that they are being sued for the crime of raising their minimum wage is, to me, beyond comprehension.

Again, this is just an example of what is happening now and what will only happen in an accelerated manner if we pass this agreement, but let me give one last example.

A Swedish energy company called Vattenfall launched a \$5 billion lawsuit over Germany's decision to phase out nuclear power. This initiative was implemented in response to the Fukushima disaster. Germany, last I knew, was an independent country, with an elected government, and they made a decision to phase out nuclear energy. Some people think it is a good idea, some think it is a bad idea, but last I heard that should be a decision of the German Government and the people who elected that government. The elected officials of Germany are not dummies. I presume they do what their people want them to do or they pay the political consequence.

But that was the decision of the elected officials of Germany. They said: Let's phase out nuclear power. Yet now they are being sued by a Swedish energy company, Vattenfall, for some \$5 billion because they made that decision.

Now, that is just what is going on right now. Think about what that means into the future. It means any government around the world or in this trade agreement, it means any State in the United States—if my State of Vermont, which is sensitive to the environment, decides to go forward on an environmental piece of legislation, some large corporation can go to an independent tribunal and say: Look, we are going to sue Vermont for \$1 billion because we wanted to do business there and their environmental regulations are impacting our ability to make a profit. That undermines what the State of Vermont or the State of Georgia or any other State chooses to do.

To me, it is just beyond comprehension that anybody would vote for that type of legislation. We can disagree with what they do in Egypt or disagree with what they do in Uruguay, we can disagree with what we do here, but to say an independent tribunal can provide billions of dollars in damages to a corporation because of a democratically made decision in the United States or any other country around the world is, to me, just incomprehensible.

The last point I would want to make deals with a health issue. Clearly, one of the health crises we face not only in America but around the world is the high cost of prescription drugs. In our country, if my memory is correct, some 25 percent of Americans who receive prescriptions from doctors are unable to afford to fill those prescriptions—someone goes to the doctor who diagnoses that individual and writes out a script, and the person says thank you very much but doesn't have the money to fill that script. It is bad in this country, but obviously it is much worse in very, very poor countries around the world.

What this agreement will do, among other things, if it is passed, is allow pharmaceutical companies to fight back against their brand-name products being converted into generics at much lower prices, so poor countries all over the world would have to struggle to come up with very high prices for medicine for people who don't have a whole lot of money.

In fact, that is why Doctors Without Borders has said—and Doctors Without Borders, as you may know, is a heroic group of doctors who, whenever there is a health care crisis around the world—whether it is Ebola in Africa or whatever—travel to those places and put their lives on the line. Some have died to provide medical treatment in the most difficult of circumstances to the poorest people around the world. They are really a heroic group of people. But Doctors Without Borders has said: "The TPP agreement is on track

to become the most harmful trade pact ever for access to medicines in developing countries."

So to my mind, the vote we are going to have in a short time is really a no-brainer. Are we dumb enough to continue down the road of failed trade policies? I would hope not. Do we think it is a good idea to be siding with corporate America, which has already used previous trade agreements to outsource millions of our jobs and thinks this agreement is just wonderful? Are we going to stand with Wall Street, whose greed has no limits? Are we going to stand with the pharmaceutical industry, which wants to sell drugs to people all over the world at a higher price or do we stand with unions, environmental groups, religious groups? Do we get involved in a trade agreement which allows corporations to undermine the democratic rights of countries that stand up for their environment, stand up for the health and well-being of their kids? Do we make it harder for poor people around the world to get the medicines they need?

This is a no-brainer. I would hope Members of the Senate send a resounding note to the corporate world that says you can't have it all; that we are going to pass trade agreements which protect working families, which protect the middle class, and which protect struggling people all over the world and we are going to vote no on fast-track and no on the TPP.

With that, Mr. President, 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. NELSON. 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. NELSON. Mr. President, the negotiating process has finally worked. Indeed, the spirit of four bills that passed the Finance Committee last week on this issue of trade—the spirit of that overwhelming bipartisan vote in the Finance Committee has now been carried out on the floor of the Senate and, in fact, is being carried out and will be so as we invoke the motion for cloture to go to the bill in the next vote that will occur in 30 minutes.

Certainly, trade preferences with regard to African countries, plus the trade preferences with regard to the poorest nation in the Western Hemisphere, Haiti, were not controversial at all. We passed that.

Certainly, the intent was that the safeguards we put in with regard to considering trade legislation put them on a Customs bill. That was intended to go along with the trade legislation, and now that has passed. Remember, all of this was bollixed up 2 or 3 days ago and we weren't going anywhere, but cooler minds prevailed and brought everybody together.

Now we go to the main event.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the minority has expired.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 additional minutes.

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

Mr. NELSON. I am very grateful to my colleague from Alabama for allowing me to do that.

Mr. President, the main event is the combined two bills of trade adjustment assistance, which is, if there is a disruption in a local economy or in a particular trade as a result of new international trade arrangements, there will be extra training for those workers to be trained into another job so they have a livelihood—that is common sense. That is combined with the other main event, which is a procedure to fast-track, ultimately, the two trade bills that are being negotiated by the United States, one in the Pacific area, the other one with Europe.

Fast-track means that when those trade bills come to the Congress for approval or disapproval, it will be done with an up-or-down vote. In other words, they can't be pecked to death with hundreds of amendments. That is why it is called fast-track. We are getting to the point where we are going to pass this as we get into the consideration of this legislation and amendments that will be coming to it.

At the end of the day, this Senator is quite confident we will be able to pass the fast-track, and it will have this Senator's support. Why? Simply because this Senator believes these trade agreements are in the interest of the United States.

I would conclude by saying that if we take, for example, the potential Pacific agreement, our military commanders have told us that, in fact, it is one of the best things we could do to get this trade agreement so China can't get in the economic door before the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be notified after 12 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will so notify the Senator.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I think that as we consider these trade agreements, it is appropriate that we recognize the importance of free trade, how it helps the world and helps the economy, and it is something I certainly support and have supported on a number of occasions in the past, including the last big trade bill, the Korean trade bill. I generally support—I actually do support the idea of comparative advantage, the gist of which is that if a nation can produce a product and sell it cheaper in another country, people over time will benefit from allowing that country's product to enter the country and being able to buy it at a lower price. That is comparative ad-

vantage, and I think it is sound in principle and generally sound in practice.

But the American workers are not doing well now. Wages have not increased since 2000—15 years. We have been down \$3,000 in median family income since 2009 and still down \$3,000. We have the lowest percentage of Americans in working years actually working today since the 1970s. So this is not a healthy environment for Americans. The market has done pretty well. Revenues and profits are holding pretty well, but the average American working person is not doing so well.

So what has happened? Is there a problem with currency manipulation, state-owned enterprises, subsidized foreign industries, people who dump products here below market cost or right at market cost being subsidized and supported by foreign countries? Do those alter the situation? Do they make it impossible for American businesses to compete, and if they go out of business, will our government bail them out in any way? We had one bailout after the financial collapse, but businesses are closing every day and they are not being bailed out today. We have seen substantial reductions in manufacturing around the country.

The Wall Street Journal just this week published an article, "The Case of the Vanishing Worker." That was in Monday's Wall Street Journal. It talked about the city of Decatur, IL, and detailed how their unemployment rate had gotten as high as 14 percent and it had dropped to almost half of that. It dropped down to almost half of that, so that looked pretty good, but when they looked at the numbers, they weren't so good.

What did they find? Even though the unemployment rate had fallen to almost half, how many people were actually working? Well, the answer was 8 percent fewer. So how can the unemployment rate fall and the number of people actually working fall at the same time? The answer is, as the article said, that people are moving away; they are dropping out of the workforce entirely; they are taking early retirement. That is what is happening too often in America.

So I think it is important for us to ask, how are these trade agreements benefiting the nation? How are they impacting American people? Let's ask some questions about it.

I asked the President questions on that. I sent him a letter, and I asked him a series of questions relating to wages. Will this trade agreement improve job prospects? Will it improve or make worse our trade deficits? Well, he hasn't answered those questions.

So I ask my colleagues: Has anybody demanded the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the administration to produce data to show that if we enter into another agreement involving 40 percent of the world's economy, involving some of our most capable and rigorous and toughest mercantilist competitors, what will it do

to the American workers' prospects? Is that a fair question to ask? We haven't seen any discussion of it, so far as I can tell. And let me tell you what the reason is.

Well, first, I will say this: I believe unfair trade competition is real. We talk to people out there every day, and they tell us about it. Dan DiMicco, former CEO of Nucor Steel, has one of his plants in Alabama. They have plants all over the country. He said that these trade agreements are in effect unilateral American trade disarmament and they enable foreign mercantilism. In other words, what he is saying is that we have acquiesced to the mercantilist nationalism emphasis of our trading partners. And why is that? Well, I figured it out. It has taken me a while to understand exactly what the theory is behind these trade agreements, and I don't believe I am in error when I discuss this.

Ross Kaminsky, writing in the American Spectator—a fine magazine—wrote a fine piece arguing for this TPA and the trade agreement. He was overwhelmingly saying it must be passed virtually regardless of what is in it.

I have to say his position is consistent with the position of the editorial page of the Wall Street Journal and many other economists, and we have to understand what it is. And I am losing confidence in this position. I am not sure it is a good position. As a matter of fact, I don't think it is. Maybe I am wrong, but I don't think it is.

This is what he says on trade:

It bears repeating—and repeating and repeating and repeating—that the benefit to American consumers of free trade is so large that it must trump any parochial interest of a particular industry or labor union or politician.

Because they lower the prices of imports, and even understanding that there will be a few losers, free trade agreements are almost always worth supporting regardless of what is offered to American exporters by the foreign trade partner.

Let me repeat that. He said they are almost always worthy of being entered into regardless of what is offered to the American exporters by the foreign trade partner.

I remember, as a skilled businessman, when I first came to the Senate, and Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, was before me. I was kind of nervous about it—a big maestro of the economy.

I asked him a simple question: Mr. Greenspan, what if a country wants to trade with us, wants to sell products to us but will buy zero products from us? They just want to sell to us but will buy nothing in return. Should we enter into a trade agreement with them?

What do you think he answered? I used to ask people in townhalls about this on occasion, and they would say he said no. But, but he said yes.

I am telling you, this is the movement—the mentality of the current trade agreement supporters, at least in the intellectual, corporate world and

the newspaper world and many within universities, certainly not all.

So is this a valid position? Are we subjecting our American people unfairly to competition that could cost jobs and so forth?

Well, I am losing confidence in those views. That is all I am saying, colleagues. And I think it is time for us to analyze what it means.

I would say that the steel industry of the United States is not a little bitty matter. Right now, U.S. Steel closed a big plant I think in Indiana or Ohio. They just laid off a thousand or so workers in Alabama. SSAB Steel in Alabama says they are facing ferocious dumping, it is threatening their market share and their ability to make the most modern plant in the world competitive, and they don't think it is fair.

How long do you have to sustain this to have dealt substantial damage to the American steel industry? Don't we need a steel industry? Where would steelworkers get jobs? They say: Well, they can take service jobs. Well, maybe so. Maybe they can work at the plumbing company. Maybe they can work at a hospital. Maybe they can work in a nursing home. Maybe there is other work that can be found. But at some point, do we not need a manufacturing capability that provides a lot more than a service job—manufacturing capabilities, for example, that provide demand for products, demand for supplies, demand for workers who supply those plants and have ripple effects much larger than a person just repairing faucets. I think we have to ask that question in a very serious way.

I said earlier I voted for the Korean trade pact. I did not have a lot of trouble voting for that at the time. I thought it was going to be fine. Maybe it is OK. Maybe the pact is going to be, sometime in the future, positive for the United States.

The Koreans, like the Japanese, are good trading people. They are allies around the world on security agreements. I am not putting the Koreans down. The Koreans are tough trade negotiators. They have a mercantilist philosophy.

What happened before that agreement was passed? President Obama promised that the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement would increase U.S. goods exports to Korea by \$10 billion to \$11 billion. However, since the deal was ratified in 2012, I believe it was, our exports rose only \$0.8 billion—less than \$1 billion, not \$10 billion. Does that make any difference?

We just bring in from abroad and our trading partners don't allow exports abroad? What about the Korean imports to the United States? They rose more than \$12 billion, widening our trade gap, almost doubling our trade.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 12 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe I had up to 15 to 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is still time until 2. We are just notifying you of the 12 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. I see my colleague from Louisiana. If he is ready to speak, I will wrap up.

Mr. VITTER. I do not desire to speak.

Mr. SESSIONS. I will wrap up, Mr. President.

What about the Census Department's report on the U.S. trade deficit of South Korea? They found it has almost doubled since the passage of the agreement. In 2011, the United States had a \$13.2 billion trade deficit with South Korea—not a healthy relationship there—but in 2014, it was \$25 billion.

Furthermore, the deficit is currently 66 percent higher so far this year than it was at the same point last year. March was the largest trade deficit we have had in a very long time. The first quarter, we had a huge deficit. I believe the March trade deficit was the largest worldwide that we have had in over 6 years. It was almost the highest ever.

I am going to support moving forward to discuss this trade bill. There will be some amendments that I would seek to offer. If that is the will of the Congress, those will pass; if not, they will not pass. But fundamentally I do believe it is time for the American people to expect their political leaders to give them some real analysis about what the results of these trade agreements are going to be. Will it help raise wages? Will it create increasing job prospects? Would it increase or reduce our trade deficit? Trade deficits represent a drain and a negative pull on the American economy. Some say they do not make much difference, but they do. It does impact adversely GDP. With regard to those questions, I think we need some answers. I will be asking those as we go forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I wish to share a few more thoughts with my colleagues.

In 2014, net exports—net exports subtracted 1.5 percent from fourth-quarter GDP. That is a lot. GDP growth in the fourth quarter was subtracted by—excuse me, 1.15 percent. That is more than \$500 billion. That is enough to fund a highway reauthorization program for a long time.

The problem is that in the short run, Americans tend to be losing jobs as a result of trade agreements; whereas, long-term unemployed people have a difficult time finding work. I would say I believe in trade, but it is not a religion with me. I believe it is a religion when somebody says that you should enter into a trade agreement with anybody, opening your markets totally without demanding anything in return for that.

I have to tell you, as I just read from others—it is clearly the policy of the Wall Street Journal—that is good policy, that you should enter into a trade agreement whether or not your partner will allow you to sell anything at all to them. I say good negotiations in a con-

tract are, which a trade negotiation is, if we open our markets, our competitors ought to open theirs sufficiently. Too often we have the problems that arise from nontariff barriers that are impacting the ability of American businesses to sell products in their country. So even if they reduce their tariff, their ability to sell products is blocked by other nontariff matters, all of which I think we can discuss in the weeks to come.

Let's be sure we understand where this trade agreement is taking us, what the philosophy and approach behind it is, and let's be sure it serves the interests of the American people first.

Mr. President, 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. SESSIONS. 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. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the vote now, 5 minutes earlier than we planned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider the vote on which cloture was not invoked on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

Mitch McConnell, Bob Corker, Joni Ernst, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, Thad Cochran, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, John McCain, James Lankford, Patrick J. Toomey, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, David Vitter, Ben Sasse.

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 proceed to H.R. 1314, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Leg.]

YEAS—65

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

NAYS—33

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

NOT VOTING—2

Cassidy Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 65, the nays are 33.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

DON'T TAX OUR FALLEN PUBLIC SAFETY HEROES ACT

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 606) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain compensation received by public safety officers and their dependents from gross income.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed; that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (H.R. 606) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I am very honored to be here today with my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator SHAHEEN. We worked together on this important bill that has just passed the Senate and had previously passed the House of Representatives.

This week is National Police Week. We were honored to receive law enforcement officers representing more than 20 agencies in New Hampshire, including the Brentwood police chief and many members of his department. They are here joining thousands of officers and families of law enforcement to remember and honor those who have given the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty to keep the rest of us safe.

Last night during a candlelight vigil, 273 fallen officers from across the Nation whose names were added this week to the national memorial were honored, including Officer Stephen Arkell from New Hampshire, from the Brentwood Police Department, who lost his life in the line of duty a year ago Tuesday. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with Officer Arkell's family and with the Brentwood Police Department.

Unfortunately, more than a year after his death, his family is still waiting for their survivor benefits. We are here today to discuss the bill that was just passed by the Senate—H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act—which Senator SHAHEEN and I worked on together.

Recently, Senator SHAHEEN and I had the opportunity to sit down and have a roundtable with many law enforcement officers, fire chiefs and firefighters from our State. We heard many of the challenges that the families of those law enforcement officers and firefighters who lost their lives in the line of duty face to get the survivor benefits that they should receive.

One of those challenges is the fact that while survivor benefits for the families of our fallen firefighters and law enforcement officers are tax free, unfortunately, ambiguity in the tax has forced families to apply for private letter rulings from the IRS to have that clarified. Our bill will ensure that they no longer have to go through this bureaucratic step when it comes to their survivors' benefits.

It ensures that the benefits their survivors receive for the sacrifice they have made are not taxed under the Internal Revenue Code. These benefits are intended to help those families and make sure that when they go through this incredibly tragic loss, they are able to continue with their lives.

I thank Congressman ERIK PAULSEN from Minnesota for working with us to get this bill passed through the House of Representatives.

I also thank Senators TOOMEY and CARDIN for their work in the Senate Finance Committee to pass this legislation and Senate Finance Committee

Chairman HATCH and Ranking Member WYDEN for their work to help get this important legislation passed.

I most of all thank my colleague Senator SHAHEEN because this issue is so important to law enforcement officers and firefighters in New Hampshire. Our public safety officers who go out every single day on our behalf—every hour, every holiday, every weekend—to make sure we are safe. When, unfortunately, we lose one of them in the line of duty, as we experienced in New Hampshire too recently, we want to make sure those families are taken care of. That is what this bill does—it makes sure that those families do not have to wait to receive benefits they should receive and that they do not have to go through a rigamarole with the IRS to make sure these benefits are not taxed.

I also want to mention that, in New Hampshire, not only did we unfortunately lose Patrolman Stephen Arkell a year ago, but in 2012 we also lost Greenland Chief of Police Mike Maloney, who was about to retire. Both of those families have been down here for National Police Week. Our prayers continue to be with their families and the families of every single law enforcement officer and firefighter who makes sure we are safe every single day.

I am so glad this legislation passed during National Police Week. We are going to continue to work together to make sure that the families of public safety officers that lose their lives in the line of duty do not have to go through any bureaucratic red tape to get their survivor benefits.

I want to thank Senator SHAHEEN for her work on this issue.

I yield to Senator SHAHEEN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am very pleased to be here to join my colleague Senator AYOTTE in applauding the passage in both the House and the Senate—today in the Senate—of H.R. 606, the Don't Tax Our Fallen Public Safety Heroes Act.

As Senator AYOTTE said so eloquently, this is legislation we have worked on for over a year. It was first introduced in the last Congress. Now, it is finally on its way to the President's desk to become law, and it couldn't be happening at a more important time.

This is National Police Week, but maybe more important for New Hampshire, this week we celebrate the memory of Officer Stephen Arkell of Brentwood. He was killed in the line of duty just a year ago this week. Last night, Officer Arkell's name was added to the Roll of Honor of police officers killed in the line of duty at the National Law Enforcement Memorial in Washington, DC.

Officer Arkell was not only a terrific police officer, he was a very good and decent man. As I read in one newspaper, he was the kind of police officer who would rather write a warning than

a ticket, and he aimed to end fights with words instead of handcuffs.

Well, it has been a full year since we lost Officer Arkell. We don't forget, and we will never forget his example of courageous public service. Day in and day out, our public safety officers, our police, our firefighters, and their families make enormous sacrifices.

Now, family members fully understand the dangers of their spouses' jobs. They live with that constant worry. But when the worst happens in the line of duty to a loved one, the last thing a surviving family should have to worry about is navigating the Federal Tax Code. For too long, families of police officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty have had to wrangle with the IRS to exempt death benefits from taxation. They have had to hire lawyers and wait years for a ruling from the IRS and, in the meantime, their urgently needed benefits are held up.

This is just unacceptable, and today it ends. Thankfully, the House and Senate have passed a bill to exempt these death benefits from taxation, ending any ambiguity that may have existed. So this is legislation that should not just help the Arkell family, but it should help families across this country.

I applaud the work of my colleague Senator AYOTTE on this bill, all of our colleagues in the Senate who have helped to make this happen and also those in the House who understood the need to help support our fallen public safety heroes. When the President signs this bill into law, this problem will finally be cleared up once and for all.

Again, I thank my colleague Senator AYOTTE for all of her work on this issue. I am delighted it is finally done and look forward to making sure it gets implemented in a way that continues to support the surviving families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before I speak on the trade legislation—and the distinguished chairman of the committee is on the floor as well—I wish to note that the Finance Committee, under the leadership of Chairman HATCH, has already passed a version of this important legislation.

Now we have taken up the House bill—our companion legislation. I congratulate both of my colleagues. Senator SHAHEEN has talked to me about this a number of times. I know Senator AYOTTE is very interested in it as well. I congratulate both of them.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, if I could make my remarks about trade, Chairman HATCH has graciously al-

lowed me to make a few comments at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, with the votes that have been cast today in the Senate, the Senate has begun to develop a powerful and bipartisan message that the trade policy of the 1990s will be unacceptable in 2015.

The Customs and Enforcement package passed this morning goes a long way toward breaking new ground. We will be talking about the final two elements of the overall trade package, trade promotion authority, and trade adjustment assistance. But until we are done with this debate, I will be referring to the chart next to me because what we will be outlining are all of the specific areas that demonstrate that this legislation is going to finally put the 1990s and NAFTA in the rearview mirror and fix many of its flaws.

For example, in the NAFTA era, American priorities, like rights for working families and environmental protection, were an afterthought, and they were stuck in unenforceable side agreements. With this legislation, they will be bedrock elements of future trade agreements. Back in those NAFTA days, the United States pretty much just asked our trading partners to enforce their own labor and environmental laws, and then we sort of hoped for the best.

The trade promotion act says that if a trading partner's laws fall short, they are going to be required to pass new laws to fix the problem, and for the first time, these labor and environmental protections will be fully enforceable, enforceable because they are backed by the threat of trade sanctions.

So the NAFTA-era policies, colleagues, had no teeth. In effect, this legislation raises the global bar on labor rights and environmental protection.

We are going to hear a lot about how somehow this is just more of the same, and it is going to promote a race to the bottom. What we intend to spell out in the days ahead is how this creates new momentum to push our standards up, rather than promote a race to the bottom.

For the first time, I wish to note—with the support of our colleagues, the outstanding work done by our colleague from Maryland, BEN CARDIN—now human rights will be a negotiating objective for our future trade agreements.

Back in the NAFTA era, the United States fought for intellectual property protection for drugmakers, but nobody was trying to do much of anything to look for people stuck in hardship around the world who needed access to affordable medicine. That also will change with this legislation.

The old NAFTA playbook was written in a time when cell phones were about as big as bricks and Internet commerce was still a dream. Today, it is right at the heart of our economy.

So our new approach to trade is going to help cement American leadership in the digital economy. Even now, in 2015, you have repressive governments in China, Russia, and elsewhere building digital walls that block the free flow of information and commerce online. If that trend continues, it would chop the Internet up into small, country-sized pieces. In my view, the Internet is the shipping lane of the 21st century, and products sent around the world in bits and bytes are just as important as products packaged into shipping containers and sent across the oceans. I strongly believe this is the best chance to fix what NAFTA got wrong and introduce a new day in American trade policy.

The only way for our country to defend an open Internet, promote access to affordable medicine, protect our values on labor standards, environmental protections, and human rights is to fight for them as part of our trade negotiations. Certainly nobody else is going to pick up the American banner and fight for those kinds of progressive American values in the way we can. In fact, it is my view that if our country fails to lead the way, it will be China that steps in to write rules, rules that very likely could hurt American workers and our exporters. So we have to engage with modern, progressive trade policies and with a higher bar for trade agreements.

I recognize there are skeptics with doubts about trade deals and the process of moving them through Congress. I think we can still take steps to try to reach out to those who have been critical about past trade policy, find common ground, and lock those new policies into the future way in which we make a trade law.

