

was to meet employees and business owners, take stock of their challenges and successes, and identify ways the Federal Government can help them grow and innovate.

We have highlighted the diverse products being produced in our great State, and we celebrate the hard-working Marylanders who have made these products and the companies that are providing jobs in our local communities.

For example, the Paul Reed Smith guitar factory in Stevensonville, MD, makes high-end guitars used by some of the most prominent musicians in the world—including Carlos Santana. Paul Reed Smith has operated for nearly 30 years and now employs nearly 230 workers with revenues of \$24 million. They are the largest private employer in Queen Anne's County, MD, and one of the top five employers on the upper shore.

As a region and country, we must stay focused on creating good jobs at home and strengthen and continue to build our economy. Manufacturing is good for Maryland, and it is good for America.

Let me tell you about my visit to Volvo Group, which employs 1,500 people in Hagerstown, MD—accounting for 1 out of every 10 jobs in the region's manufacturing sector. Employees at this facility are paid approximately 62 percent above the average wage in the region. These are good jobs that people are proud to hold.

Volvo has set the standard for environmentally aware manufacturing. Through its partnership with the U.S. Department of Energy, Volvo has developed the next generation of fuel-efficient engines and trucks. Since 2001, Volvo has invested \$330 million to upgrade and renovate their facilities, allowing Volvo to build a state-of-the-art engine development laboratory to produce increasingly fuel-efficient engines.

This Volvo facility has shown outstanding success. Sixty of Volvo's trucks a day have the same emission as one truck in 1990. That is an amazing reduction of pollutants going into the air. In addition, the facility recycles 84 percent of the site's waste, and it has achieved an 83-percent decrease in the use of diesel fuels.

Furthermore, Volvo remains invested in western Maryland by making generous contributions to local health and welfare organizations, civic and community organizations, art and cultural organizations, and education initiatives across the region. This commitment to the well-being of Volvo employees is demonstrated by the August 2013 opening of an onsite Family First Pharmacy which will provide employees and their families innovative state-of-the-art health care to be provided by doctors, nurses, and pharmacists in cooperation with Walgreens.

As the Volvo facility is highly invested in the local community and its numerous employees, we must remain

invested in assuring this socially responsible company's future success.

Later in the day I traveled to Frederick, MD, and visited the Flying Dog Brewery. They make a very different product than the most energy-efficient transmissions in the world that are assembled at Volvo, but I recognize the same qualities in both of these unique companies and their employees: hard work, attention to detail, and a real pride and passion for the product being made. These are qualities that can never be outsourced.

Small breweries such as Flying Dog have been anchors of local and American economies since the start of our history.

This is a state-of-the-art facility that constantly works to perfect its product through innovative techniques. In addition to making a product whose high quality I can attest to, they are supporting 80 jobs and reinvesting profits back into the western Maryland community.

When I grew up, brewing in Maryland was a huge industry. We lost most of it, but it is coming back. Today, the brewing industry in Maryland is supporting more than \$13 million in wages paid and contributing nearly \$100 million to our State's economy.

My "Made in Maryland" tour was conceived to highlight manufacturing and innovation that is boosting our economy across our State. But I can tell my colleagues that agriculture, which is still our No. 1 industry, is being revived along the way too. During my tour of the Flying Dog Brewery, I met a farmer and his son who are fifth- and sixth-generation Frederick County family farmers celebrating the 175th year of their family farm. They told me their decision to begin growing barley, small grains, and hops for local breweries is what kept their farm going. They supply small grains and hops to Flying Dog and numerous Maryland brewing companies for many of their seasonal, locally sourced brews. Their farm, Amber Fields Malting and Brewing Company, in conjunction with Brewer's Alley Restaurant and Brewery in Frederick, MD, introduced Amber Fields Best Bitter, which they describe as an English-style best bitter. This was the first commercially brewed beer in over 100 years to rely exclusively on barley grown and malted in Maryland. Amber Fields Best Bitter and additional releases also featuring locally grown ingredients are available through Brewer's Alley and their sister brewery, Monocacy Brewing Company, both in Frederick, MD.