I have indicated for many months that I think those who are skeptical about our trade policies have a valid point when they talk about the excessive secrecy that has so often accompanied much of the trade discussion. My view has been, if you believe strongly in the benefits of trade—and particularly those high-skilled, high-wage export jobs, and you want more of them—why in the world would you want to have all of this secrecy that just makes Americans so aware of the fact that something isn't coming to light? They are wondering whether there is a reason something has been hidden.

Now, it has been too common that Oregonians and other Americans have no way of knowing what is on the table in trade talks or how they would be affected. That was a problem with NAFTA, and it has been a problem that has continued over the years.

There is no question about the need for protecting some of the details in our trade negotiations. I often say at a townhall meeting that nobody is talking about giving out the secret sauce in some particular product. But today Americans have reasonable expectations to be able to fire up their computer, click open their browser, and

learn about the public policies that affect them and their families.

It is time to close the book on those days when Americans were kept in the dark on trade. The reality is, under the old playbook, that NAFTA playbook, the President could be handed an agreement for signature and put pen to paper right away.

So nothing illustrates better than the changes that Chairman HATCH, I, and Chairman RYAN have worked on to put in place a fresh set of policies to ensure that the American people are no longer in the dark with respect to trade.

Under this legislation, the President, by law, will have to make the full text of trade deals public for 60 days before a President can sign them. When you factor in the Congress, agreements would be public for as many as 100 days before they are voted on and often more.

So what that means is, if you live in West Virginia, Utah, Oregon or Alaska, you will be able to come to one of our community meetings and have in your hands the trade agreement, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership, for more than 3 months before your Senator or your Member of the House has cast a vote on them. For more than 3 months, the American people will have the actual text, starting with the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. I think that is a long overdue change. I will say, that is a very dramatic change. That is part of the reason why I note that this TPA is certainly not one that resembles the NAFTA era on transparency.

Finally, on the transparency front, long before the deals are finalized, our trade officials would be required to give detailed and public updates on what is at stake in the negotiations. Every Member of Congress will have access to the full text, from beginning to end, and the doors will be open for Members to attend negotiating sessions and briefings.

Perhaps the most important new tool in this legislation is a new procedure for hitting the brakes on bad trade deals before they reach the Senate or House floor. If a trade deal doesn't meet the high bar the Congress sets under this progressive, modern approach, it will be a whole lot easier to shut it down. It is my view that protecting that ability makes the process more democratic, and all of those upgrades will close the door on the 1990s and NAFTA once and for all.

The second matter at hand now is the support system for American workers known as trade adjustment assistance, and paired with that program is the health coverage tax credit.

When times are tough for workers and industries affected by trade, the health coverage credit guarantees that those persons and their families will still be able to see their doctors. And trade adjustment assistance is there to help with job training and financial support. It is a lifeline for more than

100,000 Americans today, including 3,000 in Oregon, and it helps to guarantee that those workers and their families have a springboard to a new set of opportunities where they can have for themselves and their families a new opportunity for good-paying jobs and a chance to get ahead.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance Program has spent the last few years working at reduced capacity. That would change with this legislation. Trade adjustment assistance would be back at full strength in the year 2021 with a level of funding the administration says will cover everybody who qualifies. Once again the program would bring service workers into the mix because it is not just manufacturing employees who face competition from abroad. Trade adjustment assistance takes into account competition that comes from anywhere, including China and India, instead of just a select list of countries.

I want to be clear that the Senate is not voting today to give the green light to the Trans-Pacific Partnership or any other trade agreement. As I see it, this is legislation which raises the bar for trade deals and challenges our negotiators to meet it. It will go further than ever before in stripping the secrecy out of trade policy and will provide new accountability by protecting our ability to slam the brakes on trade deals that don't work for our hard-working middle class.

When you put these vast improvements together with a next-level enforcement system, it is my view that you have a long-overdue progressive, modern approach that sets aside the NAFTA playbook. This is a plan which will help get trade done right so that it works better for all Americans, whether they are a service professional, a business owner, or a worker who punches the time clock at the end of the day.

I will close with just a short statement about why this is especially timely right now. All the evidence suggests that in 2025 there are going to be 1 billion middle-class workers in the developing world. These are going to be workers with money to spend. They are going to buy computers and helicopters and bicycles, their companies will buy planes, and the list goes on and on. It is my hope and I think the hope of every Member of the Senate that we have a trade policy that ensures our workers can have the opportunity to export what we make here and what we grow here—the products of the United States—to this 1-billion-person middle-class market.

Let's take this opportunity—a bipartisan opportunity—to have a fresh new trade policy that increases the prospect of having American workers, who are the best and most competitive workers on the planet, sell the goods and services they make and deliver them to that enormous market that wants to buy American, wants to buy Oregon. It just seems to me to be obvi-

ous that we should take the opportunity to tap the potential of that market.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, while my colleague from Oregon is still on the floor, I want to thank him for his leadership through these discussions over these past several days on the floor and longer prior to that. He has been a leader in trying to thread the needle, and it has been a little bit harder, but I appreciate the fact that we are here today and hopefully moving forward to that agreement that will allow us as a nation to be the best we can and to engage in a level of trade that is fair, free, and really of great benefit to us as a nation. I thank him for that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Madam President, I too want to speak about the trade promotion authority and some of the issues associated with it, but I first want to speak briefly and acknowledge the comments made by my colleagues from New Hampshire when they spoke about National Police Week and honoring those brave men and women who serve us day in and day out, those who go where many of us would choose not to, whose families worry about them, and those who have fallen in the line of their service.

This is National Police Week in the Nation's Capital and across America. Each year during National Police Week I honor the men and women of law enforcement who have given their lives in the line of duty. In previous Police Week speeches I have taken note of the sad coincidence that a spate of line-of-duty casualties seems to happen in the days and weeks leading up to National Police Week.

This year, unfortunately, is no exception. Last weekend the Nation was shocked by the shooting of two members of the Hattiesburg, MS Police Department. A week ago two communities lost law enforcement officers bearing the last name of Moore—Detective Brian Moore of the New York Police Department and Sergeant Greg Moore of Coeur d'Alene, ID. They are among 45 law enforcement heroes who have died in the line of duty this year alone. I extend my condolences to their families and to their communities on these tragic losses. And I extend my support to my colleagues from the States of Idaho, Mississippi and New York who share in the grief of their communities. In the U.S. Senate we take the loss of a first responder personally for we regard these public servants as members of our own extended families.

During National Police Week we honor and remember the 117 law enforcement officers lost in 2014. Their names were read at a candlelight vigil on Judiciary Square Wednesday evening and their memories will be

honored at the Peace Officers Memorial Service on the Capitol grounds on Friday. This week the families and colleagues of these 117 officers are gathered in Alexandria at the Police Survivors Seminar sponsored by Concerns of Police Survivors, where they will gain comfort from a community of survivors who have walked in their steps. This week's events are very important steps in the lengthy journey our families face to heal their losses. But it is a vital step.

I have attended the Police Survivors Seminar and cannot say enough good things about Concerns of Police Survivors and Suzie Sawyer, its founding executive director, who set the standard for caring and healing. Although Suzie claims to have retired, when we face a law enforcement tragedy in the State of Alaska I am comforted by the fact that her phone number is still in my speed dial. Sadly I had an opportunity to use it in 2014.

Last evening I attended the candlelight vigil as I have in past years to honor fallen officers from the State of Alaska. Joined on the dais by the Attorney General of the United States and the Secretary of Homeland Security I was honored to read the names of two Alaska State Troopers who gave their lives while protecting the Native Village of Tanana in 2014. Trooper Sergeant P. Scott Johnson and Trooper Gabriel Lenox Rich at the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial.

I have spoken before about the unique dangers that are presented when law enforcement officers perform their duties in Alaska Native villages. No roads connected most of these villages to the nearest trooper post which can be hundreds of miles away, accessible only by air or boat and only then when the weather cooperates. And that was the case when Sergeant Johnson and Trooper Rich were ambushed in the village as they sought to apprehend an individual who was driving while intoxicated in the village and brandished a weapon at the unarmed village public safety officer.

There is no consoling those who remember the lives and passions of Scott and Gabe. But it matters that their life stories were not forgotten. Fallen law enforcement officers are heroes for the way they live their lives. And at last night's observance the stories of Scott and Gabe were an integral part of the event. Attorney General Loretta Lynch spoke to their heroism as did the event organizers. For the first time I can remember you could see the distinctive tunics worn by our Alaska State Troopers among the crowd of 10,000, and as the event ended my staff encountered two members of the Fairbanks Police Department in uniform on the streets of downtown Washington. They traveled at their own expense to pay their respects to two individuals from Interior Alaska who were widely respected by area wide law enforcement. Sergeant Johnson was well known as a "cop's cop". He was well

known as both a drug expert and a tactical expert.

The Fairbanks officers mentioned that Scott was gracious with his time and his expertise—providing training to the Fairbanks Police Department that otherwise would have cost tens of thousands of dollars. Gabe Rich was a young guy and mentored by the finest of Alaska's finest—Sergeant Johnson—and he demonstrated great potential. Both lived their lives as model Alaska State Troopers.

Service as an Alaska State Trooper is regarded as a huge deal in our State. I am reminded that there are 700,000 law enforcement officers across the country but only 400 have what it takes to be Alaska State Troopers. Guardians of the last frontier.

In May I came to the floor to discuss the lives of Scott and Gabe and the families they left behind. Today I would like to pay homage to the organization they were a valuable part of and devoted their lives to. And I pay homage to the creed they willfully and enthusiastically chose to live their lives by.

I ask unanimous consent that the Creed of the Alaska State Trooper be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CREED OF AN ALASKA STATE TROOPER

From the beginning, society has needed a special few willing to face evil and run toward harm for the sake of others. I am one of those few. I am an Alaska State Trooper. My environment is harsh, vast and unforgiving. I thrive in it. My state is beautiful, majestic and the last of its kind. I will protect it. My integrity is absolute. My loyalty is to what is ethical, right and true. My courage will not falter. Fear does not control me. I am the master of my actions and emotions, regardless of circumstance. When action is needed, I will act. If I fail, I will get back up. If I fail, I will try again. I will either find a way or make one I will never give up. I will be physically superior, mentally tougher and more tenacious than those determined to bring harm to others. I will enhance my knowledge and proficiency every day. My training will never cease. I am a quiet professional. I do not seek recognition for my actions. I accept and will overcome the mental and physical hazards of my profession. I will do what is necessary to place the needs of others before my own. Because I endure this, others won't have to. Titles will not define me. No man will determine my worth. I will live my life according to the creed I have written on my heart, regardless of my position, rank or title. I will stand on the shoulders of those who have gone before me. I am honor bound to maintain the proud traditions of Alaska's finest. The fallen are honored by my actions and I commit myself daily to the mighty cause of preserving this honor. I am an Alaska State Trooper.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I will close with these words which appear at the gates to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. The words of President George H.W. Bush: "Carved on these walls is the story of America, of a continuing quest to preserve both democracy and decency, and to protect a national treasure that we call the Amer-

ican dream." Last evening the names of Patrick Scott Johnson and Gabriel Lenox Rich were carved into those walls. A reminder, once again, that in valor there is hope.

Madam President, returning to the issue of trade in my State of Alaska, we are here to debate trade promotion authority. We have had an opportunity to proceed to this measure. I was pleased to be able to vote to advance it earlier this week and again today, and I will continue to support free trade.

In my State, which is separated from the contiguous 48 States, our trade is based primarily with those to the west in Asia. Most of our trade does not go to the lower 48 States. So when we think about our trading partners, for Alaskans, it is international trade. International trade in our State supports about 1 in 5 jobs—over 90,000 Alaskan jobs. Of those who are exporters, about 70 percent are small- and medium-sized companies. These are men and women who are engaged in a very sophisticated level of trade overseas, but many of them are relatively small. We are very vigorous in our trade with Japan, South Korea, and China, but we also have good relationships, of course, with our friends in Europe and elsewhere around the globe.

In 2013, the countries that are negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership—the TPP—and the TTIP agreements comprised about 54 percent of Alaska's exported goods. This is a significant part of what we look to for our exports. As we look to the TPP and the benefits that it will accrue, I think our State is looking to clearly strengthen these relationships as well as open new markets for Alaska's exports.

About 34,000 Alaska jobs are supported by trade with TPP countries. Thirty-six percent of Alaska's goods are exported to TPP countries, and more than 50 TPP companies have investments within the State of Alaska.

One of our longest and more established trading partners—Japan—is obviously not a current U.S. FTA partner, but the TPP negotiations will provide an avenue for removing some of the trade barriers we see with Japan and will allow us additional economic opportunities within the State of Alaska, specifically as it relates to our fish, our fisheries, and our frozen fish. Current tariff rates to export frozen fish and prepared crabs to Japan are about 10 percent, so a free-trade agreement will lower these tariffs and increase access to Japan's seafood market. This is something we care a great deal about, and it has been a very longstanding partnership and relationship.

Today, I want to move from some of the issues relating to my State and what opportunities there will be for us with the prospect of trade promotion authority moving forward and I want to draw attention to a related issue. This is an issue that is outdated when

it comes to exports and, very specifically, a ban on exports. What I am referring to is the current ban, the prohibition on crude oil exports. This absolutely runs counter to the principle of free trade as well as the notion that we should stand ready to help our allies, to help our friends for the sake of global security.

We talk a lot about national security. We talk a lot about what more we can do to provide for national security and the geopolitics and how we can be of help to our friends and allies. Well, one way we can demonstrate our willingness to help is by lifting this decades-old ban, this prohibition on our crude oil and allow for exports.

I want to share with my colleagues five quick facts they may or may not know about our Nation's history of oil exports, because while we have this ban in place—and it has been in place since the mid-1970s—there is a history that I think is important.

The first fact goes back to World War II. The United States exported tens of millions of barrels of crude oil to our allies in World War II, and I am talking about Canada, the United Kingdom, India, and Australia. We were engaged in a very robust level of exports to our friends during World War II.

Second fact: When Egypt seized control of the Suez Canal, President Eisenhower moved quickly, and he ordered American oil to relieve what was called Europe's oil famine. That was pretty immediate, that was pretty direct, and it was targeted to help our allies and friends at that time.

Third fact: When Rhodesia cut off the flow of oil to Zambia in 1965, America stood with Britain to provide assistance. We delivered petroleum products in the Zambian airlift. So we were there in 1965 when Zambia needed that assistance.

Then, in the 1970s, facing a threat from multiple regimes, Israel secured an agreement from the United States to supply it with oil in the event of a national emergency. So this agreement was made back in 1975. This was under the administration of President Ford, and that agreement was that the United States would stand with our friend and ally and provide oil in the event that their sources were threatened, that Israel was threatened.

That agreement stood through President Ford's administration, President Carter's, President Bill Clinton's, President George Bush's, and with President Obama's administration. So it is an agreement that has endured—that we will stand by our friend Israel in providing it with a source of oil in the event of a national emergency. This is something where we just got the administration to sign off on this just literally a month or so ago, to reaffirm that agreement.

Then, the fifth fact here is that former Ambassador Carlos Pascual and others have testified before our energy committee that the sanctions against Iran—which brought Iran to the table—

worked. They worked because of rising U.S. oil production. He went further to say that we were hamstrung by our inability to export it.

We have heard this consistently in the energy committee. We heard this discussed on the floor of the Senate the past couple of weeks when we were talking about the Iran deal. Today, we are in a position where our friends, our trading partners, and our allies are again asking for our assistance. We have the resource.

Some would say we are awash in oil right now. The production we have seen has been nothing short of phenomenal. But we are tied. We are limited in our ability to move it beyond our shores. Our allies are looking at us, and they are in the grips of tension.

Look at our friends and allies in Poland. Poland is 96-percent dependent on Russia for their oil. Don't we think that Poland would rather receive their oil from their friend the United States? Poland has been there with us when it comes to national missile defense. With just about every engagement we have had, Poland has been there for us. Wouldn't it be nice for us to be there for our friend Poland?

Just a couple weeks ago, we had the Prime Minister of Japan here, Mr. Abe. Iran is still supplying oil to Japan, despite those sanctions. Japan needs a source of oil. Don't we think that Japan would much rather receive oil from the United States—more crude from the United States?

I think we recognize the world has changed out there. There are new alliances, there are new threats, there are new hopes, and there are new fears. It remains my hope that, while the world may change, our role as a global leader has not eroded. And one way—one clear, sure way—we can ensure that it hasn't eroded is to help our friends and to use our resource as a national strategic asset to help our friends and allies.

The whole idea that oil exports are still prohibited is just mind-boggling. I have been working on this now for over a year. We have been encouraging different reports so people really understand this issue and wrap their minds around it, because to change a policy that has been in place for decades takes understanding and education. I am willing to give that time, but I also appreciate that the policy that is in place right now just doesn't make sense.

The Commerce Department retains a list of commodities that are defined in short simply, and they call this the Short Supply Controls. Historically, these controls were generally not blanket prohibitions. They were on things such as aluminum, copper, iron, steel scrap, nickel, selenium, and the polio vaccine.

But it is interesting—we look at that Short Supply Controls list right now, and there are three items on that list. The first, obviously, is crude oil; the second is western red cedar; and the

third is horses for export by sea intended for slaughter.

Now, there is a small caveat, because there is a prohibition of exports of petroleum products that would come from the Naval Petroleum Reserve, but it is very small. So really what we are talking about and the three items that are on this Short Supply Controls list—in other words, prohibited—are oil, cedar, and horses. Go figure.

Now, we do have embargoes on North Korea, for example, and we control the export of other things such as sensitive technology. But crude oil's presence on the Short Supply Controls, I think, is particularly conspicuous, since we export our petroleum products—our refined products—at record levels. I think it is important for people to make that distinction because sometimes there is a little bit of confusion.

We export our refined products at record levels. What we don't export is the crude. Some people say: Well, I am afraid that if we lift the oil export ban and we allow for crude export, the price of oil or the price at the pump is going to go up, and I am worried about that. I think we would all be worried about that. We don't want to see the price of gasoline at the pump go up. The fact remains that what we put in our vehicle, what we pump at the filling station is a refined product that we already export. So we don't see that price spike; we don't see that increase. What we don't refine is the crude product.

We have engaged in study after study after study. There have been about eight different, very reputable studies out there, and each and every one of them has come to the same conclusion—that allowing for the lifting of the export ban will not increase the price of gas to the consumer. I think it is important to reaffirm that.

I urge my colleagues who are ready to vote for trade promotion authority to consider joining my effort. My colleague Senator HEITKAMP from North Dakota is working with me on the other side to lift this ban, to extend the principle of free trade to crude oil exports.

We export natural gas. We export diesel, jet fuel, gasoline, natural gasoline, propane, coal—so many other petroleum products.

I should end by reminding people that the ban that we have in place does allow for certain limited amounts of export. Today, we export to Canada about 4,000 barrels a day. I think that is about average right now. With Alaska, there is an exception that allowed for export of Alaska crude back in the mid 1990s. I just asked for confirmation on what we have been exporting. Last year, in September of 2014, we exported about 800,000 barrels to South Korea, and I am told that just this month, in May, there were 975,000 barrels that went over to South Korea.

So we in Alaska are trying to do our little bit to help. We need to get our oil pipeline filled up so that we can do more to export more to those who are

our friends, partners, and allies. But this is something for which, again, the time is now. The subject is ripe as we are talking about allowing for greater opportunities for export. But when we look to those policies that hold us back—hold us back from good jobs, from producing our resources to our benefit and our economy's benefit and to the benefit of our friends and allies—it is time that we lift the ban on crude oil. Doing so will create jobs, strengthen our security, lower our trade deficit, and, again, as study after study has shown, not raise our gasoline prices.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the time on the floor this afternoon, and look forward to working with my colleagues on these issues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank the Presiding Officer for letting me talk about the trade agenda this afternoon. And I appreciate the words of my colleague from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, regarding the liquefied natural gas exports and oil exports.

This is a discussion about how we ensure that we are accessing the 95 percent of consumers who live outside of our borders. For the workers and farmers I represent in Ohio, that is really important. This is how we are going to be able to get this economy back on track. In part, it is to provide more markets—more customers.

Already in my State of Ohio, we depend heavily on exports. One out of every three acres that is planted in Ohio—we are one of the top farm States in the country. We are proud of that. It is the No. 1 industry. One out of every three acres that is planted is exported. Of our soybean crop, which is typically our biggest crop in Ohio, 60 percent gets exported. So for farmers, in order to keep their prices up, these foreign markets are absolutely critical.

But it is also really important for our manufacturing sector in Ohio. About 25 percent of our manufacturing jobs are export jobs. And, frankly, what has happened over the last 7 years, while America has not been in the business of opening up these markets, is that they are beginning to lose their market share.

So it is good for us to expand exports. We have to do that because that creates not only more jobs in my State and in our country, but it also creates better jobs. These are higher-paying jobs with better benefits.

Those 95 percent of consumers outside of the United States border deserve to get some products stamped "Made in America" because they are great products. They are great agricultural products, great manufacturing products, great services. We should be aggressively expanding our exports.

But while we do that, we have to be sure it is fair, too. We have to be sure that these other countries are not sending us imports that are traded at

below their cost—that is called dumping—that they aren't illegally subsidizing their exports, which happens. That is when you put duties in place to make sure they are not doing things to make the playing field unlevel, and so that our workers who are doing all the right things—playing by the rules, becoming more competitive, and making concessions to be competitive—are not left holding the bag and don't get the short end of the stick. Instead, they get the ability to compete on a level playing field. If they can do that, they will be just fine. We will be able to expand exports, and therefore, create these better-paying jobs we talked about.

That is what this debate should be all about. It is about a balance. It is about expanding exports, at the same time making sure that the rules of the road work for all of us, including our workers and our farmers, our service providers in my State of Ohio and all around our great country.

I am delighted to see that we are moving forward with this debate because it is an honest debate we have to have.

And for those who just say that we can expand exports but we can't do anything about this unfair trade, I think that is not the right balance. For those who say we shouldn't be doing these exports because somehow that doesn't help our workers because there is so much unfair trade out there, that doesn't work, either. There is a balance in between here.

One of the issues I have spent a lot of time working on over the years and looking at is this trade distortion called currency manipulation. Look, I understand it is a complicated area, and some people think we just shouldn't touch it or maybe it is something that only the Department of Treasury can deal with because it is currency. It is not technically products and goods. But I would say that there is not a Member in this body who doesn't believe that when another country manipulates its currency to expand its exports, that that affects trade. It is just obvious.

If you are trying in a deliberate way to lower the cost of your exports by lowering the value of your currency vis-à-vis another country, such as us, that is going to help you in trade.

I had the fasteners in here this week. These are the people who make nuts and bolts and screws, and they are big in Ohio. We are happy to have a good fastener industry in Ohio. But they will tell you that their margins are pretty tight.

Chairman Volcker, who was the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, made an interesting statement. He said that, in 1 week, through currency manipulation, we can do away with all the benefits of years of trade negotiations. Sadly, I think that is true.

So while we are promoting exports, we should also make it clear that we do not believe we should distort trade.

And for our Republican colleagues, those of us who believe in markets, we should be against distortions—and this is a market distortion. We should speak up about it and not be shy about it and not suggest that somehow, because it is something that traditionally has been handled by the Treasury Department and by the International Monetary Fund and as a currency issue, it doesn't affect trade. It does affect trade.

Now, if they were making great progress on it at the International Monetary Fund, I might feel differently about it. But why not include it as a trade negotiating objective? I think it makes all the sense in the world. We are going to have an amendment to do just that, and it will be on the floor next week as we take up the trade promotion authority.

I urge my colleagues to take a look at it, objectively. It is very targeted. It does not deal with a country being able to adjust its monetary policy. It explicitly says it does not relate to monetary policy, macroeconomic policy. It has to do with deliberate intervention in currency markets to have this benefit in exports we talked about, again, to distort the free market in order for other countries to be able to sell their products to us at a lower value than they should be and in turn, for our exports to them to be at a higher value, which makes it harder for us to keep jobs here in America.