America's manufacturing sector—from autos and truck manufacturing to beer makers and guitars—have played a major role in growing our economy and our Nation to be the world's leader. It has also helped create the strongest middle class in history. To continue in our recovery, we need to make sure companies such as Volvo Group, Flying Dog Brewery, and Paul Reed Smith Guitars, which are creating jobs and

investing in our economy here at home, have what they need to be successful. Our job in Washington should be to make their job easier, because when they do better, we all do better.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, there has been some confusion about the President's health care law recently, so I come to the floor to try to clear up one point.

Just before the Fourth of July holiday, the Obama administration admitted to the world that its health care law is not working out according to plan. It did it in an unusual way—in a blog post—right before the Fourth of July holiday, but yet it is known to the world. By choosing to delay the law's employer mandate, the President conceded it would place a tremendous burden on America's job creators.

Then, just this past Sunday, the Senate majority leader went on "Meet the Press," on television, and said: "ObamaCare has been wonderful for America." Wonderful for America? Senator REID's comments demonstrate once again that Democrats in Washington—the people who voted for this law—are not listening to the American people.

I hear it when I return home to Wyoming every weekend. I did this past weekend. I hear it as Members of the Senate do when they talk to friends from home. I heard it today from people from Gillette and Evanston and Cody that this health care law is unraveling. So I just want to make a couple of things clear to everyone.

After 3½ years, we know the Obama health care law is not working. It is a train wreck. If the law was wonderful, it wouldn't increase premiums. It wouldn't shrink paychecks. It wouldn't discourage job creation. If the law was wonderful, we wouldn't put the feared IRS as the enforcer of the health care law. If the law was wonderful, the administration wouldn't have delayed one of its most critical parts. It is clear to me that even President Obama does not share Senator REID's opinion that the health care law is wonderful.

This law is not wonderful for America. It is obviously terrible for America's job creators. It is also terrible for many people trying to make a living in this country.

There was an article on the front page of the New York Times recently—Wednesday, July 10—with the headline: "At Restaurant, Delay Is Help on Health Law." The delay is a help.

This article—front page, above the fold of the New York Times—looked at

a small Maryland restaurant called the Shanty Grille. What is going on at that restaurant makes the case better than any actuarial study, any sort of charts or any economic model ever could because it is a story about real people and their lives. The article talked about how the law was hurting everyone from the owner of the restaurant to the uninsured waiter, to the chef who has insurance. All of them were hurt by this health care law. Because for each of these people and for millions of others similar to them across the country, the reality of health care reform is that it has fallen far short of the President's many promises.

According to this article in the New York Times, the restaurant's owner is on a pace to finally this year turn a profit. It will be the first profit since the economic downturn a number of years ago. Four years after the recession ended, he is finally set to recover and get back into the black. If he has to provide expensive Washington-approved, Washington-mandated health insurance for every employee, though, that profit will quickly evaporate. So that would certainly harm this employer.

What about the employees? Let's talk about the people this is designed to help. It turns out the younger workers at the restaurant actually aren't too interested in having this health insurance coverage. They say they would rather have more money in their paychecks so they could decide how they want to spend it, not how the President thinks they should spend it. So they stand to lose out once the law's individual mandate starts in January because they are going to have to go out and buy insurance which may be much more than they want or need or can afford.

The employees at the restaurant who already have health insurance are worried too. They are concerned they will not be able to keep their current coverage. When the President stopped his disastrous employer mandate, I believe he actually made the right decision, but I have some doubts about his reasoning. I think this was purely for political reasons.

Regardless of how and why the President made the decision, a 1-year delay in this one policy doesn't solve the problem; it only extends the problem.

First, this restaurant and other small businesses can't afford and can't expand or hire more staff because they still face the mandate in 2015. Actually, the final line in this article on the front page of the New York Times, when we carry over and read the end of it, says: We are not going to expand. "No more expansion."

Second, many businesses are cutting back workers to part-time status because of the health care law. President Obama has had nothing to say to those Americans looking for full-time work but trapped in a part-time job, and part-time is defined by the health care law, which is different than most

Americans think of or define part-time work.

Third, the law still requires all of the employees, as with nearly everyone else in America, that they have to buy pricey health insurance starting January 1. That is a problem for the President and he knows it.

Here is how an article in Politico put it this past weekend. This article is entitled "ObamaCare's Missing Mandate." It says:

The massive coast-to-coast campaign to get people to sign up for ObamaCare is light on mentions of one central element: The widely disliked individual mandate.

The Politico article goes on to say:

Poll after poll has found that Americans don't like being told they have to get insurance or face a penalty. So the groups doing outreach don't plan to draw much attention to it.

The employer mandate has collapsed. The individual mandate is unpopular, so they just don't want to talk about it.

A lot of the people who do have to buy this new Washington-mandated, Washington-approved insurance will have to buy it through the government exchanges. Of course, these may not be ready on time. There are 77 days left for these to be ready. Even if they are up and running by the deadline, we have seen ample evidence that premiums will be much higher than they were before the mandate. That is especially true for young healthy adults who the President expects to pay more in order to help older sicker people pay less. But a lot of younger healthier people are going to have to pay more for that one older sicker person.

These weren't the kinds of reforms Democrats promised when they were forcing this plan through Congress on strictly party-line votes. During the debate, Republicans made suggestions to improve the health care law, but we were shut out of the backrooms where the Democrats struck their deals.

In the end Democrats drafted their law so badly that the negative side effects and unintended consequences were inevitable. The New York Times article shows how some of these side effects are hurting millions of Americans—not just those working at the restaurant, including the restaurant owner, in Maryland.

We all know President Obama likes to hold photo ops with people who he says are helped by the law. It is time for him to meet with people such as the ones featured on the front page of the New York Times—people who are being hurt by his health care law. It is time for the President to sit down with both Democrats and Republicans to truly talk about how we can reform health care in this country. Delaying the employer mandate for 1 year is not enough. It doesn't eliminate the burdens of this costly law.

The House is scheduled to vote this week to delay the individual mandate. The Senate should do the same. It is time for the President and for Senator

REID to listen to the victims of ObamaCare.

President Obama was right to recognize his health care law is not working out. Senator REID was totally wrong because ObamaCare is not wonderful for America. It is turning into a costly failure. The only appropriate course at this point is to permanently delay implementing the rest of the law and to replace it with reform that works.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and 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. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, earlier today the Senate held a first of a series of cloture votes on controversial nominations by voting to invoke cloture on the nominee to be the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. This agency is unlike any other Federal agency. Under its current structure, the CFPB has very broad discretion but very little in terms of executive or congressional oversight.

It is not a debate about whether Republicans in the Senate support consumer protection, as some would portray it. Both sides agree everyone benefits from a mortgage industry and marketplace free of fraud and other deceptive, exploitive practices.

Republicans did not object to consumer protection when it was placed in each of the prudential banking regulators. In fact, bills aimed specifically at consumer protection passed with an overwhelming majority in the Senate. The Fair and Accurate Credit Transactions Act of 2003 passed 95 to 2, and the Credit CARD Act of 2009 passed 90 to 5.

During the Dodd-Frank debate, the key point of contention was not the value of consumer protection but, rather, the Bureau's design.

One of the lessons of the financial crisis is that we need a supervisory program that looks and considers how safety, soundness, and consumer protection work together to create a better functioning financial system. What Republicans have been asking for is that the Bureau be restructured in the same way as other similarly situated financial regulators, with accountability and transparency to Congress and to the taxpayers.