People say this is all about the auto industry. Yes, the autoworkers care about it, and they should—so do the auto companies, so do the fastener companies, so do the steel companies, so does anybody or any group in Ohio that is concerned about ensuring that they get a level playing field for their exports, because currency manipulation does not help anybody. People say: Well, why are you doing this now, because these countries, such as Japan, are not currently manipulating their currency? I agree. Since probably the end of 2011, 2012, Japan stopped manipulation of their currency. They would not fall under these criteria we played out. But they have done it over 300 times in the past.

All we are saying is this: Is it not right that when we are negotiating an agreement, we put in place some kind of discipline to say we do not want you to do this in the future because it is not fair for you and for us? Trade ought to be about balance—not just a balance of expanding exports but also having enforcement measures in place to level that playing field I talked about, and balance in the sense that we sell something to you, we get some money from doing that, and we use that money to buy something from the other place. So you have a balance in terms of trade. You do not have these huge surpluses you see in countries such as China, for instance, where they have manipulated their currency.

I hope this issue will be one that we can address in an objective manner.

Take the politics out of it. Let's decide what is best for the workers and farmers we represent and for the overall health of our economy. If we are going to get back into the business of trade—which I think we should—I think we should be expanding trade by doing good agreements that knock down the barriers to us so that it is fair. If we do that, let's be sure that we can build a consensus for that among the American people, who get it. They understand that we need to have exports. But they also understand that we need to have more fairness.

There are other issues as well that we are going to address in the Senate in the trade promotion authority vote next week. I hope some of them will be issues that we actually voted on today in the Customs bill. Some of you followed this closely, but in the Customs bill there were a number of enforcement measures, not just on currency but also on this issue of how do you show when you are injured, as an American company, if there is unfair trade. If another country sells something over here below its cost—meaning they dumped it here—or if they subsidized something illegally, how do you show as an American company that you have been injured by it in order to get the relief that you and the workers you represent deserve?

Right now, it is very difficult sometimes to show injury, to the point that some companies tell me: ROB, by the time we were able to go through this process and show that we were injured, it was too late. We had lost too much market share. We were not able to get back on our feet.

There is a very simple provision. It is a Brown-Portman amendment that was included in the Customs bill. We voted on it today. I would urge my colleagues to help us get that provision into the TPA bill as well because we know that the Customs bill may or may not make it through the process. We believe that the trade promotion authority bill is much more likely to make it through the process and to the President's desk for signature.

I hope we have that provision in there. I asked my own leadership to include it in the substitute that was filed apparently today. I do not know if it is in there. I am told it is probably not. I am sorry to hear that because it was one that we seem to have a bipartisan consensus on in committee. I thank Senator HATCH and Senator WYDEN because they included it in the committee markup on the Customs bill. We did not have a vote as an amendment because they included it in the markup because they thought it was good policy.

Yet, somehow in the substitute, I understand it may not be in there. I hope it is. But if it is not, we intend to offer an amendment to have it included. I hope my colleagues will support that, because, again, if you are talking about trade in a State such as Ohio where we have a lot of manufacturing, you have

to be sure to be able to look workers in the eye and say: This is going to be fair for you. Get in this business of trade because we want to access the 95 percent of consumers outside of our borders, but we are going to help you. If somebody unfairly competes with you by dumping their product or illegally subsidizing their product, you know what, we will be there for you. We are going to be able to level that playing field by adding tariffs to their products because it is illegal what they are doing.

I have been active on this issue back home, not just on the material injury standard, which is what this is about when you get injured in trade, but also on this issue of being sure that we are opening up more markets for all of our Ohio products.

Ohio manufacturers right now in rebar, hot-rolled steel, tires, and uncoated paper are all involved in trade cases such as this—all of them. They all want to know that this is going to be fair.

Wheatland Tube is one of the Nation's largest producers of steel pipe and tube products. They have four facilities in Ohio: one in Warren, one in Niles, one in Cambridge, and one in Brookfield. They make products ranging from steel products for the energy industry, pipe for hydraulic tracking, and so on—construction industry. They have been particularly impacted by a number of these trade enforcement cases, including several crucial cases we won last year on pipe and tube from China. We have had some nice victories for them. In fact, given the import concerns they have, I understand the plant in Warren, OH, which has 178 workers, probably would not be in existence today if we had not won these trade enforcement measures. Here is a plant with 178 people in Warren, OH, who would not have a job today if not for our standing up for them and saying we are going to help you when there is an unfair import coming into this country.

The workers there understand this issue. They get it because they know it has a direct impact on their jobs. Let me read an email I received this week from Mike Mack. Mike is a maintenance foreman at Wheatland Tube in Warren, OH. This is what he said:

As an individual employed in manufacturing, I understand better than most that trade is a key component for economic growth. However, it's important for U.S. manufacturers (i.e. steel pipe and tube producers) to have the tools to challenge unfair trade. . . . I support the adoption of enforcement provisions . . . that will close loop holes in the trade laws to ensure that companies can access these laws to challenge trade distorting practices.

I continue with his quote.

I also support language in the TPA that prevents currency manipulation and the "dumping" of foreign products in the U.S.

It's essential that provisions to close loop holes in trade laws are included in a final trade bill. After all, there's a huge difference between FAIR trade and FREE trade.

He says his company "relies on these laws, and has utilized them in recent years to challenge trade distorting practices that have injured our industry and our employees."

He says:

Without laws to regulate unfair trade, I know my job—and the jobs of thousands of other manufacturing workers—is at risk.

I think that email says it well. He did not say he is against trade. He did not say he is against exports. In fact, he said that "trade is a key component for economic growth." He supports it. He just wants to know there is going to be a balance.

If there is a balance, Mike will stand up and support trade. But if there is not, he, understandably, is worried about his job and the jobs of his colleagues at that company and the companies all over my State.

I really hope that as we promote trade—and we should—we do so in a more balanced way. If we do that, I think we are going to build a broader consensus for doing exactly what we should be doing—reengaging in the world, expanding markets, and knocking down barriers to trade—tariff barriers and nontariff barriers alike.

As some of you know, I was the U.S. Trade Representative for a while. I had that great honor to be able to travel all around the world representing our great country. Other countries are looking to us to able to knock down these barriers to trade because they are unfair, because they know that it helps the economies in their countries develop.

Developing countries know in their hearts that higher tariffs and nontariff barriers between countries make it harder to grow a middle class, to be able to bring people out of poverty, and they depend on us for that. They also depend on us to ensure that the rules of the road are fair. It affects us. It affects this plant in Warner, OH, and it also affects them.

They suffer from currency manipulation, too. They suffer from unfairly traded imports, too. Frankly, they are not always strong enough or big enough countries to be able to stand up to it. America's role in the world is truly exceptional. It is truly essential that we are out there. It is true on a whole broad range of issues—from human rights, to fighting terrorism, to keeping open the Strait of Hormuz, the South China Sea, and so on.

It is also important on trade. This is an opportunity for us to stand up here in this Chamber and say we are going to get back into the business of expanding trade. We are going to do it in a balanced way.

Finally, let me mention a specific issue that is part of the trade legislation coming to the floor. This is about something beyond exporting American products. It is about exporting American values and the rule of law. As I said, countries are looking for us, in part, to let people know what the rules of the road ought to be. One of those

rules of the road ought to be that we believe that human trafficking ought to be stopped, whether it is in our country or on other shores.

Addressing human trafficking has been a really bipartisan issue here in this body. I serve as cochair of the Senate Caucus to End Human Trafficking. I started it a few years ago with Senator BLUMENTHAL. Since we founded the caucus in 2012, we have made real progress, passing a number of bills to end trafficking in Government contracting, for instance, reauthorizing the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. A few weeks ago we passed a big bill called the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act. We passed it 99 to 0. Three bills that I had proposed were part of that package. It is good legislation.

As a member of the Finance Committee, I was happy to support a bipartisan amendment to the trade promotion authority that was offered by Senator MENENDEZ. It puts additional teeth into our trafficking enforcement so that countries that are dealing with us in a trade agreement know that we are serious, if year after year they turn a blind eye to the horrible reality of human trafficking in their labor markets and in their countries.

The question before us is this: Do we keep that in this legislation or not? I think we should not water down trafficking protections that have already been adopted by a bipartisan majority of the Finance Committee by a vote of 16-10. I think we should take into account the horrendous human trafficking record of some of the world's worst offenders.

If we do—if we do that—we are going to be able to help stop human trafficking globally. If we do not do that, if we water it down, I fear we are giving some of these countries an easy way out, promoting trafficking by letting countries get around the rules.

Every year, the State Department issues the "Trafficking in Persons Report," or TIP—"Trafficking in Persons Report." The report ranks countries. They have different tiers. Tier 1 means the country is responsive and proactive to combating human trafficking. Tier 3 means the country has failed to take steps to prevent trafficking, and the laws and policies of the country actually promote a market that encourages human trafficking, so that is the State Department.

I understand this report—the TIP Report—will be released in June. It has already been substantially drafted. I understand that one of the TPP countries may fall in category 3, tier 3. This government continues to detain trafficking victims for periods of time, treating them as criminals for months or years, we are told. This country does not support the NGOs, the nongovernmental groups in the region that provide counseling or rehabilitation for victims. This is from the State Department.

The most egregious trend highlighted by the State Department is that this

government is now identifying fewer victims and conducting fewer investigations than in recent years.

Should we be concerned about that? Yes, we should. I think there is nothing wrong with us including that, to provide that incentive and to provide that leverage in this TPA bill that we are going to vote on early next week.

The trafficking in persons office is independent. They are not swayed by political considerations. That is my sense of it. It is a good office. I will have enormous respect for their TIP analysis. I will be disappointed if that language is not included in the trade agreement.

Again, the Finance Committee—with the support of five Republicans, including me—passed this amendment, and I think Senator MENENDEZ's attention to this issue is appropriate. I hope it will stand up, as we did with the 99-to-0 vote with regard to the broader legislation.

I thank the Presiding Officer for giving me the ability to talk about these issues today. I think it is incredibly important that we move forward with expanding trade. I think trade promotion authority is needed to do that. But as we do it, let's be sure that we are able to look those workers and those farmers in the eye back home and say: You know what. This is going to work for you, too. It is going to work for all of us. This is going to work because we are giving you access to markets you would not otherwise have. That creates more and better-paying jobs. But we are also going to be sure that it is a more level playing field, that you are able to compete effectively and win because the rules won't be rigged against you. The rules are going to be fair for everybody.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I appreciate the excellent remarks that were made by the distinguished Senator from Ohio and other Senators on the floor this day. There is no question that the Senator from Ohio is a very strong leader when it comes to international trade, having served as the Nation's Trade Representative and having served very well.

Not only was he a great Trade Representative, but he is a great Senator. I have a very high regard for him. I understand why he—just as I am—is working to push this bill through Congress.

We have enough Democrats who are pro-free trade and understand what this bill will do for them, and I think we have enough Republicans. Let's just hope that we can put this through.

Having said all of that, I wish to praise the President. I have had many differences with the President over the years. We have always been cordial. There is no question that I care for him, and I hope he cares for me. But the fact is that on this issue, our President happens to be right, and that is

why I was pretty upset the other day when cloture was not invoked. I am glad we were able to work together to overcome that logjam and have the bill on the floor now, and hopefully we will overcome any desire to filibuster this bill in any way, shape, or form.

There have been many heroic Democrats who have worked on this bill, and I want to pay homage to all of them, from Senator WYDEN right on through. They all deserve a lot of credit. There are not enough, but nevertheless a good number, and those folks deserve a lot of credit for standing up for this bill the way they have.

Think about it. The Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN, said that 95 to 96 percent of all of the world's consumers live outside of the United States of America. That ought to tell anybody—even an idiot—that this bill is important and that international trade is important. We have all kinds of small and large businesses that are doing trade overseas but are severely limited because of the lack of a free-trade agreements with a wide variety of countries.

The advantage of this particular agreement—and people are starting to realize that it is a very advantageous agreement—is that this will provide great trade relations.

This bill will provide a means whereby 11 countries in the Asian-Pacific—through the Trans-Pacific Partnership—will have great trading rights with us, and us with them.

Additionally, should this bill pass, there are 28 nations in Europe that are party to the TTIP negotiations, and this will be one of the most important things we can do to keep trade alive and interchange with these countries in ways that will benefit not only them but us.

The fact is that we know that trade generally helps us to have better jobs in this country, and the proven fact is that when we negotiate free trade agreements, wages go up. So it is good for our workers, it is good for our consumers because we will be able to purchase products at better prices than we have in the past, and it is good for our country because we will lead the world in trade. Although we are far away from that right now because there are 400 trade agreements in the world and we are only signed on to 20 of them. It shows how lacking we are in negotiating the free-trade agreements that we really ought to.

This bill will push us forward, and it will enable us to create free trade agreements with countries that compose 40 to 60 percent of worldwide trade. That should say to anybody that this is a good thing to do. It creates jobs, it creates opportunities, and it also creates better relationships between our Nation and the almost 40 nations currently in negotiations with us under TPP and TTIP.

Having said that, there are those who do not like this bill. The labor unions, in particular, don't like this bill. I

think some of the union members do, because it means a level international playing field for their jobs, higher pay, more opportunity, their States can get well and strong, that their agriculture is going to improve, their industry is going to improve, and their manufacturers are going to improve. I could go on and on. It creates more jobs, more opportunities, and higher paying jobs.

It is pretty hard for anybody to really cite any reason why they should vote against this agreement. A lot of people have misconstrued—some of the most brilliant people in the Senate—that it as though this is the final trade agreement, that is TPP, with 11 nations.

This is TPP. This is the procedural agreement that makes it possible for those nations to sign treaties with us knowing that when the TPP or the TTIP agreements are brought to the Senate and the House, we will simply have a right to a vote those agreements up or down.

After having a complete look at them, there will be lots of transparency. People have been raising the issue that this is not transparent. Well, this is not the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement; this is the mechanism through which we can arrive at a Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement. This bill provides more transparency than any other TPA agreement in the past.

This opens up the world for trade and says to the other countries that we are willing to comply with certain rules and regulations if they will. And in the process, we know that we are not going to be able to conclude most of these individual trade agreements with individual nations unless we have trade promotion authority in law because these countries don't want to enter into a very difficult, intensively complex set of negotiations if their only hope is that the negotiations in the trade agreement that they signed would be brought back to the two Houses of Congress that could do whatever they want to with it and open it up to any kinds of amendments. They are not going to sign on to these trade agreements.

We have had some representatives of some of these 11 countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations saying that unless we pass trade promotion authority, they will not sign on to any agreement, and I can hardly blame them because you never know what Congress is going to do once these agreements come back.

We do have a right to know what they are. We do have a right to look at them thoroughly. We do have a right to debate them on the floor. We do have a right to vote up or down for or against these treaties, and that is a right this particular bill enshrines. That is an important right. On the other hand, we need to have TPA in order to attract other countries to negotiate and conclude agreements with our country, which is what this agreement is all about.

So those who are saying “Well, this is not transparent” or “We don't know what is in the TPP” and so forth, of course they don't. It is not concluded yet. But this gives us the right to know, this gives us the right to debate, this gives us the right to vote, and this gives us the right to be part of that system.

The administration has made it very clear that they will work in a way that every Senator in the Senate and every Member of the House of Representatives will have a right, if they want to, to participate in the process under certain terms that are really outlined by this particular bill.

What we are talking about here today is future trillions of dollars in trade—not just billions, trillions. We are talking about the United States being a leader of the free world. We are talking about leading other nations to come and work with us for freedom in this world.

Think about it. If we get those mainly Asian-Pacific countries in the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement to agree to this agreement and agree to work with us on trade that will send a message to everybody in that area that they better work with the United States as well. It sends a message to every country in the world, really, that if they are willing to work in a fair way with the United States of America then we are willing to work with them.

If we don't pass this legislation, can you imagine what it will do to our relationships with many of these countries that are absolutely critical to our foreign influence? I would say all 11 of the Asian-Pacific and 28 of the European countries are. These are important countries to us. Just the massive percentage of trade in the world that is done by these almost 40 countries says to anybody—any thinking person—you would be crazy not to enter into agreements that outline how we can do things, do them right, protect intellectual property, and do a lot of other things that good trading relationships can grow from.

This will enable us to at least work with the United States Trade Representative, the Ambassador Michael Froman, and conclude these agreements so that everybody in our country will benefit from them. It just makes sense.

Not only that, can you imagine, if we fail to pass TPA—trade promotion authority—the message it will send to almost 40 countries, including ours? Can you imagine what message that would be? Not only that, but it would interfere with foreign policy objectives for our country in many years to come in drastically bad ways.

So the frightened people who don't like this approach, of giving the administration the tools it needs to be able to properly negotiate free-trade agreements with other countries need to understand that this is the best tool Congress has to give the American people the level playing field and competi-

tive edge they have worked so hard for. It also lets other countries know they are going to have to comply with important and relevant terms—and it says to the people in all of those countries that the United States is a dependable partner to deal with.

This is an important debate, and that is why it has come so far. I wish to personally applaud the heroic Democrats who are willing to stand up for this, as well as Republicans. We can always find something wrong with every piece of legislation that comes through this place. I don't know of many that have been perfect, although I am sure there have been a few. Nothing seems to be perfect, but what we try to do here is do the absolute best we can to get as close to perfection as we can. Yes, this is not a perfect bill, but, by gosh, it takes us a long way toward resolving all kinds of disputes and relationships throughout the world.

This is an important bill, and we will begin the real work by holding votes on the bill on Monday. Hopefully, our colleagues will pay attention to what is in this bill and what it really means; that it is not the Trans-Pacific Partnership but that it is a means by which Congress has a say in the Trans-Pacific Partnership and TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, and it gives us some authority over these matters. Plus, it helps us to comply, cooperate with, and work with the President of the United States and the people he has designated to negotiate these agreements. It is just the right thing to do.

I have to say this would be a crown for the Obama administration should we pass this through. It would be a crown to every Senator and every House Member who votes for it. It is going to be a crown that a lot of people will be able to wear for years to come—at least 6 years—and it will be helpful to future administrations as well.

So I hope our colleagues will help us to pass this bill. I hope they will help us to keep amendments that shouldn't be on and that really aren't helpful off this bill. I hope they will help us to keep the poison pills that sometimes come up around here off, so this bill can pass through and become law. Then, it will enable whatever administration it is—this administration for the next year and a half, approximately—to be able to complete some of these agreements with other countries that are important to our well-being as well as their well-being, that may be as important to our relationship with them as it is to their relationships with us, and to our region as well as their region. To have the United States of America working with them and have them working with us sends a message to a lot of enemies around this world that we are making headway. We are doing things the way they ought to be done, that the United States is a good trading partner, and that as tough as it sometimes is to get these types of landmark pieces of legislation through

both Houses of Congress, this one is worthwhile to put through.

I hope we will conclude this in a way that will help the administration do a really good job and will help us to move forward as a nation and will help our economy and help their economies and create greater foreign policy presence for our great country around the world, especially for the countries involved in these agreements.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, this is a very important debate. I was here earlier this week and I look forward to more debate next week. I look forward to a vote on the Portman-Stabenow amendment addressing currency manipulation.

At this point in time, I wish to speak as in morning business, and I ask unanimous consent to do so.

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

REMEMBERING RACHEL JACOBS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today on the floor of the U.S. Senate in memory of a young woman whose life was extraordinary and meaningful and whose passing has left so many of us so profoundly sad.

On Tuesday night, Rachel Jacobs left work and boarded a train to go home to her husband Todd and her 2-year-old son Jacob. Rachel's life, so filled with passion and purpose, was lost that night, along with at least seven others, when her train—and we all know now about the train—derailed just outside of Philadelphia.

Rachel touched so many lives all across the country. Today, all of those hearts are broken. The loss is so profound. Her family has lost a wonderful wife and mother and daughter and sister, and all of us have lost someone who had accomplished so much already in her young life and would have done so much more to make the world a better place if only she had been given the time.

I want my colleagues in the Senate to know Rachel. I want them to know the life she lived. She grew up in the Detroit area, where she was a smart, engaged young woman who was active in her community and always looked for ways to make a difference. She was an exceptionally talented and bright young woman. She went to college at Swarthmore and then to Columbia for her MBA.

Two months ago, she became the CEO of ApprenNet, an online workforce training startup. She had a vision to use technology to help people get the right skills to be successful in the fastest growing sectors of our economy, such as health care.

She was also the cofounder and chair of Detroit Nation, which brought together native Detroiters around the country to stay engaged and connected to their hometown in an effort to create jobs and economic growth.

Rachel did so much for others—something I know she learned from her par-

ents, Gilda and John Jacobs. Gilda is a dear friend of mine and someone who has devoted her own life to public service. I cannot imagine the sadness of her family today. It is small comfort that Rachel's dedication to her family and community is a testament to the wonderful person she was. She was an inspiration to so many and that inspiration will endure.

Rachel's life was not the only one lost on Tuesday night. A Navy midshipman from New York, a college dean, an award-winning Associated Press technology staffer, and five other Americans with families and friends and with so much going for them, and we are finding more who have lost their lives—so many lives cut short in their prime, so many people who were doing so much good in the world.

There are many questions as the investigation into this crash gets underway. Federal authorities are doing their work right now, and the families of those killed or injured deserve answers.

So I was truly stunned yesterday when the House of Representatives voted in committee to slash funding for our infrastructure, including Amtrak. I could not believe that happened. There is something deeply wrong when an unthinkable tragedy such as this occurs—that should serve as a wakeup call to all of us to work together—and not even 24 hours later, Republican Members of Congress act as if nothing had happened.

Our roads and bridges and railroads carry people. They carry young mothers such as Rachel who want to get home to hold their babies. They carry young men such as Justin Zemser, the 20-year-old midshipman at the Naval Academy—a patriot whose contributions to his country could have been incredible. I know, from speaking to Senator SCHUMER who nominated him, he was an incredible young man.

We have a responsibility to the people of this country, to the people who sent us here to represent them, to make sure our infrastructure is secure. Yet we see on the horizon the very real possibility that our highway trust fund will soon be empty. We see the events of yesterday, with a vote in the House Appropriations Committee to slash funding for trains and roads and bridges. It is personally very alarming to me.

As we engage in these discussions over the next few weeks about how to fund transportation in this country, I hope my colleagues will not forget the people who use our transportation system—people like Rachel Jacobs.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

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

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

NIH-SUPPORTED RESEARCH AND ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues the idea that biomedical research must be a national priority.

The Presiding Officer and myself, as members of the Appropriations Committee, are in the process of crafting our appropriations bills for fiscal year 2016, and we face a tremendous task in trying to balance effective, efficient government operations with the necessity of righting our Nation's fiscal course during very difficult and challenging times. Therefore, what I take from that—the circumstance we are in—is it is extremely important that we prioritize initiatives that are effective in their service to the American people and demonstrate a significant and sufficient return on investment. Congress should set spending priorities and focus our resources on initiatives with proven outcomes. No initiative meets these criteria better than biomedical research supported by the National Institutes of Health.

NIH-supported research has raised life expectancy, improved the quality of life, lowered overall health care costs, and is an economic engine that strengthens American global competitiveness.

The benefits of NIH are widely acknowledged on a bipartisan basis. During the recent negotiations on the fiscal year 2016 budget agreement, 34 of my Senate colleagues, both Republicans and Democrats, cosponsored an amendment I offered affirming NIH biomedical research as a national priority. I was pleased this amendment was included in the final budget agreement passed by Congress.

Furthermore, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, and the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, have recently agreed to form a Senate NIH—National Institutes of Health—Caucus. I am happy to be a founding member of this caucus, which will offer an opportunity for Senators to visit about the importance of NIH and to seek bipartisan strategies to provide steady, predictable growth for biomedical research.

If the United States is to continue its leadership in providing medical breakthroughs to develop cures and treat diseases, we must be committed to supporting this research.

If researchers cannot rely on consistent support from Congress, we will jeopardize our current programs, we will reduce our progress, stunt our Nation's competitiveness, and lose a generation of young researchers to other careers or other countries.

New scientific findings help us confront the staggering challenges of disease and illness. One such challenge I wish to focus on in my remarks is Alzheimer's. It is a devastating and irreversible brain disease that slowly destroys an individual's cognitive functioning, including memory and thought. Today, more than 5.3 million

Americans are living with this terrible disease. Every minute, someone in our country develops Alzheimer's. It is the sixth leading cause of death in the United States, and it is the only cause of death among the top 10 in the United States that cannot be prevented, cured or even slowed.

Within these grim statistics are immeasurable suffering and stress this disease places on individuals, on their families, on their friends. This reality hits home in the stories I hear from Kansans.

The Alzheimer's Association's Heart of America Chapter in Prairie Village, KS, tells me about Ricky from Topeka:

Ricky has early onset Alzheimer's disease. He is 60 years old. Due to Alzheimer's disease, Ricky had to retire from a good-paying job because he no longer was able to do the work. He and his family expected him to work at least another 5 years or more, and they had plans that were interrupted that caused them to have to adjust from a two-income family to a single-income family.

Ricky is frustrated at times and tries to maintain a positive attitude with his family and his peers. He and all members of his early stage support group are very scared about their future and they are desperate for a cure. They are worried about the burden they might place upon their families.

Ricky and so many of his peers are continually looking for ways to slow down the progression of this disease. This includes testing himself daily with the use of an iPad, trying new foods, and joining in a research study at the University of Kansas Medical Center. Fortunately, Ricky is still able to ride his Harley Davidson, but he knows the day is coming when the thing he enjoys so much will not be able to occur again.

I am also aware of Katrina from Shawnee, KS. She is an Alzheimer's Association ambassador and she shared her story:

As personal and health care advocates, my brother and I used more than 7 weeks of personal vacation time—some unpaid—during our mother's final year of care. During the year, she was transitioned through 10 different care facilities, we worked with more than two dozen health care professionals at these locations and some were not [even] notified of her basic needs such as her iodine allergy or insurance—information she was unable to share during her moves. This would be a significant life change for anyone—but especially for our mother, a 67 year old, physically strong woman but cognitively impaired due to early onset dementia diagnosed at [age] 59.

Katrina said they reflect upon her passing, which is now 3 months ago, and the emotional and financial toll of the last 27 months couldn't be quantified—long-term savings and time off from work for vacations were limited, and the time spent at work was interrupted with calls, doctors appointments, and meetings to communicate with care providers “regarding our mother's ongoing care needs, including behavioral challenges.”

My brother and I are 40 and 37—we have children ages 4 to 15—we worked full time [during this period of time] while doing everything we could to advocate for our mother's care. We are fortunate to have devoted spouses, family, and friends and understanding employers that worked through these difficult times with us.

All of us in the Senate, every American knows someone who has been affected, someone whose family member has been affected by the terrible disease Alzheimer's. It is a tremendous personal tragedy, this disease, but it is also a very expensive disease, and we have a lot to gain both in the care for people and the quality of their lives that we want to maintain.

We also have the opportunity to invest in Alzheimer's research that will reduce the cost of Alzheimer's to us as taxpayers, to health care, to those of us who pay insurance premiums. This is a way we also can save money because, on average, per-person Medicare spending for individuals with Alzheimer's and other dementias is three times higher than Medicare spending across the board for all other seniors. So for Alzheimer's patients, Medicare has per-person expenditures three times the amount of other seniors on Medicare.

This year, the direct cost to America for caring for those with Alzheimer's is estimated at \$226 billion—\$226 billion. Half of these annual costs—more than \$100 billion—will be borne by Medicare. These numbers mean that nearly one in five Medicare dollars is spent on individuals with Alzheimer's disease and other dementias.

In 2050, which isn't that far away, this amount will be one in every three Medicare dollars will be spent on Alzheimer's and dementia diseases. Unless something is done, in 2050, Alzheimer's will cost our country over \$1 trillion in 2015 dollars. Taking into account inflation, it will be \$1 trillion, and costs to Medicare will increase more than 400 percent to nearly \$590 billion.

We must commit to a national strategy for speeding the development of effective interventions for Alzheimer's disease. As the baby boomer generation ages, Alzheimer's has unfortunately become a disease to define a generation, but it doesn't have to be an inevitable part of the aging process. America can tackle Alzheimer's by prioritization of our biomedical research capabilities.

In a recent New York Times editorial, former Speaker Newt Gingrich praised the considerable benefits of NIH and specifically a research breakthrough relating to Alzheimer's. He noted that a breakthrough that could delay the onset of the disease by just 5 years, slow the onset by 5 years, would reduce the number of Americans with Alzheimer's in 2050 by 42 percent and cut costs by a third.

These encouraging statistics—the idea that we can have hope and that there is a better day—these encouraging statistics would also represent increased health and quality of life for both patients and their loved ones.

Current research advances give us that reason for hope. Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of the National Institutes of Health, recently stated, “Alzheimer's research is entering a new era in which creative approaches for detecting, measuring and analyzing a wide range of biomedical data sets are leading to new insights about the causes and course of the disease.”

Dr. Collins calls on our Nation's medical researchers to work smarter, faster, and more collaboratively to determine the best path for progress in Alzheimer's disease research. As an example, NIH is implementing a new initiative called the Accelerating Medicines Partnership, working together with pharmaceutical companies to develop the next generation of drug targets for Alzheimer's disease, as well as rheumatoid arthritis, type 2 diabetes, and lupus.

NIH is also leading the Brain Research through Advancing Intuitive Neurotechnologies Initiative, or BRAIN Initiative, which is a multi-agency effort to revolutionize our understanding of the human brain. The objective of the BRAIN Initiative is to enable the development and use of innovative technologies to produce a clear understanding of how individual cells and neurocircuits interact. By better understanding how the brain works, technologies developed under this initiative could help reveal the underlying cause of a wide array of brain disorders. Understanding these causes will provide new avenues to treat, cure, and prevent neurological and psychiatric conditions such as Alzheimer's disease, traumatic brain injury, autism, schizophrenia, and epilepsy.

Groundbreaking research is taking place, and Congress must do its part to prioritize the important work supported by the NIH. As a member of the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that is responsible for the funding of NIH, I am committed to working with my colleagues to see that prioritization of NIH occurs and that within NIH there is strong support for Alzheimer's research.

In 2011, Congress passed the National Alzheimer's Plan that specifically lays out a series of scientific milestones that researchers think need to be met in order to make meaningful impact on the trajectory of Alzheimer's by 2025—what is the plan to get us where we need to be by that point in time?

Over the last two years, Congress has provided NIH with approximately \$125 million in increased funding to support good science that addresses Alzheimer's disease and other dementias. Additionally, we have worked to include language in the fiscal year 2015 omnibus that requires NIH to submit a yearly budget request for Alzheimer's research based on what is required to fund the necessary science. This particular effort is to make certain we have a specific, accountable research plan to ensure that our resources are effectively targeted to meet these

milestones the scientific community has established.

Alzheimer's disease is a defining challenge for our generation. The health and financial future of our Nation are at stake, and the United States simply must not continue to ignore such a threat. This is a moral and financial issue. It is one that should be easy for us to come together on. If you are the person or the Senator who cares the most about people, who cares in compassionate ways, you should be for medical research. If you are the Senator who cares about the fiscal condition of our country and getting our financial house in order, you should be for biomedical research.

This commitment by all of us will significantly lower costs and improve health care outcomes for people living with the disease today and those who may encounter it in the future. Together, we can. This is what we are all here for. Together, we can make a difference, and we can do that by making a sustained commitment to Alzheimer's research that will benefit our Nation and bring hope and healing to Americans today and tomorrow.

The challenge is ours, and the moment to act on this disease is today. It is important for our moms, our dads, our grandparents, our family members, our friends. For the fiscal health of our Nation, the time to act is now.

Madam President, 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.

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

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

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, I rise to continue an effort to honor the 198 North Dakotans—soldiers, sailors, and airmen—who gave their lives while serving in Vietnam.

Together with the Bismarck High School history and English classes, we are reaching out to families and friends of these fallen servicemembers and sharing a bit about each one on the floor of the Senate.

Today, I begin by talking about a large family, the Gietzens, who lost one of their own in Vietnam but continue to serve our country and our State. Bill and Mary raised 15 children on a farm outside Glen Ullin. It was on their farm that their children learned the importance of hard work, dedication, and bravery.

After serving in the Army in World War II, Bill married his sweetheart Mary, and they had 15 children.

GENE GIETZEN

Gene Gietzen served in Vietnam in the Marine Corps' Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 7th Marines. Gene was born March 19, 1950. On May 21, 1969, he died

as a result of wounds received on a company operation. He was 19 years old.

Gene's twin brother Glenn and older brother, Russell, were also stationed in Vietnam for a time while Gene was there. Once, when Russell and Glenn's battalion passed through Gene's camp, they had an opportunity to spend a night together. That night, the young men learned of the birth of their youngest brother Fred.

While the brothers said goodbye, Gene told them he would never get to see baby Fred. Glenn and Russell told him they would see him soon and that he needed to stop being so pessimistic. A few weeks later, they learned of Gene's death. Glenn escorted his twin brother's body home.

Russell, the oldest child, served three tours of duty in Vietnam with the Army as an interpreter and participated in several covert missions. Russell has two sons who served our State and country in the North Dakota National Guard.

Glenn also served in the Army in Vietnam. Glenn started the Injured Military Wildlife Project of North Dakota, which gives wounded veterans nationwide opportunities to hunt and fish in North Dakota.

Mark, their other brother, joined the Marine Corps and served all around the world on embassy duty.

Greg served with U.S. Special Forces for 37 years. Jim joined the Army and was stationed in Germany for 2 years.

Aaron served 22 years with Army Special Operations as a combat medic. He now trains a new generation of Army medics at the U.S. Army Special Operations Command in Fort Bragg, NC.

The rest of the Gietzen children have served as nurses, missionaries or have kept up the tradition of family farming.

North Dakota is proud to be home to this inspiring family.

Now, I will talk about more North Dakotans who, like Gene Gietzen, gave the ultimate sacrifice while serving their country during Vietnam.

GERALD "JERRY" DECKER

Gerald "Jerry" Decker was from Sentinel Butte and was born June 17, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Jerry died on April 10, 1969. He was 20 years old.

Jerry was one of seven children and the youngest of three boys. Jerry and his brother, Ron, were both stationed overseas at the same time, Ron running supplies from Thailand and Jerry as a cook in Vietnam.

Jerry chose to enlist so he could serve his country and return to the family farm and ranch as soon as possible. Jerry intended to eventually take over the farm. His sister, Rose, recalls how much Jerry loved farming, loved the animals, and loved training his dogs to hunt.

After his death, Jerry's brother, Ron, escorted his body home. The day after Jerry's funeral, their brother, Tom,

had to appear before the draft board, but he was excused from service.

Rose remembers Jerry as the kind of guy everyone loved, even though he had a very dry sense of humor. She says that during Jerry's funeral, their church was overflowing with people mourning Jerry's death.

NORMAN EMINETH

Norman Emineth was from Baldwin and was born June 13, 1949. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Norman was 20 years old when he died on May 22, 1970.

Norman and his four siblings grew up on a farm outside of Baldwin. He spent his childhood working on the farm, picking rock, and milking cows. In his free time, Norman enjoyed hunting, fishing, and spending time with their neighbors.

In 1961, the singer Sue Thompson recorded a song called "Norman." His friends poked fun at Norman, but despite the teasing, Norman loved the song. He bought the record and listened to the song over and over until he had memorized all of the lyrics. To this day, his sister, Elaine, can still hear the song in her head.

Elaine cherishes the time she spent with Norman when he was home on leave from Vietnam. She said that during this time, she felt like the kids had finally become adult friends instead of bickering children. The siblings all wished they could have spent time in their adult years with their brother, Norman.

LAWRENCE ESSER, JR.

Lawrence Esser, Jr., was from Minot. He was born February 21, 1948. He served in the Army's Ninth Infantry Division. He was 21 years old when he died on March 12, 1969.

Lawrence was the fourth of eight children, and his family and friends called him Junior.

His sister, Darlene, has fond memories of playing together outside making mud pies. She says that from the time Lawrence was a child, he loved to build things and work with his hands. He attended a trade school and worked for his brother-in-law in a construction firm.

Lawrence's family remembers him as a humble and quiet person. His mother, who died when she was 98 years old, still had a hard time speaking about Lawrence until her own death.

JOSEPH "JOE" FISCHER

Joseph "Joe" Fischer was from Zeeland and was born September 11, 1948. He served in the Army on the USS King as a boiler technician. Joe died on May 23, 1969. He was 20 years old.

When Joe was very young, his mother passed away. During middle school, he began living with Ben and Laura Jund of Zeeland. Joe and the Junds, his foster family, grew very close.

Joe's high school friend, Anne Welder, remembers that Joe was kind of a class clown and participated in baseball, basketball, football, drama, and

pep club. Anne and Joe's foster family loved that everyone who knew Joe loved being around him.

After his high school graduation, Joe enlisted in the Navy. He enjoyed his Navy service very much.

The day after Joe's foster family learned that Joe had died, they received a note in the mail sent to them, stating: "I just thought I would let you know that I am still alive."

WENDELL KELLER

Wendell Keller was from Fargo and was born May 19, 1934. He served in the Air Force 433rd Tactical Fighter Squadron. Wendell was 34 years old when he went missing in action on March 1, 1969.

Wendell's parents were Raymond and Leona Keller, and his siblings are Virginia Post, Ray Keller, and David Keller. In addition to his siblings, Wendell is survived by his wife Jacqueline, son Gregory and his wife Patty, stepson Andy, and son Michael and his wife Jane and their daughter Lydia.

While at North Dakota State University, Wendell majored in electrical engineering and graduated with an Air Force ROTC commission.

Wendell was an accomplished pilot. In 1959, he was selected to fly over the first U.S. Air Force Academy graduation ceremony. In 1968, Wendell volunteered for an assignment in Southeast Asia rather than accepting the recommendation to become a Thunderbird pilot.

On March 1, 1969, Wendell, an Air Force major at the time, was the flight commander of a night strike over Laos. It was his 80th mission, and he made multiple passes before his plane was struck by anti-aircraft fire and crashed in the rugged terrain. Search-and-rescue efforts to locate him were unsuccessful. He was declared missing in action and was promoted to lieutenant colonel.

Fifteen years later, the crash site was discovered, and after several ground searches and excavations, in 2012, his remains were identified and he was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

The Air Force issued Lieutenant Colonel Keller medals to honor his extraordinary service, including the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with Four Oak Leaf Clusters, and the Purple Heart.

STANLEY OTTMAR

Stanley Ottmar was from Mott and was born October 26, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Stan died April 10, 1969. He was 19 years old.

His family called him Stan, and he was the third of seven children. His sister, Mavis Jarnagin, or Mavis Ottmar, was my college roommate when we were at UND and remains a good friend of mine today.

Their father served in World War II in the Army. After high school graduation, Stan followed in his father's footsteps and enlisted in the Army, where he joined a parachute training program.

Stan was a friendly and social person who had a love and talent for music. His sister, Sharon, has fond memories of Stan at home standing in front of the mirror watching himself play guitar and sing. The family cherishes the recordings they have of him singing and playing the guitar.

Stan died with just 2 weeks left in his tour, and he was already making plans at the time to buy a new car.

JOHN RENNER

John Renner was from Mandan and he was born June 24, 1949. He served in the Marine Corps' Hotel Company, 2nd Battalion, 26th Marines. He was 20 years old when he died July 28, 1969.

John was one of three kids. His sister Mary lives in Mandan, and his brother Tim lives in Arizona.

Mary remembers John as a happy, nice person who was always smiling. He was never unkind to a soul.

John was killed just 2 months after beginning his tour of duty in Vietnam.

After John died, his brother Tim joined the Marine Corps. Tim was not sent to Vietnam but felt he owed it to his brother to join the military.

John's fellow soldiers remember him as a brave and good friend. He is deeply missed by all who knew him.

VIRGIL GREANY

Virgil Greany was from Rugby and he was born November 26, 1930. He served as a major in the Army. He was 33 years old when he died September 25, 1964.

Virgil served our country for over 12 years prior to his death, including service in Korea and Ethiopia before he volunteered to go to Vietnam as an adviser. Virgil had made the military a career, but he had a passion for mathematics. Virgil's dream was to become a math teacher after he retired from the Army.

The day Virgil died, a Vietnamese soldier threw four grenades into his vehicle. The third grenade exploded inside of the truck, killing Virgil.

Virgil left behind his young wife, stepchildren, and a daughter.

ROBERT "BOB" SIME

Robert "Bob" Sime grew up in Velva and Tolna and was born on December 10, 1939. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division, in what was called the "Garry Owen" regiment. Bob was 27 years old when he died on October 23, 1967.

His siblings are John, Richard, and Marilyn. His parents both worked in education.

Bob grew up in Velva. His senior year of high school the Sime family moved from Velva to Tolna, where his father became the superintendent of schools. Bob was tall and was talked into joining the basketball team at Tolna, where he played just for the fun of it.

Bob's cousin, Jean, remembers that Bob liked 1950s rock-and-roll music and that he always combed his hair like Elvis Presley. After graduating from Tolna High School, Bob enlisted in the Army.

In the Army, Bob met Lieutenant Bob Trimble, who became his company's executive officer. The two men had confidence in each other on missions and also enjoyed spending their free time together. Lieutenant Trimble remembers Bob's great sense of humor, even when times were tough. He was with Bob when Bob was killed and says that day will always haunt him.

THOMAS "TOM" SPITZER

Thomas "Tom" Spitzer grew up on a farm south of Wilton and was born June 17, 1941. He served as a Navy pilot on the USS *Oriskany*. Tom was 25 years old when he died on October 26, 1966.

Tom is survived by his siblings, wife, and his son Tom, who was born the month after his father was killed.

In high school, Tom and a friend began flying. He then attended North Dakota State University, where he participated in ROTC and received a degree in business administration.

During his Navy training, Tom was designated a Top Gun graduate. His brother Jeff says it was the proudest moment of Tom's life.

The Navy intended for Tom to stay in the United States to train other pilots, but Tom volunteered to go to Vietnam to serve his country. As a Navy pilot in Vietnam, Tom flew over 100 missions. One of those missions involved him flying over his wing commander, who had been shot down, to draw fire away while they waited for help to arrive. The Navy awarded Tom with distinguished medals in recognition of his heroism.

DONALD "DONNY" VOLLMER

Donald "Donny" Vollmer was from Bismark. He was born August 2, 1950. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Donny died on November 2, 1969. He was 19 years old.

Donny had three brothers and one sister. He enjoyed hunting and fishing in his free time. Donny decided to join the Army because his older brother Jim was enlisting and he wanted to go too. At the time, Donny was 17 years old, so his parents had to give permission, and Donny had to finish his GED while at basic training.

Donny and Jim served in the same unit, and Donny was a helicopter crew chief. A few weeks before Donny was killed, he and Jim came home on emergency leave because their mother had a heart attack. Donny spent his time at home telling his friends how much he loved serving his country. Jim's tour was almost over, so he was allowed to stay home, but Donny returned to Vietnam alone.

Jim believes that if Donny had not been killed in the war, he would have made the Army his career.

ROBERT BROTHEN

Robert Brothen was from Mohall and was born February 14, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Robert died on February 27, 1969. He had just turned 22 years old.

His two sisters were Beverly and Audrey, and his brother's name was Bernard. Even though he was Robert's

younger brother, Bernard joined the Army during the war just to help protect Robert.

At one point during their service, Robert and Bernard were both hospitalized in Washington State, being treated for foot rot, but didn't learn they were in the same place until the day after they left.

Robert's father Alvin died of cancer the same year Robert died. Their sister Beverly is the last living member of the family. Their mother Pearl passed away in 2004 but witnessed the deaths of three of her children and two husbands during her lifetime.

These are the stories of just a few North Dakotans and actually just a few of those brave soldiers killed in action in Vietnam. As we continue to participate in the commemoration of the Vietnam war, I believe it is critically important that we continue to honor and appreciate their sacrifice and to help educate the younger generation, like the Bismark High School students who are helping me with this project, on the importance of sacrifice and commitment to our country.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time be considered expired and the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, and that Senator HATCH be recognized to offer substitute amendment No. 1221 and a first-degree amendment to strike title 2 of the amendment. I further ask that the following amendments be the only other amendments in order during today's session of the Senate: Brown No. 1242 and Lankford No. 1237.

I further ask that when the Senate resumes consideration of H.R. 1314 on Monday, May 18, the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided between the managers or their designees, and that at 5:30, the Senate proceed to vote in relation to the Brown and Lankford amendments in that order, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes, and a 60-affirmative-vote threshold for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, reserving the right to object, first of all, I haven't had the opportunity to express my appreciation for the hard, hard work of the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Finance. The senior Senator from Oregon has gone through a lot the past 2 weeks trying to help us get to the point where we are today, so I admire the work

they have done and look forward to the fair amendment process we are going to have next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the motion to proceed is agreed to.

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1221

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 1221.

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

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 12, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. HATCH. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1243 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 1243 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program)

Strike title II.

AMENDMENT NO. 1237 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up the Lankford amendment No. 1237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. LANKFORD, proposes an amendment numbered 1237 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish consideration of the conditions relating to religious freedom of parties to trade negotiations as an overall negotiating objective of the United States) At the end of section 2(a), add the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I call up Brown amendment No. 1242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1242 to amendment No. 1221.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the trade adjustment assistance program to the level established by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011)

On page 118, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "shall not exceed" and all that follows and inserting "shall not exceed \$575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021."

(2) OFFSET.—

(A) CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking "and" at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

"(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;" and

(ii) by inserting "(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)" in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after "In determining the amount omitted from gross income", and

(iii) by inserting "AMOUNT OMITTED FROM" after "DETERMINATION OF" in the heading thereof.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to—

(i) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, if the chairman of the Committee on Finance and Senator WYDEN will indulge me, I would like 2 or 3 minutes to explain the amendment and the importance of it.

One of the most important reasons for the vote on Tuesday, I believe, is that a significant number of Members of this body and I think the public—those who support fast-track and those who oppose it—all believe that enforcement is important and assisting workers is important. So it would be a tragedy to send TPA to the desk of the President for him to sign, leading the way to at least two other trade agreements—the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the United States-European Union agreement, the so-called TTIP trade agreement—without enforcement and without assistance for workers.

We make decisions in this body, those who support this fast-track and the trade agreements, and we know—even the most enthusiastic supporters and cheerleaders for free trade acknowledge there are winners and losers when it comes to trade agreements. Some people, because of dislocation due to these trade agreements, dislocation in the economy, lose their jobs in places such as Wheeling, WV, and Bellaire, OH, right across the Ohio River. So it is important that we take care of those workers who lose their jobs because of our actions. That is why the TAA—trade adjustment assistance—provides help for workers to get new training and find new jobs when they are laid off from the chemical or steel industry along the Ohio River or elsewhere. The opportunity to be retrained is so important.

I meet people frequently who were laid off because of NAFTA or because of CAFTA and now they are back in school. A man the other day I met is becoming a nurse, a woman might become a physical therapist, a man might be trained in information technology or some other kind of work after they have lost their job. So that is the importance of trade adjustment assistance.

The President's budget called for a significantly higher number of dollars for trade adjustment assistance than the bill coming out of the Finance Committee. That is why I am offering my amendment, to get those dollars commensurate with the need, because every President in both parties—President Bush I on NAFTA, President Clinton on NAFTA and PNTR, President Bush on fast-track and CAFTA, President Obama on South Korea Free Trade Agreement and now on TPP—make big promises about trade numbers and increased jobs, big promises about higher wages. Unfortunately, those big promises end up with bad results.

We know it from South Korea most recently; we have seen it throughout the last 20 years of trade. That is why the number of dollars authorized and appropriated for the trade adjustment assistance needs to be increased, so it will take care of those people who lose their jobs because of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and because of TTIP, which this Congress could very well agree to in the next year or so.

So I ask for support of Brown amendment No. 1242. My understanding is that vote will come on Monday night. I appreciate the support of all the Members of this body.

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.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this week we welcome thousands of law enforcement officers for National Police Week 2015. It is a time to pay tribute to all the men and women who serve in Federal, State, and local law enforcement all across America. It is a good time for those of us who benefit from the shield of protection they provide—and actually, that is all of us—to express our gratitude.

Police officers are here to rededicate themselves to the pursuit of justice and to honor fallen officers. We are proud to have them all here in Washington.