As outlined in two letters to the President sent by Republican Senators in May 2011 and this past February, the changes highlighted are not new. In fact, they exist in the current Federal regulatory landscape. One of the key changes we seek is the establishment of a board of directors to oversee the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau with staggered terms.

This is the structure of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the

Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Federal Reserve.

A board of directors would allow for the consideration of multiple viewpoints in decisionmaking and would reduce the potential for politicization of regulations.

Indeed, the administration originally supported a board of directors for the Bureau. In 2009, the Obama administration proposed a stand-alone Consumer Financial Protection Agency with a board of directors funded through the congressional appropriations process. The Bureau also should be subject to the congressional appropriations process, rather than, as the Dodd-Frank legislation did, to fund it through the Federal Reserve with no review by Congress.

While Mr. Cordray stated that he would come and testify before the Appropriations Committee, this is quite different than Congress being able to oversee how the monies that the agency utilizes are spent. For example, the CFPB intends to spend close to \$100 million to renovate its current headquarters. This amount is double the amount that the Government Services Administration has for property acquisition and renovation in any 1 year.

Finally, consumer protection cannot and must not be detached from prudential regulation. Although the Bureau must consult with other prudential regulators before finalizing its rulemaking, the Bureau can simply disregard their advice.

By establishing a solid safety and soundness check for prudential regulation, the link and coordination between prudential supervision and protection would be strengthened by allowing potential regulators to provide meaningful input into the CFPB's actions and proposals. Such collaboration will only strengthen our financial system, not weaken consumer protection.

Without it, the CFPB and prudential regulators may issue rules that result in confusion for the regulated entities, as has already been the case with conflicting guidance for private student loans, and the many questions raised by the qualified mortgage final rule.

The Dodd-Frank solution was to have the Financial Stability Oversight Council review certain CFPB actions, but it set the threshold at two-thirds of the FSOC members. This very high threshold before the FSOC can act renders its veto virtually meaningless.

Since the beginning of this year, I have encountered a number of items with the CFPB that are a cause of concern and warrant greater scrutiny, but it is the Federal agency's data collection initiative that is the most disturbing to me. Recently, we learned from press accounts—not from the agency but from press accounts—that the CFPB was spending tens of millions of dollars to collect Americans' credit data. We have learned from the recent

IRS, Associated Press, and NSA scandals what happens when government agencies cross the line and watch our citizens instead of watching out for them. There is a trust deficit in government today.

During the last several months, I have raised significant concerns with the CFPB's data collection efforts. I have been told that the Bureau needs big data to level the playing field. However, the Bureau's efforts go far beyond simply leveling the playing field. Unfortunately, for an agency that prides itself on transparency, I have encountered very little concrete answers to very basic questions.

For example, I have asked the Bureau on three occasions to give me information on the number of Americans' credit accounts that the CFPB is currently monitoring. In response, the CFPB said the information was confidential and could not be supplied.

Information coming from last week's hearing in the House Financial Services Committee indicates that the CFPB is undertaking unprecedented data collection on possibly hundreds of millions of Americans' accounts, possibly as many as 900 million credit card accounts in the United States. The size of this data collection and the amount of money being spent by the agency are a cause of concern and should be for those Americans whose financial and credit data is being sent to the Bureau each and every single month.

The CFPB is collecting credit card account data, bank account data, mortgage data, and student loan data. In addition, the Bureau has hired third parties to act as its agent to collect, aggregate, and produce consumer credit data on behalf of the agency. Some contracts even contain instructions to follow specific consumer accounts over time.

This ultimately allows the CFPB to monitor, on a monthly basis, an individual consumer's financial activity. Some of the data collected and provided to the CFPB monthly includes account balances, ZIP Code+4 location data, the year of birth, and other demographic information. Thus, the CFPB can know how much you owe, how much money you have, how much you pay each month, and where you live within a few blocks.