I want to recognize especially the many men and women who protect and serve as peace officers in Kentucky. Today, I had the pleasure of meeting with some of Kentucky's finest. I want to thank them personally for courageously risking their lives in the service of people across the Commonwealth.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF ERNEST T. FRANKLIN

Sadly, the occasion of National Police Week is also the time when we pay tribute to the brave and honorable peace officers who have fallen in the line of duty over the last year. So I want to remember and say a few words about Kentucky's own Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin, of the Barren County Sheriff's Office, who died on April 2, 2014.

Deputy Sheriff Franklin was killed in an automobile crash on Kentucky

Route 90, just west of Glasgow. He was 58 years old and had served with the sheriff's office for 7 years.

Friends and coworkers recall him as a friendly man who always had a kind word for everyone. He worshipped at Hopewell Baptist Church, volunteered at the local community center and soup kitchen, and was, by all accounts, an excellent chef.

Deputy Sheriff Franklin put his life on the line every day to protect his fellow Kentuckians. I want to extend my deepest condolences to his family and to all of those who knew and loved him.

As Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin is mourned in Barren County, in Frankfort, the Kentucky State Police have created their own unique way to memorialize their fallen fellow officers. This week they unveiled a new statue called The Trooper, a figure of a Kentucky State Trooper cast in bronze and 10 feet tall, at the Kentucky State Police Academy.

The statue is a tribute to members of the Kentucky State Police who have given their lives in the line of duty. That is 27 troopers and officers. It is quite an inspirational sight—a lone figure in uniform striding forward, ready to defend the property, dignity, and lives of his fellow Kentuckians.

I know my colleagues in the Senate join me in holding the deepest admiration and respect for the many brave law enforcement officers across Kentucky and across the Nation. Theirs is both an honorable profession and a dangerous one. It is also a necessary one because the peace and order of a civil society that we all take for granted would not exist without them. Kentucky is grateful for our law enforcement officers' service, and we are grateful for the service of Deputy Sheriff Ernest T. Franklin.

NATIONAL BLUE ALERT ACT

On a related note, I was proud to co-sponsor and see to Senate passage this year of the National Blue Alert Act. The bill will establish a national Blue Alert system within the U.S. Department of Justice to help catch those criminals who kill, harm, or threaten law enforcement officers. The Blue Alert system will be similar to what the AMBER Alert system does for abducted children.

Should law enforcement officers be killed, seriously injured, threatened or go missing while in the line of duty, this system would be utilized to widely disseminate information to help identify and apprehend potential suspects.

Blue Alert will help bring to justice those who harm our police officers and hopefully help deter future violence. I was pleased to see that the House passed the bill earlier this week. With this bill, we will help protect those who put their lives on the line to protect us all.

FAIR AND EQUAL WAGES

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, last Sunday, I joined millions of people

across the country to celebrate the mothers in our lives—in mine, my wife Marcelle, my daughter, friends, and other family members. Mother's Day is an important reminder of just how essential these inspirational women are to their families, their friends, and their communities.

Mothers—and all women—are also essential to the fabric of our economy. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, just four decades ago, fewer than half of mothers were in the American work force. Today, 70 percent of mothers are working outside the home, and one-third of working mothers are the sole wage earners in their households. More than 30 percent of Vermont families rely on working moms as the exclusive wage earners in their homes.

The numbers are staggering. Yet working moms still fall behind in equal and fair pay. The Joint Economic Committee of Congress recently released a report showing that working mothers earn 3 percent less than women without children, while fathers earn 15 percent more than men without children. Working moms also face the potential of missing scheduled wage increases or bonuses, if they take time away from the workforce to care for a child.

Vermont has been a national leader in leveling the playing field for working moms. In 2002 the Green Mountain State enacted its own Equal Pay Act, making it illegal for employers to offer anything less than equal pay for equal work. The Federal Government has fallen behind, and it is far past time for Congress to approve the Paycheck Fairness Act. This legislation, authored by one of the trailblazers in the Senate, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI (D-MD), builds on efforts that date back more than 50 years to ensure a balanced and equal playing field in the workplace for women.

Of course, equal wages are not fair wages if they are not livable wages. According to the Joint Economic Committee, working mothers in families in the bottom 20 percent of households contribute an astounding 86 percent to their families' income. In an overwhelming majority of cases, these families are supported solely by a mother. That is just one of the many reasons we need to ensure that wages are not just equal and fair, but also livable. Two weeks ago I joined with Senator PATTY MURRAY (D-WA) and 31 other Democratic Senators to propose legislation to raise the minimum wage. The Raise the Wage Act will provide a staggered increase in the Federal minimum wage, from \$7.25 to \$12.00 by the year 2020. It is the right thing to do, and it is the fair thing to do, for working mothers, for our families, and for our Nation's economy as a whole.

Mother's Day is always an opportunity to show the moms in our lives just how valued they are. It is past time for Congress to do the same, and to act on commonsense bills like the Paycheck Fairness Act and the Raise the Wage Act.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD A. RITCHIE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, this week, the Senate will say goodbye to the Chamber's current Historian, and welcome him to the ranks of Historian Emeritus. Donald Ritchie has observed, studied, and documented the workings of the U.S. Senate for almost four decades. Only the second person to serve as the Historian of the Senate, Don has been with the Senate Historical Office since shortly after its creation.

Beginning in 1976, Don spearheaded the Senate Oral History Program, for which he interviewed dozens of former senators and their staff. He documented firsthand recollections of those individuals' time with the Senate, major events and debates, and how the institution evolved during their tenure. In the 1990s, the Senate Historical Office began making transcripts of the interviews available at various libraries and archives, including the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress and the Senate Library. These accounts are fascinating, and remind us of the intricacies—both in public and behind the scenes—of legislating in the U.S. Senate. The Oral History Program was a colossal undertaking, and one congressional scholars will study for many years to come. Don's work on this program was exceptional.

In addition the Senate Oral History Program, Don and the Senate Historical Office maintain and make available historical documents, statistics, and provide historical background and how it may pertain to current events. In addition to his enormous undertaking, for years, Don has provided enlightening—sometimes humorous, always informative—vignettes to Members and staffers of moments in history, from now famous—or infamous—committee proceedings, to turning points in historical Senate debates, to the personal interactions and relationships among Senators that often don't make the history books.

My wife Marcelle tells me that Don is always welcomed at the Senate spouses' luncheon because of his valuable insights.

Don often reminds us of our roots—how our many traditions began—and how the Senate, as a continuing body, has evolved, decade to decade, generation to generation. He reminds us that for all our political disagreements, progress in the Senate requires some measure of consent. The history of the Senate is clearer because of the talents of Don Ritchie. The time has come to thank him for his decades of service and to wish him well as he assumes a new title of Historian Emeritus.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD FRANCIS "PAT" PATIERNO

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to one of the foundational figures of the U.S. global demining effort, Mr. Donald Francis "Pat" Patierno.

Pat is retiring after more than 20 years of global demining leadership both at the State Department's Office of Humanitarian Demining and subsequently as a member of the board of directors and four-term president of the 501(c)3 Mine Advisory Group, MAG, America.

Pat was the first Director of the Office of Humanitarian Demining where he organized and led the U.S. Government worldwide demining program for nearly 10 years. Under his determined and capable leadership in those formative years, U.S. participation expanded its efforts to remove the scourge of landmines, unexploded bombs and shells left behind in former areas of conflict. From its modest beginnings that program today is working around the world to save civilians from becoming limbless victims of past wars.

Before his retirement from the State Department in 2006, Mr. Patierno oversaw a \$60 million program that supported humanitarian mine action assistance to over 40 countries. Subsequent to his retirement, he joined the board of directors of MAG America to carry on his humanitarian work in the area of demining and unexploded ordnance. At the same time Mr. Patierno served as the U.S. advocate for the Slovenian-based International Trust Fund for Demining and Mine Victims Assistance. Mr. Patierno became president of the MAG America board in January 2011. So strong and dedicated was his leadership that at the request of the board, he served four 1-year terms as president.

Many Senators know of my long interest in stopping the death and maiming of civilians from landmines and other unexploded ordnance left behind when conflicts end. The carnage does not stop when the soldiers cease combat: civilians continue dying and suffering long after the fighting stops, and they continue to do so today. That is why I, as former chairman and now ranking member of the Department of State and Foreign Operations subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee have so strongly supported the dedicated work of Pat Patierno and his colleagues.

I close by expressing my admiration of and appreciation for Pat Patierno's selfless service, outstanding leadership, commitment, determination, and tenacity in this most noble and worthy cause.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, on May 14, 2015, the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library organized, elected a chairman, a vice chairman, and adopted committee rules for the 114th Congress. Members of the Joint

Committee on the Library elected Senator ROY BLUNT as chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as vice chairman. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

RULES OF PROCEDURE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY, 114TH CONGRESS

TITLE I—MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE

1. Regular meetings may be called by the Chairman, with the concurrence of the Vice-Chairman, as may be deemed necessary or pursuant to the provision of paragraph 3 of rule XXVI of the Standings Rules of the Senate.

2. Meetings of the committee, including meetings to conduct hearings, shall be open to the public, except that a meeting or series of meetings by the committee on the same subject for a period of no more than 14 calendar days may be closed to the public on a motion made and seconded to go into closed session to discuss only whether the matters enumerated in subparagraphs (A) through (F) would require the meeting to be closed followed immediately by a recorded vote in open session by a majority of the members of the committee when it is determined that the matters to be discussed or the testimony to be taken at such meeting or meetings—

(A) will disclose matters necessary to be kept secret in the interests of national defense or the confidential conduct of the foreign relations of the United States;

(B) will relate solely to matters of the committee staff personal or internal staff management or procedures;

(C) will tend to charge an individual with a crime or misconduct, to disgrace or injure the professional standing of an individual, or otherwise to expose an individual to public contempt or obloquy, or will represent a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy of an individual;

(D) will disclose the identity of any informer or law enforcement agent or will disclose any information relating to the investigation or prosecution of a criminal offense that is required to be kept secret in the interest of effective law enforcement;

(E) will disclose information relating to the trade secrets or financial or commercial information pertaining specifically to a given person if—

(1) an Act of Congress requires the information to be kept confidential by Government officers and employees; or

(2) the information has been obtained by the Government on a confidential basis, other than through an application by such person for a specific Government financial or other benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the benefit, and is required to be kept secret in order to prevent undue injury to the competitive position of such person; or

(F) may divulge matters required to be kept confidential under the provisions of law or Government regulation. (Paragraph 5(b) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.)

3. Written notices of committee meetings will normally be sent by the committee's staff director to all members at least 3 days in advance. In addition, the committee staff will email or telephone reminders of committee meetings to all members of the committee or to the appropriate staff assistants in their offices.

4. A copy of the committee's intended agenda enumerating separate items of com-

mittee business will normally be sent to all members of the committee by the staff director at least 1 day in advance of all meetings. This does not preclude any member of the committee from raising appropriate non-agenda topics.

5. Any witness who is to appear before the committee in any hearing shall file with the clerk of the committee at least 3 business days before the date of his or her appearance, a written statement of his or her proposed testimony and an executive summary thereof, in such form as the Chairman may direct, unless the Chairman waived such a requirement for good cause.

TITLE II—QUORUMS

1. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(1) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 4 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

2. Pursuant to paragraph 7(a)(2) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules, 2 members of the committee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony; provided, however, once a quorum is established, any one member can continue to take such testimony.

3. Under no circumstance may proxies be considered for the establishment of a quorum.

TITLE III—VOTING

1. Voting in the committee on any issue will normally be by voice vote.

2. If a third of the members present so demand, a recorded vote will be taken on any question by roll call.

3. The results of the roll call votes taken in any meeting upon a measure, or any amendment thereto, shall be stated in the committee report on that measure unless previously announced by the committee, and such report or announcement shall be include a tabulation of the votes cast in favor and the votes cast in opposition to each measure and amendment by each member of the committee. (Paragraph 7(b) and (c) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

4. Proxy voting shall be allowed on all measures and matters before the committee. However, the vote of the committee to report a measure or matters shall require the concurrence of a majority of the members of the committee who are physically present at the time of the vote. Proxies will be allowed in such cases solely for the purpose of recording a member's position on the question and then only in those instances when the absentee committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded. (Paragraph 7(a)(3) of rule XXVI of the Standing Rules.)

TITLE IV—DELEGATION AND AUTHORITY TO THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN

1. The Chairman and Vice Chairman are authorized to sign all necessary vouchers and routine papers for which the committee's approval is required and to decide in the committee's behalf on all routine business.

2. The Chairman is authorized to engage commercial reporters for the preparation of transcripts of committee meetings and hearings.

3. The Chairman is authorized to issue, on behalf of the committee, regulations normally promulgated by the committee at the beginning of each session.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

RULES OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, on May 14, 2015, the Joint Committee on Printing organized, elected a chairman,

a vice chairman, and adopted committee rules for the 114th Congress. Members of the Joint Committee on Printing elected Senator ROY BLUNT as vice chairman and Congressman GREGG HARPER as chairman. Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 2, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the committee rules be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, 114TH CONGRESS

RULE 1.—COMMITTEE RULES

(a) The rules of the Senate and House insofar as they are applicable, shall govern the Committee.

(b) The Committee's rules shall be published in the Congressional Record as soon as possible following the Committee's organizational meeting in each odd-numbered year.

(c) Where these rules require a vote of the members of the Committee, polling of members either in writing or by telephone shall not be permitted to substitute for a vote taken at a Committee meeting, unless the Ranking Minority Member assents to waiver of this requirement.

(d) Proposals for amending Committee rules shall be sent to all members at least one week before final action is taken thereon, unless the amendment is made by unanimous consent.

RULE 2.—REGULAR COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(a) The regular meeting date of the Committee shall be the second Wednesday of every month when the House and Senate are in session. A regularly scheduled meeting need not be held if there is no business to be considered and after appropriate notification is made to the Ranking Minority Member. Additional meetings may be called by the Chairman, as he may deem necessary or at the request of the majority of the members of the Committee.

(b) If the Chairman of the Committee is not present at any meeting of the Committee, the Vice-Chairman or Ranking Member of the majority party on the Committee who is present shall preside at the meeting.

RULE 3.—QUORUM

(a) Five members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, which is required for the purpose of closing meetings, promulgating Committee orders or changing the rules of the Committee.

(b) Three members shall constitute a quorum for purposes of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE 4.—PROXIES

(a) Written or telegraphic proxies of Committee members will be received and recorded on any vote taken by the Committee, except for the purpose of creating a quorum.

(b) Proxies will be allowed on any such votes for the purpose of recording a member's position on a question only when the absentee Committee member has been informed of the question and has affirmatively requested that he be recorded.

RULE 5.—OPEN AND CLOSED MEETINGS

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of business of the Committee shall be open to the public except when the Committee, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by roll call vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public. No such vote shall be required to close a meeting that relates solely to internal budget or personnel matters.

(b) No person other than members of the Committee, and such congressional staff and other representatives as they may authorize, shall be present in any business session that has been closed to the public.

RULE 6.—ALTERNATING CHAIRMANSHIP AND VICE-CHAIRMANSHIP BY CONGRESSES

(a) The Chairmanship and Vice Chairmanship of the Committee shall alternate between the House and the Senate by Congresses: The senior member of the minority party in the House of Congress opposite of that of the Chairman shall be the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(b) In the event the House and Senate are under different party control, the Chairman and Vice Chairman shall represent the majority party in their respective Houses. When the Chairman and Vice-Chairman represent different parties, the Vice-Chairman shall also fulfill the responsibilities of the Ranking Minority Member as prescribed by these rules.

RULE 7.—PARLIAMENTARY QUESTIONS

Questions as to the order of business and the procedures of Committee shall in the first instance be decided by the Chairman; subject always to an appeal to the Committee.

RULE 8.—HEARINGS: PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS AND WITNESSES

(a) The Chairman, in the case of hearings to be conducted by the Committee, shall make public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any hearing to be conducted on any measure or matter at least one week before the commencement of that hearing unless the Committee determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing at an earlier date. In the latter event, the Chairman shall make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The staff director of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest of the Congressional Record as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(b) So far as practicable, all witnesses appearing before the Committee shall file advance written statements of their proposed testimony at least 48 hours in advance of their appearance and their oral testimony shall be limited to brief summaries. Limited insertions or additional germane material will be received for the record, subject to the approval of the Chairman.

RULE 9.—OFFICIAL HEARING RECORD

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be kept of all Committee proceedings and actions. Brief supplemental materials when required to clarify the transcript may be inserted in the record subject to the approval of the Chairman.

(b) Each member of the Committee shall be provided with a copy of the hearing transcript for the purpose of correcting errors of transcription and grammar, and clarifying questions or remarks. If any other person is authorized by a Committee Member to make his corrections, the staff director shall be so notified.

(c) Members who have received unanimous consent to submit written questions to witnesses shall be allowed two days within which to submit these to the staff director for transmission to the witnesses. The record may be held open for a period not to exceed two weeks awaiting the responses by witnesses.

(d) A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee. Testimony received in closed hearings shall not be released or included in any report without the approval of the Committee.

RULE 10.—WITNESSES FOR COMMITTEE HEARINGS

(a) Selection of witnesses for Committee hearings shall be made by the Committee

staff under the direction of the Chairman. A list of proposed witnesses shall be submitted to the members of the Committee for review sufficiently in advance of the hearings to permit suggestions by the Committee members to receive appropriate consideration.

(b) The Chairman shall provide adequate time for questioning of witnesses by all members, including minority Members and the rule of germaneness shall be enforced in all hearings notified.

(c) Whenever a hearing is conducted by the Committee upon any measure or matter, the minority on the Committee shall be entitled, upon unanimous request to the Chairman before the completion of such hearings, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to the measure or matter during at least one day of hearing thereon.

RULE 11.—CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FURNISHED TO THE COMMITTEE

The information contained in any books, papers or documents furnished to the Committee by any individual, partnership, corporation or other legal entity shall, upon the request of the individual, partnership, corporation or entity furnishing the same, be maintained in strict confidence by the members and staff of the Committee, except that any such information may be released outside of executive session of the Committee if the release thereof is effected in a manner which will not reveal the identity of such individual, partnership, corporation or entity in connection with any pending hearing or as a part of a duly authorized report of the Committee if such release is deemed essential to the performance of the functions of the Committee and is in the public interest.

RULE 12.—BROADCASTING OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS

The rule for broadcasting of Committee hearings shall be the same as Rule XI, clause 4, of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

RULE 13.—COMMITTEE REPORTS

(a) No Committee report shall be made public or transmitted to the Congress without the approval of a majority of the Committee except when Congress has adjourned: provided that any member of the Committee may make a report supplementary to or dissenting from the majority report. Such supplementary or dissenting reports should be as brief as possible.

(b) Factual reports by the Committee staff may be printed for distribution to Committee members and the public only upon authorization of the Chairman either with the approval of a majority of the Committee or with the consent of the Ranking Minority Member.

RULE 14.—CONFIDENTIALITY OF COMMITTEE REPORTS

No summary of a Committee report, prediction of the contents of a report, or statement of conclusions concerning any investigation shall be made by a member of the Committee or by any staff member of the Committee prior to the issuance of a report of the Committee.

RULE 15.—COMMITTEE STAFF

(a) The Committee shall have a staff director, selected by the Chairman. The staff director shall be an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate.

(b) The Ranking Minority Member may designate an employee of the House of Representatives or of the Senate as the minority staff director.

(c) The staff director, under the general supervision of the Chairman, is authorized to deal directly with agencies of the Government and with non-Government groups and individuals on behalf of the Committee.

(d) The Chairman or staff director shall timely notify the Ranking Minority Member or the minority staff director of decisions made on behalf of the Committee.

RULE 16.—COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

The Chairman of the Committee may establish such other procedures and take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the foregoing rules or to facilitate the effective operation of the Committee. Specifically, the Chairman is authorized, during the interim periods between meetings of the Committee, to act on all requests submitted by any executive department, independent agency, temporary or permanent commissions and committees of the Federal Government, the Government Publishing Office and any other Federal entity, pursuant to the requirements of applicable Federal law and regulations.

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES "CHICK" CLEVELAND

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate Lt. Gen. Charles "Chick" Cleveland of Montgomery, AL, for receiving the Congressional Gold Medal as one of the American Fighter Aces.

Lt. Gen. "Chick" Cleveland's distinguished Air Force career spanned nearly four decades, and more than 4,300 flight hours. His military decorations and awards include the Distinguished Service Medal (Air Force), Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross with oak leaf cluster, Meritorious Service Medal with oak leaf cluster, Air Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Air Force Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal and Republic of Korea Order of Military Merit, Chung Mu.

Less than 3 years after graduating from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and within months of joining the 334th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Kimpo Air Base, South Korea, he scored four confirmed MiG-15 kills. On September 21, 1952, Lieutenant Cleveland's squadron fought another flight of MiGs. Cleveland engaged one of the enemy aircraft and fired, scoring hits in the tail pipe, engine, and right wing. Within seconds, there was an explosion, and the MiG fell out of the sky. However, instead of watching the MiG to claim credit for the kill, Lieutenant Cleveland broke off the engagement to assist his squadron. He left Korea with those four confirmed kills—one confirmed victory short of becoming an ace.

After the war, he was stationed with the 27th Fighter-Bomber Wing at Bergstrom Air Force Base in Texas, where he led the transition team to the Air Force's new aircraft, the F-101 Voodoo. On August 10, 1962, Cleveland became the first pilot to achieve the 1000-flight hour mark in the Voodoo.

Lieutenant General Cleveland also served with distinction in Vietnam as the executive assistant to Gen. William Westmoreland, commander, Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

In 2008, 55 years after his aerial victories in Korea, he finally gained official recognition by the U.S. Air Force

as a fighter ace. With the de-classification of Soviet records in 2003, his friend and fellow Korean war ace, Dolph Overton discovered the Soviets' account of the events on September 21, 1952. With those records, as well as the testimonies of Cleveland's wingman that day, Don Pascoe, and his former operations officer, Frederick "Boots" Blesse, the Air Force awarded Lieutenant General Cleveland credit for one of his two probable victories in Korea and officially recognized him as an Air Force Ace.

Lieutenant General Cleveland retired from the Air Force in 1984 and settled in Montgomery, AL, close to where he once had command of the Air University at Maxwell Air Force Base. He continues to involve himself in his community. I am proud to call Lieutenant General Charles "Chick" Cleveland a fellow Alabamian and to acknowledge and celebrate his receipt of the Congressional Gold Medal.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SUN RIVER WATERSHED GROUP

• Mr. DAINES. Madam President, I rise to recognize Montana's Sun River Watershed Group from Cascade, MT, which was recently named one of four finalists for the 2015 North American Riverprize, a prestigious recognition from the International RiverFoundation. The award is meant to honor projects that have demonstrated excellence and diversity in river restoration.

The Sun River Watershed Group was formed in 1994 and has since prioritized the management and restoration of the river. Nineteen years later, the project is still succeeding. The group has formed a collaborative effort to discuss and solve natural resource issues and has acted as a seamless liaison between management agencies and the public.

Although the Sun River Watershed Group was not awarded the top prize, their tireless work makes all of Montana exceedingly proud. They should be commended for their dedication to restoring river flows to the Sun River as well as improving efficiency of water allocation for irrigation. To Montana, you are our winner for making our State a better place to live, work, and enjoy.●

CELEBRATING SIDNEY HUNTINGTON AND REMEMBERING DAN CUDDY

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, this is a bittersweet week in my home State of Alaska. On Saturday, the celebrated Athabascan Elder, Sidney Huntington, turned 100. That is indeed a cause for celebration. Sidney Huntington's life is the stuff of which legends are made. His book, "Shadows on the Koyukuk" published in 1993, details his remarkable life. Sidney's inspiring

ways are the subject of a stage play, "The Winter Bear." The Winter Bear is a play that tells the story of an abused, neglected Alaska Native teenager. He decides suicide is his best option until Athabascan elder Sidney Huntington shows him how to use traditional culture to work through his despair and find his true voice

Last evening as I approached the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial to honor the memories of Alaska State Troopers Patrick Scott Johnson and Gabriel Lenox Rich, I learned of the death of Dan Cuddy of Anchorage. Dan was president of First National Bank Alaska for some six decades. Dan was age 94. He leaves a remarkable legacy which is carried on today by his daughter Betsy Lawer and a large family of achievers. I will have more to say about the exemplary life of Dan Cuddy next week.

Dennis McMillan, the recently retired CEO of the Foraker Group spoke to KTVA last evening about Dan's passing. Dennis said, "We're losing history, especially as we are losing these 90 plus citizens, but such a great legacy because they were still engaged with the community and totally involved in all sorts of things, and great role models."

Dennis's words seem especially appropriate this week as we celebrate Dan's legacy while at the same time wishing Sidney another 100 years of inspiration to our Alaska community.●

TRIBUTE TO JON GEDNALSKE

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Jon Gednalske, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Jon is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, Jon is attending Luther College, where he is majoring in political science. Jon is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jon Gednalske for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CASSANDRA KRANZ

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Cassandra Kranz, an intern in my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Cassandra is a graduate of Watertown High School in Watertown, SD. Currently, Cassandra is attending Augustana College, where she is majoring in accounting, business administration, and government. Cassandra is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Cassandra Kranz for all of the fine work she has done and wish

her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JESSE NELSON

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Jesse Nelson, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Jesse is a graduate of Milbank High School in Milbank, SD. Currently, Jesse is attending Augustana College, where he is majoring in government and international affairs. Jesse is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jesse Nelson for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALEXANDRA STANLEY

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Alexandra Stanley, an intern in my Washington, DC office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Alexandra is a graduate of Washington High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Alexandra is a recent graduate of the University of Arizona, where she majored in English. Alexandra is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Alexandra Stanley for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOHN WEBER

• Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize John Weber, an intern in my Sioux Falls office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

John is a graduate of Highland Park Senior High School in Saint Paul, MN. John is also a recent graduate of South Dakota State University, where he majored in animal science. John is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to John Weber for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING CENTRAL PLUMBING CO.

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses have the unique opportunity to train skilled workers and create

well-paying jobs for members of their communities, while also providing necessary services with quality customer service. These apprenticeship programs are becoming increasingly useful to add highly-skilled workers to the general workforce. In recognition of their contribution, this week's Small Business of the Week is Central Plumbing Co. of Baton Rouge, La.

Founded in 1974 by the Payne family, Central Plumbing began serving the Baton Rouge area with one truck and a commitment to quality plumbing service. In the more than 40 years since, the Payne family has grown their business into a 40-employee operation, operating 20 trucks across the Southern Louisiana region. Today, fourth generation Master Plumber Jay Payne oversees operations of the business, continuing their commitment to providing the highest level service in residential and commercial plumbing.

Central Plumbing's commitment to service does not stop with their customers. With generations of Paynes joining the family business, the company realized the need for an organized program to train the next generation of Master Plumbers. Central Plumbing apprenticeship program offers the opportunity to learn the trade through paid, hands-on training and support. Programs like this can often serve as an alternative for individuals who do not pursue higher education. Apprenticeship programs are beneficial opportunities to pave the way for folks to become experts in a highly specialized field and get paid accordingly, and also provide a certain amount of security for sustained future of the industry and the small businesses who administer them.

Congratulations again to Small Business of the Week—Central Plumbing Co. Thank you for your decades of service and ongoing commitment to create good quality, high-paying jobs and to train the next generation of Louisianians to be Master Plumbers.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) reported that he had signed the

following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 651. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 820 Elmwood Avenue in Providence, Rhode Island, as the "Sister Ann Keefe Post Office".

H.R. 1075. An act to designate the United States Customs and Border Protection Port of Entry located at First Street and Pan American Avenue in Douglas, Arizona, as the "Raul Hector Castro Port of Entry".

At 1:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1381), as amended by Public Law 114-6, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives and the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate jointly re-appoint the following individuals each to a 2-year term on the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance: Ms. Barbara L. Camens of Washington, DC, Chair and Ms. Roberta L. Holzwarth of Rockford, Illinois.

The message further announced that pursuant to sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes (20 U.S.C. 42-43), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution: Mr. BECERRA of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 2004(b), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the Harry S. Truman Scholarship Foundation: Mr. DEUTCH of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy: Mr. ISRAEL of New York and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 8162 of Public Law 106-79, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members of the House of Representatives to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia and Mr. THOMPSON of California.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio, Mr. HONDA of California, and Mr. LIEU of California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3003, and the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. COHEN of Tennessee, and Mr. GRAYSON of Florida.

The message further announced that pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 2081, the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the United States Capitol Preservation Commission: Ms. KAPTUR of Ohio.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4(c) of House Resolution 5, 114th Congress, the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission: Mr. JAMES P. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, Co-Chair.

The message further announced that pursuant to the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 955(b) note), the Minority Leader re-appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to the National Council on the Arts: Ms. BETTY MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 2:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 2048. An act to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 1350. A bill to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May, 14, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 665. An act to encourage, enhance, and integrate Blue Alert plans throughout the United States in order to disseminate information when a law enforcement officer is seriously injured or killed in the line of duty, is missing in connection with the officer's official duties, or an imminent and credible threat that an individual intends to cause the serious injury or death of a law enforcement officer is received, and for other purposes.

S. 1124. An act to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to improve the Act.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 460. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to train Department of Homeland Security personnel how to effectively deter, detect, disrupt, and prevent human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-46).

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. KING:

S. 1338. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide licensing procedures for certain types of projects; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1339. A bill to permanently authorize the special immigrant nonminister religious worker program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 1340. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to improve coal leasing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1341. A bill to amend section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act in order to improve the privacy protections available to students and their parents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1342. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to conduct a study and issue a report that quantifies the energy savings benefits of

operational efficiency programs and services for commercial, institutional, industrial, and governmental entities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1343. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to maintain a project to improve hurricane forecasting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN:

S. 1344. A bill to clarify that nonprofit organizations such as Habitat for Humanity can accept donated mortgage appraisals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1345. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes self-management training by authorizing certified diabetes educators to provide diabetes self-management training services, including as part of telehealth services, under part B of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 1346. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an e-prize competition pilot program to provide up to 4 financial awards to eligible entities that develop and verifiably demonstrate technology that reduces the cost of electricity or space heat in a high-cost region; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1347. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 1349. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 1350. A bill to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1351. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to update certain procedures applicable to commerce in firearms and remove certain Federal restrictions on interstate firearms transactions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DONNELLY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1352. A bill to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1353. A bill to ensure appropriate judicial review of Federal Government actions by amending the prohibition on the exercise of jurisdiction by the United States Court of Federal Claims of certain claims pending in other courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1354. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for recognition of attending physician assistants as attending physicians to serve hospice patients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 1355. A bill to provide for higher education reform; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1356. A bill to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions; considered and passed.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1358. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 1359. A bill to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 179. A resolution designating May 16, 2015, as "Kids to Parks Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 30

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of full-time employee for purposes of the employer mandate in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 81

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from

New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 81, a bill to authorize preferential treatment for certain imports from Nepal, and for other purposes.

S. 127

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 127, a bill to prohibit Federal funding for motorcycle checkpoints, and for other purposes.

S. 153

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 153, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize additional visas for well-educated aliens to live and work in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 246

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 246, a bill to establish the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 327

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 327, a bill to provide for auditable financial statements for the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 624

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 624, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 797

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 797, a bill to amend the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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. 980

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to clarify the definition of navigable waters, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1006, a bill to incentivize early adoption of positive train control, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1101

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1101, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for the regulation of patient records and certain decision support software.

S. 1119

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1119, a bill to establish the National Criminal Justice Commission.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1175

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, a bill to improve the safety of hazardous materials rail transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors 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. 1265

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1265, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to make certain certifications to Congress before retiring B-1, B-2, or B-52 bomber aircraft.

S. 1287

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1287, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from chronic liver disease and liver cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1299

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1299, a bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act.

S. 1324

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) 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. 1330

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to amend the Equal Credit Opportunity Act to prohibit discrimination on account of sexual orientation or gender identity when extending credit.

S. 1334

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1334, a bill to strengthen enforcement mechanisms to stop illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing, to amend the Tuna Conventions Act of 1950 to implement the Antigua Convention, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 157

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 157, a resolution recognizing the economic, cultural, and political contributions of the Southeast-Asian American community on the 40th anniversaries of the beginning of Khmer Rouge control over Cambodia and the beginning of the Cambodian Genocide and the end of the Vietnam War and the "Secret War" in the Kingdom of Laos.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policy to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1348. A bill to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 with respect to high priority corridors on the National Highway System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I am introducing the Route to Opportunity and Development Act of 2015, which would amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act, ISTEA, of 1991 to begin the process toward eventually making the Raleigh to Norfolk Corridor in North Carolina and Virginia part of the Interstate system, and to help fully upgrade the corridor to interstate standards. My colleagues, Senator RICHARD BURR, Senator TIM KAINE, and Senator MARK WARNER have agreed to cosponsor the bill. In addition, Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD has introduced a companion bill in the House of Representatives.

The Route to Opportunity and Development Act of 2015 would designate the following as high priority: the Raleigh-Norfolk Corridor from Raleigh, NC, through Rocky Mount, Williamston, and Elizabeth City, NC, to Norfolk, VA.

If the Raleigh-Norfolk corridor becomes part of the Interstate system, it would connect vital centers of commerce in the Raleigh and Norfolk/Hampton Roads region. Raleigh and Hampton Roads are two of the largest east coast metropolitan regions served by a single primary interstate route and this act proposes a second primary interstate route for the two areas.

This act helps advance the North Carolina Department of Transportation's Strategic Transportation Corridors Vision, which aims to provide North Carolina with a network of high priority corridors to promote economic development and enhance interstate commerce. It is also an important part of the future vision for transportation in the Commonwealth of Virginia. Federal High Priority Corridors are eligible for Federal funds to assist states in the coordination, planning, design and construction of nationally significant transportation corridors for the purposes of economic growth and interregional and interregional growth.

By Mr. McCONNELL:

S. 1357. A bill to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1357

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITY UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) ROVING SURVEILLANCE AND ACCESS TO BUSINESS RECORDS.—Section 102(b)(1) of the USA PATRIOT Improvement and Reauthorization Act of 2005 (50 U.S.C. 1805 note) is amended by striking “June 1, 2015” and inserting “July 31, 2015”.

(b) INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS.—Section 6001(b)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (50 U.S.C. 1801 note) is amended by striking “June 1, 2015” and inserting “July 31, 2015”.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1358. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today, I am reintroducing a piece of legislation which I strongly believe in and know that it is long overdue. The Hmong Veterans' Service Recognition Act is a bill to authorize the interment in national cemeteries of Hmong veterans who served in support of U.S. forces during the Vietnam War. I, along with a bipartisan group of colleagues, Senators Klobuchar, Sullivan, Franken, and Whitehouse believe this is an appropriate honor.

Public Law 106-207, The Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000 already acknowledges Hmong Special Guerilla Unit's contributions during Vietnam and recognizes the service of Hmong Special Guerilla Unit veterans for the purpose of naturalization. Today we try to write the next chapter for these brave veterans and grant them the one right they are requesting, to be buried in our U.S. national cemeteries.

The Hmong were ideal candidates for America's secret war—they were fighters known for their bravery and warrior traditions who knew the rocky mountain terrain of Northern Laos very well. The U.S. Central Intelligence Agency conducted covert operations in Laos which employed some 60,000 Hmong volunteers in Special Guerilla Units. The Hmong Fighters interrupted operations on the Ho Chi Minh trail and assisted in downed aircraft recovery operations of American Airmen. In Laos, they valiantly fought the Vietnamese and Laotian Communists for over a decade and were critical to America's war efforts in Vietnam.

This year marks the 40th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War. More than 35,000 Hmong lost their lives and many more were injured and disabled. I would like to recognize several Hmong Combat Veterans who live in Alaska. Lieutenant Pasert Lee from Mountain View in Anchorage, AK, was injured in 1972 when his bunker was bombed while providing radio support for American

jets in Laos. He recovered after several days, made his way to a refugee camp and many years later he was able to come to America. Lieutenant Wilson Chong Neng Vang, Sergeant Tong Pao Less and Sergeant Xia Ger Vang reside in Anchorage, AK, and are recognized for their selfless service in the U.S. Secret Army, Kingdom of Laos.

There are currently over 260,000 Hmong people in America and according to the 2010 Census, the heaviest concentrations are in California, Minnesota, Wisconsin, North Carolina, Michigan, Colorado, Georgia, Oklahoma, Oregon, and my home state of Alaska. Of the Hmong who became U.S. citizens, approximately 6,000 veterans are still with us today, and they deserve the choice to be buried in national cemeteries.

This concept is not without precedent. Currently, burial benefits are available for Philippine Armed Forces veterans who answered the call to serve during World War II, just like the Hmong. This legislation would not grant the small group of Hmong veterans full veteran benefits, but would simply authorize their interment in national cemeteries across the Nation. A small, but deserved token of appreciation and an appropriate honor for their sacrifices towards a common goal of democracy and freedom in the world.

I believe it is time to recognize the Hmong-American's bravery, sacrifice and loyalty to the United States. We would like to honor the Hmong Special Guerilla Unit Veterans' service and sacrifices by allowing them to be buried alongside their brothers in arms in our national cemeteries. Again, I appreciate the support of my colleagues who have joined me to introduce this legislation and look forward to working with them and others in the Senate to finally getting this approved into law.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, today marks the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the forced exit of many members of the Hmong community from Laos following the U.S. withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. Tens of thousands of the Hmong came to my State of Minnesota, and today in Minnesota, we are honoring this anniversary with Hmong American Day. I am proud to join my State in recognizing the remarkable service of those who fought on our behalf, and in celebrating the contributions of Hmong Americans to our shared community over the last 40 years.

The way I like to explain to people why there are so many Hmong Americans in Minnesota is by telling them that there are many fewer American names on the Vietnam War Memorial because of what the Hmong did for us during the “secret war.” Many people in America still do not realize that. But as the permanent memorial at Arlington says about the Hmong fighters and their American advisors: “Their patriotic valor and loyalty in the defense of liberty and democracy will

never be forgotten.” In Minnesota, we recognize the remarkable service the Hmong fighters performed for our country, and we will never forget.

The Senate resolution I am proud to join Senator HIRONO and many of our colleagues in introducing in recognition of May as Asian/Pacific American Heritage Month states, “the actions of the Hmong in Laos in support of the United States during the Vietnam War saves the lives of countless people of the United States.” The Hmong fought on our behalf and saved American lives. But as the new communist regime took control in Laos, the Hmong were forced to begin their journey as refugees. For many, this journey would eventually end in Minnesota. Today, the vibrant Hmong American community in the Twin Cities—the largest urban Hmong community in the country—and throughout Minnesota is tens of thousands strong and is woven into the fabric of our society.

You can see their tremendous contribution to American life every day in the many small businesses started by Hmong Americans on University Avenue, or at Hmong Village. You can see it in all the ways that Hmong Americans have brought their culture to the United States and helped to shape the culture of today's Minnesota. I also remain incredibly proud that Minnesota can boast that we had the Nation's very first Hmong American State legislator with my good friend Mee Moua, who has become a national leader on Asian American issues. I am glad others have followed in her wake.

Representing the Hmong American community in the Senate is an important part of my job. That is why I am a cosponsor of a bill being reintroduced by Senator MURKOWSKI of Alaska along with my fellow Minnesota Senator, Senator KLOBUCHAR, to make sure that Hmong fighters in the “secret war” can be honored with burial in our national cemeteries. The Hmong Americans who fought for us deserve nothing less. It is also why I traveled to Laos several years ago to engage the Lao Government directly on protecting the Hmong people, including refugees who had been forcibly repatriated to Laos from Thailand.

And it is why I fight for the Hmong Americans of Minnesota every day in the Senate. Hmong Americans want the same things that all Americans want—good-paying jobs, a bright future for their children, excellent health care. It is my job to help make sure those things are within everyone's reach.

The Hmong American community has come through so much adversity as they left Laos and as they resettled in America, and they faced that adversity with resilience and courage. They serve as an inspiration to us all.

We are so proud that the Hmong American community is part of the Minnesota—and the American—community. I am very pleased to join Minnesota in celebrating Hmong American

Day—to celebrate the community’s achievements and to commemorate the sacrifices of their loved ones in support of American troops so many years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1358

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Hmong Veterans’ Service Recognition Act”.

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY FOR INTERMENT IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2402(a) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

- “(10) Any individual—
- “(A) who—
- “(i) was naturalized pursuant to section 2(1) of the Hmong Veterans’ Naturalization Act of 2000 (Public Law 106–207; 8 U.S.C. 1423 note); and
- “(ii) at the time of the individual’s death resided in the United States; or
- “(B) who—
- “(i) the Secretary determines served with a special guerrilla unit or irregular forces operating from a base in Laos in support of the Armed Forces of the United States at any time during the period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending May 7, 1975; and
- “(ii) at the time of the individual’s death—
- “(I) was a citizen of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; and
- “(II) resided in the United States.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to an individual dying on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 179—DESIGNATING MAY 16, 2015, AS “KIDS TO PARKS DAY”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 179

Whereas the 5th annual Kids to Parks Day will be celebrated on May 16, 2015;

Whereas the goal of Kids to Parks Day is to promote healthy outdoor recreation and environmental stewardship, empower young people, and encourage families to get outdoors and visit the parks and public land of the United States;

Whereas on Kids to Parks Day, individuals from rural and urban areas of the United States can be reintroduced to the splendid national, State, and neighborhood parks located in their communities;

Whereas communities across the United States offer a variety of natural resources and public land, often with free access, to individuals seeking outdoor recreation;

Whereas the people of the United States, young and old, should be encouraged to lead more healthy and active lifestyles;

Whereas Kids to Parks Day is an opportunity for families to take a break from their busy lives and come together for a day of active, wholesome fun; and

Whereas Kids to Parks Day will broaden an appreciation for nature and the outdoors in young people, foster a safe setting for independent play and healthy adventure in neighborhood parks, and facilitate self-reliance while strengthening communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 16, 2015, as “Kids to Parks Day;”

(2) recognizes the importance of outdoor recreation and the preservation of open spaces to the health and education of the young people of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1226. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1227. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1228. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1229. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1230. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1231. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1233. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1234. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1235. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1236. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1237. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1238. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1239. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1240. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

SA 1241. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 644, to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations.

SA 1243. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra.

SA 1244. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1245. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1246. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1247. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1248. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1226. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. PETERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPANDING TRADE EXPORTS

SEC. 301. REPEAL OF DUPLICATIVE INSPECTION AND GRADING PROGRAM.

(a) FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008.—Effective June 18, 2008, section 11016 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–246; 122 Stat. 2130) is repealed.

(b) AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 2014.—Effective February 7, 2014, section 12106 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (Public Law 113–79; 128 Stat. 981) is repealed.

(c) APPLICATION.—The Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 601 et seq.) and the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C.

1621 et seq.) shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of law struck by this section had not been enacted.

SA 1227. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 109, add the following:

(c) **OUTREACH AND INPUT FROM SMALL BUSINESSES TO TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 609 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f)(1) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the President submits the notification required under section 5(a) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Chief Counsel’) shall convene an Interagency Working Group (in this subsection referred to as the ‘Working Group’), which shall consist of an employee from each of the following agencies, as selected by the head of the agency or an official delegated by the head of the agency:

“(A) The Office of the United States Trade Representative.

“(B) The Department of Commerce.

“(C) The Department of Agriculture.

“(D) Any other agency that the Chief Counsel, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, determines to be relevant with respect to the subject of the trade agreement being negotiated pursuant to section 3(b) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (in this subsection referred to as the ‘covered trade agreement’).

“(2) Not later than 30 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel convenes the Working Group under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall identify a diverse group of small entities, representatives of small entities, or a combination thereof, to provide to the Working Group the views of small businesses in the manufacturing, services, and agriculture industries on the potential economic effects of the covered trade agreement.

“(3)(A) Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Chief Counsel convenes the Working Group under paragraph (1), the Chief Counsel shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the economic impacts of the covered trade agreement on small entities, which shall—

“(i) identify the most important priorities, opportunities, and challenges to various industries from the covered trade agreement;

“(ii) assess the impact for new small entities to start exporting, or increase their exports, to markets in the covered trade agreement;

“(iii) analyze the competitive position of industries likely to be significantly affected by the covered trade agreement;

“(iv) identify—

“(I) any State-owned enterprises in each country pertaining to the covered trade agreement that could be pose a threat to small entities; and

“(II) any steps to take to create a level-playing field for those small entities;

“(v) identify any rule of an agency that should be modified to become compliant with the covered trade agreement; and

“(vi) include an overview of the methodology used to develop the report, including the number of small entity participants by industry, how those small entities were selected, and any other factors that the Chief Counsel may determine appropriate.

“(B) To ensure that negotiations for the covered trade agreement are not disrupted, the President may require that the Chief Counsel delay submission of the report under subparagraph (A) until after the negotiations of the covered trade agreement are concluded, provided that the delay allows the Chief Counsel to submit the report to Congress not later than 45 days before the Senate or the House of Representatives acts to approve or disapprove the covered trade agreement.

“(C) The Chief Counsel shall, to the extent practicable, coordinate the submission of the report under this paragraph with the United States International Trade Commission, the United States Trade Representative, other agencies, and trade advisory committees to avoid unnecessary duplication of reporting requirements.”

(d) **STATE TRADE AND EXPORT PROMOTION GRANT PROGRAM.**—Section 22 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 652) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (1) as subsection (m); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (k) the following:

“(1) **STATE TRADE AND EXPORT PROMOTION GRANT PROGRAM.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

“(A) the term ‘eligible small business concern’ means a business concern that—

“(i) is organized or incorporated in the United States;

“(ii) is operating in the United States;

“(iii) meets—

“(I) the applicable industry-based small business size standard established under section 3; or

“(II) the alternate size standard applicable to the program under section 7(a) of this Act and the loan programs under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 695 et seq.);

“(iv) has been in business for not less than 1 year, as of the date on which assistance using a grant under this subsection commences;

“(v) is export ready, as determined by the Associate Administrator; and

“(vi) has access to sufficient resources to bear the costs associated with exporting and doing business with foreign purchasers, including the costs of packing, shipping, freight forwarding, and customs brokers;

“(B) the term ‘program’ means the State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program established under paragraph (2);

“(C) the term ‘rural small business concern’ means an eligible small business concern located in a rural area, as that term is defined in section 1393(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(D) the term ‘socially and economically disadvantaged small business concern’ has the meaning given that term in section 8(a)(4)(A) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(a)(4)(A)); and

“(E) the term ‘State’ means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

“(2) **ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.**—The Associate Administrator shall establish a trade and export promotion grant program, to be known as the ‘State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program’, to make grants to

States to carry out export programs that assist eligible small business concerns in—

“(A) participation in a foreign trade mission;

“(B) a foreign market sales trip;

“(C) a subscription to services provided by the Department of Commerce;

“(D) the payment of website translation fees;

“(E) the design of international marketing media;

“(F) a trade show exhibition;

“(G) participation in training workshops;

“(H) a reverse trade mission;

“(I) procurement of foreign consultancy services (after consultation with the Department of Commerce to avoid duplication); or

“(J) any other export initiative determined appropriate by the Associate Administrator.

“(3) **GRANTS.**—

“(A) **JOINT REVIEW.**—In carrying out the program, the Associate Administrator may make a grant to a State to increase the number of eligible small business concerns in the State that export and to increase the value of the exports by eligible small business concerns in the State.

“(B) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In making grants under this subsection, the Associate Administrator may give priority to an application by a State that proposes an export program that—

“(i) focuses on eligible small business concerns as part of an export promotion program;

“(ii) demonstrates intent to promote exports by—

“(I) socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns;

“(II) small business concerns owned or controlled by women; and

“(III) rural small business concerns;

“(iii) promotes exports from a State that is not 1 of the 10 States with the highest percentage of exporters that are eligible small business concerns, based upon the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce; and

“(iv) includes—

“(I) activities which have resulted in the highest return on investment based on the most recent year; and

“(II) the adoption of shared best practices included in the annual report of the Administration.

“(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—

“(i) **SINGLE APPLICATION.**—A State may not submit more than 1 application for a grant under the program in any 1 fiscal year.

“(ii) **PROPORTION OF AMOUNTS.**—The total value of grants made under the program during a fiscal year to the 10 States with the highest percentage of exporters that are eligible small business concerns, based upon the most recent data available from the Department of Commerce, shall be not more than 40 percent of the amounts appropriated for the program for that fiscal year.

“(iii) **DURATION.**—The Associate Administrator shall award a grant under this program for a period of not more than 2 years.

“(D) **APPLICATION.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—A State desiring a grant under the program shall submit an application at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Associate Administrator may establish.

“(ii) **CONSULTATION TO REDUCE DUPLICATION.**—A State desiring a grant under the program shall—

“(I) before submitting an application under clause (i), consult with applicable trade agencies of the Federal Government on the scope and mission of the activities the State proposes to carry out using the grant, to ensure proper coordination and reduce duplication in services; and

“(II) document the consultation conducted under subclause (I) in the application submitted under clause (i).

“(4) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—The Associate Administrator shall award grants under the program on a competitive basis.

“(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of an export program carried out using a grant under the program shall be—

“(A) for a State that has a high export volume, as determined by the Associate Administrator, not more than 65 percent; and

“(B) for a State that does not have a high export volume, as determined by the Associate Administrator, not more than 75 percent.

“(6) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of an export program carried out using a grant under the program shall be comprised of not less than 50 percent cash and not more than 50 percent of indirect costs and in-kind contributions, except that no such costs or contributions may be derived from funds from any other Federal program.

“(7) REPORTS.—

“(A) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Associate Administrator shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report, which shall include—

“(i) a description of the structure of and procedures for the program;

“(ii) a management plan for the program; and

“(iii) a description of the merit-based review process to be used in the program.

“(B) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Associate Administrator shall publish on the website of the Administration an annual report regarding the program, which shall include—

“(I) the number and amount of grants made under the program during the preceding year;

“(II) a list of the States receiving a grant under the program during the preceding year, including the activities being performed with each grant;

“(III) the effect of each grant on exports by eligible small business concerns in the State receiving the grant;

“(IV) the total return on investment for each State; and

“(V) a description of best practices by States that showed high returns on investment and significant progress in helping more eligible small business concerns to export.

“(ii) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—On the date on which the Associate Administrator publishes a report under clause (i), the Associate Administrator shall notify the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives that the report has been published.

“(8) REVIEWS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Administration shall conduct a review of—

“(i) the extent to which recipients of grants under the program are measuring the performance of the activities being conducted and the results of the measurements; and

“(ii) the overall management and effectiveness of the program.

“(B) REPORTS.—

“(i) PILOT PROGRAM.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Inspector General of the Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small

Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding the use of amounts made available under the State Trade and Export Promotion Grant Program under section 1207 of the Small Business Jobs Act of 2010 (15 U.S.C. 649b note).

“(ii) NEW STEP PROGRAM.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which the first grant is awarded under this subsection, the Inspector General of the Administration shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report regarding the review conducted under subparagraph (A).

“(9) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program—

“(A) \$30,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(B) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(C) \$40,000,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(D) \$45,000,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(E) \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.”

(e) MEMBERSHIP OF REPRESENTATIVES OF STATE TRADE PROMOTION AGENCIES ON TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—Section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

“(2) REPRESENTATIVES FROM STATE TRADE PROMOTION AGENCIES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The TPCC shall also include 1 or more members appointed by the President, after consultation with associations representing State trade promotion agencies, who are representatives of State trade promotion agencies.

“(B) TERM.—A member appointed under subparagraph (A) shall be appointed for a term of 2 years.

“(C) PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

“(i) NO COMPENSATION.—A member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) shall serve without compensation.

“(ii) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—A member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from the homes or regular place of business of the member in the performance of services for the TPCC.

“(iii) ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of Commerce, or the head of another agency, as appropriate, shall make available to a member of the TPCC appointed under subparagraph (A) administrative services and assistance, including a security clearance, as the member may reasonably require to carry out services for the TPCC.”; and

(2) in subsection (e), in the first sentence, by inserting “(other than members described in subsection (d)(2))” after “Members of the TPCC”.

(f) STATE AND FEDERAL EXPORT PROMOTION COORDINATION WORKING GROUP.—Subtitle C of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 2313 the following:

“SEC. 2313A. STATE AND FEDERAL EXPORT PROMOTION COORDINATION WORKING GROUP.

“(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—It is the policy of the United States to promote exports as an opportunity for small businesses. In exercising their powers and functions in order to advance that policy, all Federal departments and agencies shall work constructively with State and local agencies engaged in export promotion and export financing activities.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The President shall establish a State and Federal Export Promotion Coordination Working Group (in this section referred to as the ‘Working Group’) as a subcommittee of the Trade Promotion Coordination Committee (in this section referred to as the ‘TPCC’).

“(c) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Working Group are—

“(1) to identify issues related to the coordination of Federal resources relating to export promotion and export financing with such resources provided by State and local governments;

“(2) to identify ways to improve coordination with respect to export promotion and export financing activities through the strategic plan developed under section 2312(c);

“(3) to develop a strategy for improving coordination of Federal and State resources relating to export promotion and export financing, including methods to eliminate duplication of effort and overlapping functions; and

“(4) to develop a strategic plan for considering and implementing the suggestions of the Working Group as part of the strategic plan developed under section 2312(c).

“(d) MEMBERSHIP.—The Secretary of Commerce shall select the members of the Working Group, who shall include—

“(1) representatives from State trade agencies representing regionally diverse areas; and

“(2) representatives of the departments and agencies that are represented on the TPCC, who are designated by the heads of their respective departments or agencies to advise the head on ways of promoting the exportation of United States goods and services.”

(g) REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO EXPORT.GOV AS A SINGLE WINDOW FOR EXPORT INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Associate Administrator for International Trade of the Small Business Administration shall, after consultation with the entities specified in paragraph (2), submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the recommendations of the Associate Administrator for improving the experience provided by the Internet website Export.gov (or a successor website) as—

(A) a comprehensive resource for information about exporting articles from the United States; and

(B) a single website for exporters to submit all information required by the Federal Government with respect to the exportation of articles from the United States.

(2) ENTITIES SPECIFIED.—The entities specified in this paragraph are—

(A) small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)) that are exporters; and

(B) the President’s Export Council, State agencies with responsibility for export promotion or export financing, district export councils, and trade associations.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(h) SMALL BUSINESS INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON EXPORT FINANCING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and the Overseas

Private Investment Corporation shall jointly establish a Small Business Inter-Agency Task Force on Export Financing to—

(A) review and improve Federal export finance programs for small business concerns; and

(B) coordinate the activities of the Federal Government to assist small business concerns seeking to export.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “small business concern” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(i) AVAILABILITY OF STATE RESOURCES GUIDES ON EXPORT.GOV.—The Secretary of Commerce shall make available on the Internet website Export.gov (or a successor website) information on the resources relating to export promotion and export financing available in each State—

(1) organized by State; and

(2) including information on State agencies with responsibility for export promotion or export financing and district export councils and trade associations located in the State.

SA 1228. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAMS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR NICARAGUA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall proclaim an extension until December 31, 2024, of the preferential tariff treatment for apparel goods imported from Nicaragua—

(1) described in U.S. Note 15 to subchapter XV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

(2) provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement and the letters described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1634(a)(2) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (title XIV of Public Law 109-280; 120 Stat. 1167).

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF ONE-FOR-ONE PURCHASING RULE FOR COTTON WOVEN TROUSERS.—The limitation specified in clause (iv) of paragraph (7)(b) of the letter described in section 1634(a)(2)(A) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 shall apply with respect to the one-for-one purchasing rule described in paragraph (7)(b) of that letter in each year after the extension pursuant to subsection (a) of the preferential tariff treatment described in that subsection.

(c) AMENDMENT TO MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006.—Section 1634(c) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”; and

(B) by striking “provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) NICARAGUAN TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘Nicaraguan tariff preference level program’ means the preferential tariff treatment provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement and extended pursuant to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

(d) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), any entry of an article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2014, that was made—

(A) after December 31, 2014, and

(B) before the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a).

(2) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a) that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(A) to locate the entry; or

(B) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(3) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of an article under paragraph (1) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(4) ENTRY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “entry” includes a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR BAHRAIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 13 to subchapter XIV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (a)—

(A) by striking “2015” and inserting “2025”; and

(B) by striking “January 1, 2016, through July 31, 2016” and inserting “January 1, 2026, through July 31, 2026”; and

(2) in the matter following paragraph (d), by striking “July 31, 2016” and inserting “July 31, 2026”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after January 1, 2016.

SEC. 303. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR MOROCCO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—U.S. Note 64(b) to subchapter XII of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended—

(1) by striking “shall be as follows:” and all that follows through “As used in this note” and inserting “shall be 10,000,000 SME for each of the calendar years 2016 through 2025. As used in this note”; and

(2) by striking “December 31, 2015” and inserting “December 31, 2025”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after January 1, 2016.

SA 1229. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM FOR NICARAGUA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall proclaim an extension until December 31, 2024, of the preferential tariff treatment for apparel goods imported from Nicaragua—

(1) described in U.S. Note 15 to subchapter XV of chapter 99 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; and

(2) provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Dominican Republic-Central America-United States Free Trade Agreement and the letters described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 1634(a)(2) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 (title XIV of Public Law 109-280; 120 Stat. 1167).

(b) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION OF ONE-FOR-ONE PURCHASING RULE FOR COTTON WOVEN TROUSERS.—The limitation specified in clause (iv) of paragraph (7)(b) of the letter described in section 1634(a)(2)(A) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 shall apply with respect to the one-for-one purchasing rule described in paragraph (7)(b) of that letter in each year after the extension pursuant to subsection (a) of the preferential tariff treatment described in that subsection.

(c) AMENDMENT TO MISCELLANEOUS TRADE AND TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2006.—Section 1634(c) of the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 2006 is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking “under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”; and

(B) by striking “provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “provided in Annex 3.28 of the Agreement” and inserting “under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) NICARAGUAN TARIFF PREFERENCE LEVEL PROGRAM DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘Nicaraguan tariff preference level program’ means the preferential tariff treatment provided for under Annex 3.28 of the Agreement and extended pursuant to the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

(d) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law, and subject to paragraph (2), any entry of an article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under the Nicaraguan tariff preference level program would have applied if the entry had been made on December 31, 2014, that was made—

(A) after December 31, 2014, and

(B) before the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a).

(2) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under paragraph (1) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the effective date of the presidential proclamation referred to in subsection (a) that contains

sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(A) to locate the entry; or

(B) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(3) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of an article under paragraph (1) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(4) ENTRY DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “entry” includes a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SA 1230. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 105(a), add the following:

(6) OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS.—In determining whether to enter into negotiations with a particular country, the President shall take into account whether the government of that country engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights.

SA 1231. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(b)(14), add at the end the following:

(D) to seek commitments from United States trading partners to strengthen their legal institutions, including by establishing an independent judiciary, ensuring the independence of prosecutors, and ensuring that such institutions are fully funded.

SA 1232. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 102(c)(4), insert before the end period the following: “, including a discussion of those activities that strengthen good governance, rule of law, effective legal regimes, and protections for internationally recognized human rights”.

SA 1233. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) REQUIREMENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 103(b)(3) of this Act and the provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) (relating to trade authorities procedures) shall not apply to any bill implementing a trade agreement between the United States and any other country or countries if such trade agreement or implementing legislation contains any provision that would permit, without the approval of Congress—

(i) modifications, amendments, or additions to the provisions of any such agreement or implementing legislation;

(ii) modification of the parties to any such agreement;

(iii) the adoption of an interpretation of any such agreement, if such interpretation affects United States law or policy; or

(iv) the granting of a waiver of any obligation under any such agreement, if such waiver affects United States law or policy.

(B) POINT OF ORDER IN SENATE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an implementing bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any part of the implementing bill or trade agreement that contains material in violation of subparagraph (A), and the point of order is sustained by the Presiding Officer, the Senate shall cease consideration of the implementing bill under the trade authorities procedures referred to in subparagraph (A).

(ii) WAIVERS AND APPEALS.—

(I) WAIVERS.—Before the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order described in clause (i), any Senator may move to waive the point of order. Such motion to waive shall not be subject to amendment. A point of order described in clause (i) may only be waived by the affirmative vote of 60 Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(II) APPEALS.—After the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order under this subparagraph, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on the point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled. A ruling of the Presiding Officer on a point of order described in clause (i) is sustained unless a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, vote not to sustain the ruling.

(III) DEBATE.—Debate on a motion to waive under subclause (I) or on an appeal of the ruling of the Presiding Officer under subclause (II) shall be limited to 1 hour. Such time shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, or their designees.

(C) IN GENERAL.—In this paragraph, the term “approval of Congress” means the affirmative vote of both chambers of Congress in accordance with the applicable rules and procedures of each chamber.

SA 1234. Mr. SESSIONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 100, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(7) LIMITATION ON IMMIGRATION PROVISIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 103(b)(3) of this Act and section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) (relating to trade authorities procedures) shall not apply to any bill imple-

menting a trade agreement between the United States and any other country if the trade agreement or the implementing bill contains any provision relating to the immigration laws of the United States or the entry of aliens into the United States.

(8) POINT OF ORDER IN SENATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering an implementing bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator against any part of the implementing bill or trade agreement that contains material in violation of paragraph (7), and the point of order is sustained by the Presiding Officer, the Senate shall cease consideration of the implementing bill under the trade authorities procedures referred to in section 103(b)(3) of this Act or set forth in section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191).

(B) WAIVERS AND APPEALS.—

(i) WAIVERS.—Before the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order described in subparagraph (A), any Senator may move to waive the point of order and the motion to waive shall not be subject to amendment. A point of order described in subparagraph (A) is waived only by the affirmative vote of 60 Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(ii) APPEALS.—After the Presiding Officer rules on a point of order under this subparagraph, any Senator may appeal the ruling of the Presiding Officer on the point of order as it applies to some or all of the provisions on which the Presiding Officer ruled. A ruling of the Presiding Officer on a point of order described in subparagraph (A) is sustained unless a majority of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, vote not to sustain the ruling.

(iii) DEBATE.—Debate on a motion to waive under clause (i) or on an appeal of the ruling of the Presiding Officer under clause (ii) shall be limited to 1 hour, which shall be equally divided between, and controlled by, the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader of the Senate, or their designees.

SA 1235. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(2) ENERGY.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in natural gas are—

(A) to ensure that energy expenditures by consumers, including households and businesses, in the United States do not increase;

(B) to protect key sectors of the United States economy that are energy intensive and exposed to the effects of trade, such as manufacturing, from price increases or job losses;

(C) to promote the energy security of the United States, including the ability of the United States to reduce its reliance on imported oil; and

(D) to ensure that domestic natural gas supplies are used to meet the future energy needs of the United States, including through use in the transportation, industrial, and electricity sectors of the United States.

SA 1236. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative

appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 106(b), add the following:

(7) **LIMITATION ON TRADE AUTHORITIES PROCEDURES FOR CERTAIN AGREEMENTS.**—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 3(b) if the agreement or agreements allow for national treatment for trade in natural gas.

SA 1237. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

At the end of section 2(a), add the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

SA 1238. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike title II.

SA 1239. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—TRADE PREFERENCES FOR NEPAL

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Nepal Trade Preferences Act”.

SEC. 302. ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The President may authorize the provision of preferential treatment under this title to articles that are imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States pursuant to section 703 if the President determines—

(1) that Nepal meets the requirements set forth in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)); and

(2) after taking into account the factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (c) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462), that Nepal meets the eligibility requirements of such section 502.

(b) **WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT; MANDATORY GRADUATION.**—The provisions of subsections (d) and (e) of section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2462) shall apply with respect to Nepal to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply with respect to beneficiary developing coun-

tries under title V of that Act (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.).

SEC. 303. ELIGIBLE ARTICLES.

(a) **CERTAIN MANUFACTURED AND OTHER ARTICLES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An article described in paragraph (2) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) **ARTICLES DESCRIBED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—An article is described in this paragraph if—

(i) the article is the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal;

(ii) the article is imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(iii) the article is described in subparagraphs (B) through (G) of subsection (b)(1) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463);

(iv) the President determines, after receiving the advice of the United States International Trade Commission in accordance with subsection (e) of that section, that the article is not import-sensitive in the context of imports from Nepal; and

(v) subject to subparagraph (C), the sum of the cost or value of the materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, Nepal or the customs territory of the United States is not less than 35 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—An article shall not be treated as the growth, product, or manufacture of Nepal for purposes of subparagraph (A)(i) by virtue of having merely undergone—

(i) simple combining or packaging operations; or

(ii) mere dilution with water or mere dilution with another substance that does not materially alter the characteristics of the article.

(C) **LIMITATION ON UNITED STATES COST.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(v), the cost or value of materials produced in, and the direct costs of processing operations performed in, the customs territory of the United States and attributed to the 35-percent requirement under that subparagraph may not exceed 15 percent of the appraised value of the article at the time it is entered.

(b) **TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A textile or apparel article described in paragraph (2) or (3) may enter the customs territory of the United States free of duty.

(2) **TEXTILE AND APPAREL ARTICLES WHOLLY ASSEMBLED IN NEPAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) wholly assembled in Nepal, without regard to the country of origin of the yarn or fabric used to make the articles; and

(ii) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States.

(B) **LIMITATIONS.**—

(i) **LOW VOLUME OF IMPORTS.**—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) from Nepal are less than 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year, such imports from Nepal may be increased to an amount that is equal to not more than 1.5 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(ii) **HIGHER VOLUME OF IMPORTS.**—If, during a calendar year, imports of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A)

from Nepal are at least 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year, such imports from Nepal may be increased by an amount that is equal to not more than 1/3 of 1 percent of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States during that calendar year for the succeeding calendar year.

(iii) **AGGREGATE COUNTRY LIMIT.**—In no case may the aggregate quantity of textile and apparel articles described in subparagraph (A) imported into the customs territory of the United States from Nepal during a calendar year under this subsection exceed the applicable percentage set forth in paragraph (4)(B) for that calendar year.

(3) **HANDLOOMED, HANDMADE, FOLKLORE ARTICLES AND ETHNIC PRINTED FABRICS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—A textile or apparel article is described in this paragraph if the textile or apparel article is—

(i) imported directly from Nepal into the customs territory of the United States;

(ii) on a list of textile and apparel articles determined by the President, after consultation with the Government of Nepal, to be handloomed, handmade, folklore articles or ethnic printed fabrics of Nepal; and

(iii) certified as a handloomed, handmade, folklore article or an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal by the competent authority of Nepal.

(B) **ETHNIC PRINTED FABRIC.**—For purposes of subparagraph (A), an ethnic printed fabric of Nepal is fabric—

(i) containing a selvedge on both edges and having a width of less than 50 inches;

(ii) classifiable under subheading 5208.52.30 or 5208.52.40 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States;

(iii) of a type that contains designs, symbols, and other characteristics of Nepal—

(I) normally produced for and sold in indigenous markets in Nepal; and

(II) normally sold in Nepal by the piece as opposed to being tailored into garments before being sold in indigenous markets in Nepal;

(iv) printed, including waxed, in Nepal; and

(v) formed in the United States from yarns formed in the United States or formed in Nepal from yarns originating in either the United States or Nepal.

(4) **LIMITATIONS ON BENEFITS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Preferential treatment under this subsection shall be extended in the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2016, and in each of the succeeding 10 1-year periods, to imports of textile and apparel articles from Nepal under this subsection in an amount not to exceed the applicable percentage of the aggregate square meter equivalents of all textile and apparel articles imported into the customs territory of the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which data are available.

(B) **APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.**—For purposes of this paragraph, the term “applicable percentage” means 1.5 percent for the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2016, increased in each of the 10 succeeding 1-year periods by equal increments, so that for the 1-year period beginning January 1, 2025, the applicable percentage does not exceed 3.5 percent.

(5) **SURGE MECHANISM.**—The provisions of subparagraph (B) of section 112(b)(3) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles described in such section 112(b)(3) and imported

from a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country.

(6) SPECIAL ELIGIBILITY RULES; PROTECTIONS AGAINST TRANSSHIPMENT.—The provisions of subsection (e) of section 112 and section 113 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721 and 3722) shall apply to textile and apparel articles imported from Nepal to which preferential treatment is extended under this subsection to the same extent and in the same manner that such provisions apply to textile and apparel articles imported from beneficiary sub-Saharan countries to which preferential treatment is extended under such section 112.

SEC. 304. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The President shall monitor, review, and report to Congress, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, on the implementation of this title and on the trade and investment policy of the United States with respect to Nepal.

SEC. 305. TERMINATION OF PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT.

No preferential treatment extended under this title shall remain in effect after December 31, 2025.

SEC. 306. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The provisions of this title shall take effect on January 1, 2016.

SA 1240. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

“An Act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.”

SA 1241. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 644, to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

“An Act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.”

SA 1242. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

On page 118, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.”

(2) OFFSET.—

(A) CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking “and” at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii),

and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

“(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;”, and

(ii) by inserting “(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)” in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after “In determining the amount omitted from gross income”, and

(iii) by inserting “AMOUNT OMITTED FROM” after “DETERMINATION OF” in the heading thereof.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to—

(i) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date.

SA 1243. Mr. HATCH (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; as follows:

Strike title II.

SA 1244. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY TO INCREASE UNITED STATES EXPORTS TO AFRICA.

Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall—

(1) establish and implement a comprehensive strategy to increase United States exports to Africa by not less than 200 percent in real dollar value during the 10-year period beginning on such date of enactment; and

(2) submit to Congress a report on the strategy.

SA 1245. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) ENERGY NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in energy products and natural resources, including hydrocarbons such as oil, gas, and coal, and mineral and timber resources, are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of energy products and natural resources in foreign markets substantially equivalent to the competitive opportunities afforded foreign

exports of energy products and natural resources in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in energy products and natural resources.

SA 1246. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 102(b), add the following:

(21) FISHERIES NEGOTIATIONS.—The principal negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products are to obtain competitive opportunities for United States exports of fish, seafood, and shellfish products in United States markets and to achieve fairer and more open conditions of trade in fish, seafood, and shellfish products.

SA 1247. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 6(b), add at the end the following:

(7) LIMITATIONS ON PROCEDURES WITH RESPECT TO AGREEMENTS THAT CHANGE IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The trade authorities procedures shall not apply to any implementing bill submitted with respect to a trade agreement or trade agreements entered into under section 3(b) that makes any changes to the immigration laws of the United States.

SA 1248. Ms. CANTWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1221 proposed by Mr. HATCH to the bill H.R. 1314, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a right to an administrative appeal relating to adverse determinations of tax-exempt status of certain organizations; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE III—EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

Subtitle A—Taxpayer Protection Provisions and Increased Accountability

SEC. 311. REDUCTION IN AUTHORIZED AMOUNT OF OUTSTANDING LOANS, GUARANTEES, AND INSURANCE.

Section 6(a) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e(a)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) APPLICABLE AMOUNT DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ‘applicable amount’, for

each of fiscal years 2015 through 2019, means \$135,000,000,000.

“(3) FREEZING OF LENDING CAP IF DEFAULT RATE IS 2 PERCENT OR MORE.—If the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is 2 percent or more for a quarter, the Bank may not exceed the amount of loans, guarantees, and insurance outstanding on the last day of that quarter until the rate calculated under section 8(g)(1) is less than 2 percent.”.

SEC. 312. INCREASE IN LOSS RESERVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635e) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) RESERVE REQUIREMENT.—The Bank shall build to and hold in reserve, to protect against future losses, an amount that is not less than 5 percent of the aggregate amount of disbursed and outstanding loans, guarantees, and insurance of the Bank.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 313. REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.

Section 17(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-6(b)) is amended to read as follows:

“(b) REVIEW OF FRAUD CONTROLS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and every 4 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

“(1) review the adequacy of the design and effectiveness of the controls used by the Export-Import Bank of the United States to prevent, detect, and investigate fraudulent applications for loans and guarantees and the compliance by the Bank with the controls, including by auditing a sample of Bank transactions; and

“(2) submit a written report regarding the findings of the review and providing such recommendations with respect to the controls described in paragraph (1) as the Comptroller General deems appropriate to—

“(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.”.

SEC. 314. OFFICE OF ETHICS.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) OFFICE OF ETHICS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Office of Ethics within the Bank, which shall oversee all ethics issues within the Bank.

“(2) HEAD OF OFFICE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office of Ethics shall be the Chief Ethics Officer, who shall report to the Board of Directors.

“(B) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Ethics Officer shall be—

“(i) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(I) with a background in law who have experience in the fields of law and ethics; and

“(II) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(ii) approved by the Board.

“(C) DESIGNATED AGENCY ETHICS OFFICIAL.—The Chief Ethics Officer shall serve as the designated agency ethics official for the

Bank pursuant to the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App. 101 et seq.).

“(3) DUTIES.—The Office of Ethics has jurisdiction over all employees of, and ethics matters relating to, the Bank. With respect to employees of the Bank, the Office of Ethics shall—

“(A) recommend administrative actions to establish or enforce standards of official conduct;

“(B) refer to the Office of the Inspector General of the Bank alleged violations of—

“(i) the standards of ethical conduct applicable to employees of the Bank under parts 2635 and 6201 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations;

“(ii) the standards of ethical conduct established by the Chief Ethics Officer; and

“(iii) any other laws, rules, or regulations governing the performance of official duties or the discharge of official responsibilities that are applicable to employees of the Bank;

“(C) report to appropriate Federal or State authorities substantial evidence of a violation of any law applicable to the performance of official duties that may have been disclosed to the Office of Ethics; and

“(D) render advisory opinions regarding the propriety of any current or proposed conduct of an employee or contractor of the Bank, and issue general guidance on such matters as necessary.”.

SEC. 315. CHIEF RISK OFFICER.

Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by section 314, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(1) CHIEF RISK OFFICER.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Chief Risk Officer of the Bank, who shall—

“(A) oversee all issues relating to risk within the Bank; and

“(B) report to the President of the Bank.

“(2) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Chief Risk Officer shall be—

“(A) appointed by the President of the Bank from among persons—

“(i) with a demonstrated ability in the general management of, and knowledge of and extensive practical experience in, financial risk evaluation practices in large governmental or business entities; and

“(ii) who are not serving in a position requiring appointment by the President of the United States before being appointed to be Chief Risk Officer; and

“(B) approved by the Board.

“(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Chief Risk Officer are—

“(A) to be responsible for all matters related to managing and mitigating all risk to which the Bank is exposed, including the programs and operations of the Bank;

“(B) to establish policies and processes for risk oversight, the monitoring of management compliance with risk limits, and the management of risk exposures and risk controls across the Bank;

“(C) to be responsible for the planning and execution of all Bank risk management activities, including policies, reporting, and systems to achieve strategic risk objectives;

“(D) to develop an integrated risk management program that includes identifying, prioritizing, measuring, monitoring, and managing internal control and operating risks and other identified risks;

“(E) to ensure that the process for risk assessment and underwriting for individual transactions considers how each such transaction considers the effect of the transaction on the concentration of exposure in the overall portfolio of the Bank, taking into ac-

count fees, collateralization, and historic default rates; and

“(F) to review the adequacy of the use by the Bank of qualitative metrics to assess the risk of default under various scenarios.”.

SEC. 316. RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a), as amended by sections 214 and 215, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(m) RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a management committee to be known as the ‘Risk Management Committee’.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The membership of the Risk Management Committee shall be the members of the Board of Directors, with the President and First Vice President of the Bank serving as ex officio members.

“(3) DUTIES.—The duties of the Risk Management Committee shall be—

“(A) to oversee, in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer of the Bank—

“(i) periodic stress testing on the entire Bank portfolio, reflecting different market, industry, and macroeconomic scenarios, and consistent with common practices of commercial and multilateral development banks; and

“(ii) the monitoring of industry, geographic, and obligor exposure levels; and

“(B) to review all required reports on the default rate of the Bank before submission to Congress under section 8(g).”.

(b) TERMINATION OF AUDIT COMMITTEE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall revise the bylaws of the Bank to terminate the Audit Committee established by section 7 of the bylaws.

SEC. 317. INDEPENDENT AUDIT OF BANK PORTFOLIO.

(a) AUDIT.—The Inspector General of the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall conduct an audit or evaluation of the portfolio risk management procedures of the Bank, including a review of the implementation by the Bank of the duties assigned to the Chief Risk Officer under section 3(l) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended by section 315.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 3 years thereafter, the Inspector General shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a written report containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out subsection (a).

SEC. 318. PILOT PROGRAM FOR REINSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any provision of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635 et seq.), the Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) may establish a pilot program under which the Bank may enter into contracts and other arrangements to share risks associated with the provision of guarantees, insurance, or credit, or the participation in the extension of credit, by the Bank under that Act.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF RISK-SHARING.—

(1) PER CONTRACT OR OTHER ARRANGEMENT.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing pursuant to a contract or other arrangement entered into under subsection (a) may not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

(2) PER YEAR.—The aggregate amount of liability the Bank may transfer through risk-sharing during a fiscal year pursuant to contracts or other arrangements entered into

under subsection (a) during that fiscal year may not exceed \$10,000,000,000.

(c) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter through 2019, the Bank shall submit to Congress a written report that contains a detailed analysis of the use of the pilot program carried out under subsection (a) during the year preceding the submission of the report.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect, impede, or revoke any authority of the Bank.

(e) TERMINATION.—The pilot program carried out under subsection (a) shall terminate on September 30, 2019.

Subtitle B—Promotion of Small Business Exports

SEC. 321. INCREASE IN SMALL BUSINESS LENDING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2(b)(1)(E)(v) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)(E)(v)) is amended by striking “20 percent” and inserting “25 percent”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

SEC. 322. REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) REPORT ON PROGRAMS FOR SMALL AND MEDIUM-SIZED BUSINESSES.—The Bank shall include in its annual report to Congress under subsection (a) a report on the programs of the Bank for United States businesses with less than \$250,000,000 in annual sales.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to the report of the Export-Import Bank of the United States submitted to Congress under section 8 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635g) for the first year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Subtitle C—Modernization of Operations

SEC. 331. ELECTRONIC PAYMENTS AND DOCUMENTS.

Section 2(b)(1) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(M) Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Bank shall implement policies—

“(i) to accept electronic documents with respect to transactions whenever possible, including copies of bills of lading, certifications, and compliance documents, in such manner so as not to undermine any potential civil or criminal enforcement related to the transactions; and

“(ii) to accept electronic payments in all of its programs.”

SEC. 332. REAUTHORIZATION OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UPDATING.

Section 3(j) of the Export-Import Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(j)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “(I) the funds” and inserting “(i) the funds”; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking “2012, 2013, and 2014” and inserting “2015 through 2019”.

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 341. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) is amended by striking “2014” and inserting “2019”.

(b) DUAL-USE EXPORTS.—Section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428 (12 U.S.C. 635 note) is

amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States expires under section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f)”.

(c) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2(b)(9)(B)(iii) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(b)(9)(B)(iii)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2014” and inserting “the date on which the authority of the Bank expires under section 7”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the earlier of the date of the enactment of this Act or June 30, 2015.

SEC. 342. CERTAIN UPDATED LOAN TERMS AND AMOUNTS.

(a) LOAN TERMS FOR MEDIUM-TERM FINANCING.—Section 2(a)(2)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(a)(2)(A)) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) with principal amounts of not more than \$25,000,000; and”.

(b) COMPETITIVE OPPORTUNITIES RELATING TO INSURANCE.—Section 2(d)(2) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635(d)(2)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(c) EXPORT AMOUNTS FOR SMALL BUSINESS LOANS.—Section 3(g)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635a(g)(3)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(d) CONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS.—Section 11(a)(1)(A) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635i-5(a)(1)(A)) is amended by striking “\$10,000,000 or more” and inserting the following: “\$25,000,000 (or, if less than \$25,000,000, the threshold established pursuant to international agreements, including the Common Approaches for Officially Supported Export Credits and Environmental and Social Due Diligence, as adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Council on June 28, 2012, and the risk-management framework adopted by financial institutions for determining, assessing, and managing environmental and social risk in projects (commonly referred to as the ‘Equator Principles’) or more”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2016 and each fiscal year thereafter.

Subtitle E—Other Matters

SEC. 351. PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.

Section 2 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (6 U.S.C. 635 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(k) PROHIBITION ON DISCRIMINATION BASED ON INDUSTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in this Act, the Bank may not—

“(A) deny an application for financing based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns; or

“(B) promulgate or implement policies that discriminate against an application based solely on the industry, sector, or business that the application concerns.

“(2) APPLICABILITY.—The prohibitions under paragraph (1) apply only to applications for financing by the Bank for projects concerning the exploration, development, production, or export of energy sources and the generation or transmission of electrical power, or combined heat and power, regardless of the energy source involved.”

SEC. 352. NEGOTIATIONS TO END EXPORT CREDIT FINANCING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 11 of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “Secretary of the Treasury (in this section referred to as the ‘Secretary’)” and inserting “President”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “(OECD)” and inserting “(in this section referred to as the ‘OECD’)”; and

(ii) by striking “ultimate goal of eliminating” and inserting “possible goal of eliminating, before the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015.”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “Secretary” each place it appears and inserting “President”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) REPORT ON STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, the President shall submit to Congress a proposal, and a strategy for achieving the proposal, that the United States Government will pursue with other major exporting countries, including OECD members and non-OECD members, to eliminate over a period of not more than 10 years subsidized export-financing programs, tied aid, export credits, and all other forms of government-supported export subsidies.

“(d) NEGOTIATIONS WITH NON-OECD MEMBERS.—The President shall initiate and pursue negotiations with countries that are not OECD members to bring those countries into a multilateral agreement establishing rules and limitations on officially supported export credits.

“(e) ANNUAL REPORTS ON PROGRESS OF NEGOTIATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Export-Import Bank Reform and Reauthorization Act of 2015, and annually thereafter through calendar year 2019, the President shall submit to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives a report on the progress of any negotiations described in subsection (d).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a) shall apply with respect to reports required to be submitted under section 11(b) of the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2012 (12 U.S.C. 635a-5(b)) after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 353. STUDY OF FINANCING FOR INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS.

(a) ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY USE OF BANK PRODUCTS.—The Export-Import Bank of the United States (in this section referred to as the “Bank”) shall conduct a study of the extent to which the products offered by the Bank are available and used by companies that export information and communications technology services and related goods.

(b) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Bank shall examine the following:

(1) The number of jobs in the United States that are supported by the export of information and communications technology services and related goods, and the degree to which access to financing will increase exports of such services and related goods.

(2) The reduction in the financing by the Bank of exports of information and communications technology services from 2003 through 2014.

(3) The activities of foreign export credit agencies to facilitate the export of information and communications technology services and related goods.

(4) Specific proposals for how the Bank could provide additional financing for the exportation of information and communications technology services and related goods through risk-sharing with other export credit agencies and other third parties.

(5) Proposals for new products the Bank could offer to provide financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods, including—

(A) the extent to which the Bank is authorized to offer new products;

(B) the extent to which the Bank would need additional authority to offer new products to meet the needs of the information and communications technology industry;

(C) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide increased financing for exports of information and communications technology services and related goods in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank;

(D) specific proposals that would enable the Bank to provide increased outreach to the information and communications technology industry about the products the Bank offers; and

(E) specific proposals for changes in law that would enable the Bank to provide the financing to build information and communications technology infrastructure, in compliance with the credit and risk standards of the Bank, to allow for market access opportunities for United States information and communications technology companies to provide services on the infrastructure being financed by the Bank.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Bank shall submit to Congress a report that contains the results of the study required by subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Regulatory Issues Impacting End-Users and Market Liquidity.”

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “A Pathway to Improving Care for Medicare Patients with Chronic Conditions.”

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Cybersecurity: Setting the Rules for Responsible Global Cyber Behavior.”

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

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 3:40 p.m.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Joint Committee on Printing be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on May 14, 2015, at 3:50 p.m.

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

IRS BUREAUCRACY REDUCTION AND JUDICIAL REVIEW ACT

AMERICA GIVES MORE ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 1295 and H.R. 644, the title amendments, Nos. 1240 and 1241, be agreed to.

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

The amendment (No. 1240) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

“An act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.”

The amendment (No. 1241) was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read:

“An act to reauthorize trade facilitation and trade enforcement functions and activities, and for other purposes.”

RELATING TO PROVISIONS OF THE BORDER PATROL AGENT PAY REFORM ACT OF 2014

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1356, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1356) to clarify that certain provisions of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 will not take effect until after the Director of the Office of Personnel Management promulgates and makes effective regulations relating to such provisions.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1356) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1356

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

SECTION 1. EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-277) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Subsections (b), (c), (d), and (g), and the amendments made by such subsections, shall take effect on the first day of the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 2016, except that—

“(1) any provision in section 5550(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by subsection (b), relating to administering elections and making advance assignments to a regular tour of duty, shall be applicable before such effective date to the extent determined necessary by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management; and

“(2) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management may issue such regulations as may be necessary before such effective date.”.

(b) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been enacted on the date of the enactment of the Border Patrol Agent Pay Reform Act of 2014.

KIDS TO PARKS DAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 179.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 179) designating May 16, 2015, as “Kids to Parks Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon

the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 179) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 1350, S. 1357, and H.R. 2048

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I understand that there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1350) to provide a short-term extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 1357) to extend authority relating to roving surveillance, access to business records, and individual terrorists as agents of foreign powers under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 until July 31, 2015, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 2048) to reform the authorities of the Federal Government to require the production of certain business records, conduct electronic surveillance, use pen registers and trap and trace devices, and use other forms of information gathering for foreign intelligence, counterterrorism, and criminal purposes, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, May 18; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 3 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 1314.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, Senators should expect at least two rollcall votes at 5:30 p.m. on Monday in relation to amendments to the TPA bill.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 18, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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 6:01 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 18, 2015, at 2 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION

LESLIE E. BAINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2015, VICE WILLIAM S. JASIEK, TERM EXPIRED.

LESLIE E. BAINS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION CORPORATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

JUAN CARLOS ITURREGUI, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 26, 2020, VICE THOMAS JOSEPH DODD, TERM EXPIRED.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

KARL BOYD BROOKS, OF KANSAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, VICE CRAIG E. HOOKS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LAURA FARNSWORTH DOGU, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

JOHN L. ESTRADA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO.

SAMUEL D. HEINS, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

THOMAS O. MELIA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE PAIGE EVE ALEXANDER, RESIGNED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED TO THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

PETER J. BROWN
SCOTT A. BUSCHMAN
MICHAEL F. MCALLISTER
JUNE E. RYAN
JOSEPH M. VOJVODICH

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. CRESSMAN
COLONEL TIMOTHY J. DAUGHERTY
COLONEL BRADLEY K. DREYER
COLONEL JOHN R. EVANS, JR.
COLONEL ANTONIO M. FLETCHER
COLONEL PATRICK D. FRANK
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

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DARSE E. CRANDALL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

ROBERT B. ALLMAN III
DAVID K. BEAVERS
BYRON V. BRIDGES
HOWARD F. CANTRELL
RAYNARD J. CHURCHWELL
DEAN A. DARROUX
RAYMOND E. FOLSOM
LESLIE J. FORBESMARIANI
JAMES J. FOSTER
EVERETT J. FRANKLIN
BRET J. GILMORE
COLLIN S. GROSSRUCK
ABDULLAH A. HULWE
ERNEST M. IBANGA
MICHAEL L. JEFFRIES
CRAIG M. JOHNSON
CARRON A. JONES
KRZYSZTOF A. KOPEC
VAIOA T. LEAU
SUN C. LEE
BRAD P. LEWIS
ROBERT E. MARS
KEVIN B. MATEER
SHAWN E. MCCAMMON
ERIC R. MEYNNERS
BYUNG K. MIN
FLORIO F. PIERRE
KELLY D. PORTER
DAVID A. SCHNARR
MICHAEL T. SHELLMAN
ROBERT R. STEVENSON
MARK A. STEWART
ANTHONY L. TAYLOR, SR.
STANTON D. TROTTER
SEAN S. C. WEAD
RICHARD F. WINCHESTER
EDWARD J. YURUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

LYDE C. ANDREWS
JONATHAN D. BAILEY
HOWARD M. BANKSTON
RONALD BOYD
WILLIAM A. BRECKENRIDGE
APRILL M. BRIGHT
ROBERT A. CARGEL
BRYANT J. CASTEEL
HWA S. CHUNG
JOHN L. CRAVEN
TIMOTHY S. CRAWLEY
KEVIN M. DAUL
DAVID S. DENNIS
BENJAMIN S. DUNCAN
BENJAMIN F. ELLINGTON
JONATHAN F. ENTREKIN
JONATHAN R. FISHER
RONNY D. FISHER, JR.
JOHN B. GABRIEL
DAVID A. HICKS
DWAYNE W. HUGHES
LYNDON A. JONG
ABRAHAM YOUNG K. KIM
BILL E. KIM
EUN S. KIM
JOSEPH W. LAWHORN
SEAN A. LEVINE
ERIC L. LIGHT
CHARLES G. LOWMAN
PAUL LYNN
MATTHEW D. MADISON

SEAN R. MAGNUSON
 MARK A. MCCORKLE
 MATTHEW T. MILLER
 KEVIN B. MUCHER
 WILLIAM M. OLIVER
 PATRICK A. OPP
 JOEL S. PANZER
 ERIC D. PARK
 COLT L. RANDLES
 PHILLIP P. RITTMERMEYER
 FRANTZO SAINTVAL
 ABRAHAM SARMIENTO
 WILLIAM J. SHEETS
 BRIAN K. SMITH
 STEVEN D. SMITH
 WILLIAM J. SMITH
 JOHN C. SNEED
 ARLES C. SUTHERLAND
 AARON R. SWARTZ
 MICHAEL D. TURPIN, JR.
 GEORGE A. TYGER
 EVERETT E. ZACHARY
 D012582

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

ELIZABETH M. LIBAO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be colonel

JOHN J. MORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER A. WODARZ

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

FATMATTA M. KUYATEH
 LUCAS S. MCDONALD
 MARY S. PADEN
 PAUL J. ROSZKO
 MICHAEL J. SCARCELLA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

MAREGINA L. WICKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

NIKKI K. CONLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

MICHAEL R. CATHEY

To be lieutenant commander

SARAH BALLARD
 LAURENCE J. BELIN
 BRANDON G. CHEW
 CRAIG S. COLEMAN
 JUSTIN A. DYE
 CHARLES L. EGAN
 THOMAS M. HEARTY
 JUSTIN R. HENNING
 JASON D. KEHRER
 DAVID J. KLIMASKI
 PIROSKA K. KOPAR
 LINDSAY J. LIPINSKI
 CHRISTOPHER D. MAROULES
 SEAN T. MEINER
 EVELYN M. POTOCHNY
 ANDREW E. SHEEP
 JASON M. SOUZA
 MATTHEW T. STEPANOVICH
 ERIC H. TWERDAHL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

TERESA M. ALLEN
 JARED L. ANTEVIL
 STEPHEN P. ARLES
 JOHN C. ARNOLD
 SAIRA N. ASLAM
 LUKE H. BALSAMO
 JOHN T. BASSETT
 ERIC E. BELIN
 RODD J. BENFIELD
 CLIFFORD A. BLUMENBERG
 RODERICK C. BORGIE
 BRIAN N. BOWES
 RODNEY D. BOYUM
 SHAUN D. CARSTAIRS
 CHRISTOPHER B. CHISHOLM
 CHRISTOPHER B. CORNELISSEN
 CHARLES E. CRAVEN
 MICHAEL E. EPPERLY
 JESSE R. GEIBE
 MARSHAL F. HARPE
 JASON O. HEATON
 JOSE HENAO
 GEOFFREY S. JACOBY
 JAMES W. KECK
 PAMELA L. KRAHL
 STEVEN M. KRISSE
 LAURENCE J. KUHN
 CHRISTOPHER T. KUZNIEWSKI
 TODD R. LAROCK
 JONATHAN M. LIESKE
 LUIS E. MARQUEZ
 GREGG J. MONTALTO
 WON K. MOON
 KRISTINA V. MOROCCO
 JOEL NATIONS
 ETHEL L. ONEAL
 CARL E. PETERSEN
 ALICIA R. SANDERSON
 GILBERT SEDA
 MICHAEL SEXTON
 INGRID V. SHELDON
 PETER R. SHUMAKER
 JAMES E. STEPENOSKY
 NIMFA C. TENEZAMORA
 MARK H. TUCKER
 JOHN VANSLYKE
 DAVID E. WEBSTER
 CARLOS D. WILLIAMS
 GORDON G. WISBACH
 JOON S. YUN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MARTIN J. ANERINO
 MARK R. BOONE
 LARRY C. BURTON
 WILLIE S. CHAO
 RAYNESE S. FIKES
 HEATHER L. GNAU
 JULIET R. HOFFMAN
 THOMAS B. JORDAN
 TARAS J. KONRAD
 PAUL I. LIM
 LAURA S. MCFARLAND
 SHAY S. RAZMI
 MELISSA L. RUFF
 MARTHA S. SCOTTY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

DAVID J. BACON
 THOMAS G. BODNOVICH, JR.
 RODERICK L. BOYCE
 TYSON J. BRUNSTETTER
 JOSEPH V. COHN
 GERALD T. DELONG
 JODY A. DREYER
 DOUGLAS W. FLETCHER
 RICHARD V. FOLGA
 EDRIAN R. GAWARAN
 DAVID W. HARDY
 MICHAEL J. KEMPER
 JOHN P. KENDRICK
 CARRIE H. KENNEDY
 FRANCIS V. MCLEAN
 DEVIN J. MORRISON
 DAN K. PATTERSON
 CHAD E. ROE
 JERRY N. SANDERS, JR.
 JENNIFER E. SMITH
 MATTHEW J. SWIERGOSZ
 SHANE A. VATH
 ANTHONY S. WILLIAMS
 RICHARD G. ZEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ARTHUR R. BLUM
 DANIEL CIMMINO
 JUSTIN B. CLANCY
 ROBERT C. DETOLVIE
 BRUCE A. GRAGERT
 ANDREW R. HOUSE
 DOMINIC J. JONES
 JON D. PEPPETTI
 LIA M. REYNOLDS
 AARON C. RUGH
 FLORENCIO J. YUZON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PATRICK K. AMERSBACH
 DONNA N. BRADLEY
 TRACI L. BROOKS
 ANNE M. BROWN
 MARNIE S. BUCHANAN
 CAROL A. BURROUGHS
 SARAH M. BUTLER
 ANN M. CASE
 DENISE M. GECHAS
 ELIZABETH K. GILLARD
 SANDRA K. HEAVEN
 KATHLEEN A. HINZ
 MICHELE C. HUDDLESTON
 ETHAN B. JOSIAH
 TERRI A. KINSEY
 MARYANN C. MATTONEN
 BARBARA A. MULLEN
 CHRISTOPHER J. REDDIN
 ERIN C. ROBERTSON
 FRANCES C. SLONSKI
 DENNIS L. SPENCE
 KIMBERLY A. TAYLOR
 EVELYN J. TYLER
 ESTHER C. VOSSLER
 BARBARA C. WHITESIDE
 NANCY V. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CRAIG L. ABRAHAM
 BRIAN J. ANDERSON
 GEORGE E. BRESNihan
 WILLIAM H. CLARKE
 BRENT L. DESSING
 FREDERICK M. DINI
 TERREL J. FISHER
 JAMES R. S. GAYTON
 MATTHEW P. HOFFMAN
 CHONG HUNTER
 TRENT C. KALP
 CHRISTOPHER D. LIGHT
 SPENCER A. MOSELEY
 CHRISTOPHER T. NELSON
 SHAWN B. NORWOOD
 RICHARD A. PAQUETTE
 MARK C. RICE
 CHAD R. RIDDER
 BRIAN V. ROSA
 DAVID E. SMITH
 AARON S. TRAUER
 SCOTT Y. YAMAMOTO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

CHAD M. BROOKS
 SCOTT O. CLOYD
 JOSEPH L. GREESON
 ERIK J. KARLSON
 MICHAEL D. KENNEY, JR.
 SCOTT R. KING
 KIRK A. LAGERQUIST
 THOMAS M. MOSKAL
 ROD W. TRIBBLE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HEATHER J. WALTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

WILLIAM A. HLAVIN
 BASHON W. MANN