The Bureau has stated publicly on several occasions that it does not collect personally identifiable information other than the voluntary personally identifiable information consumers submit to the Consumer Complaint Database and in supervisory exams. However, two documents drafted by the CFPB seem to raise doubts about this Federal agency's actions.

Pursuant to the Privacy Act of 1974, the CFPB's System of Records Notice of November 2012 for the consumer and market research database states that some of the collected data "will be personally identifiable information." In addition, a CFPB contract with a third party data aggregator states:

Most, if not all, of the data will be confidential supervisory information, and some of the data will contain sensitive Personal Identifiable Information (PII).

Questions still remain about what type of personal information is collected by the CFPB and what is collected by the agency's contractors. But without the structural changes to the agency that we are asking for, it is hard to get answers to the question.

At the hearing in the House last week, a CFPB official was unable to state how many agency employees have access to this enormous amount of credit data. He was also unaware of any law which is used when employees access the data.

I also question whether the Bureau has put in proper policies and procedures to prevent the data from being reengineered and reverse engineered. I consider these to be very serious privacy concerns by the very agency that was created to watch out for consumers, not to watch consumers.

Banks constantly worry about cyber attacks. Recent news reports have run stories about the Federal Reserve and the IRS being susceptible to cyber attacks.

What assurances do we have from the CFPB that these massive troves of consumer credit information are safe? Data safety is particularly of concern, given that both the GAO and the CFPB's inspector general have found weaknesses in the CFPB data security programs and policies.

Because I was unable to get sufficient answers out of the CFPB, I turned to the Government Accountability Office and requested that it look into the agency's data collection and security efforts. That review is now underway.

With regard to the regulatory role of the agency, in the past 2 years the Bureau has issued numerous new rulemakings, resulting in significant cumulative burdens for affected institutions, especially small and community banks that often only have a handful of employees. Remember, there is no board directing this agency. There is no board to whom the Director of the agency responds. One single individual has been given the authority in this statute, without oversight by Congress of his or her budget, to single-handedly issue rules and regulations.

In the span of 10 days this past January, the CFPB issued more than 3,500 pages of final rules affecting mortgage markets and other industries. This represents more than 1 million total words of regulatory text. When I asked at an April hearing about the overwhelming number of regulations the Bureau issued in 1 single month, I was told that there were "less than 100 pages of rules" when translated into the Federal Register.

Well, 100 pages of rules is a lot, but this ignores the more than 2,500 pages of guidance, analysis, and interpretations—which are all admissible in court—and all of which are required reading for anyone who has to comply with this complex web of rules.

In order to understand and comply with these regulations, institutions are forced to hire lawyers and compliance officers, tying up resources that could be better spent on growing business, creating jobs, and boosting the economy. Again, recall that the connection between safety and soundness regulations was severed with the creation of this agency.

Instead, these additional compliance costs are inevitably passed on to the consumers, which is especially harmful during a time of high unemployment and sluggish economic growth. If we were convinced that the agency was at least protecting consumers rather than collecting data on all individual Americans who have credit cards, student loans, mortgages, or bank accounts, then perhaps we could at least engage in a discussion or a debate about whether the agency's actions are appropriate and effective.

I am concerned that without the strong cost-benefit analysis and input from the small business panels in crafting rules, even well-intentioned rules could make consumer credit more expensive and less affordable.

Another concern I have with the CFPB is the enactment of policy changes outside of the established notice-and-comment rulemaking process.

In March, the CFPB posted a legal bulletin on its blog instructing auto lenders to adjust compensation practices to avoid violating fair lending laws. The bulletin includes significant legal interpretations and suggests that the Bureau may utilize its enforcement powers to ensure that lenders adhere to its guidance.

The only example the CFPB uses in this bulletin on how auto lenders can effectively comply with fair lending laws is flat pricing, as is interpreted by many, that any other type of pricing will be a clear violation in the CFPB's eyes. If the CFPB intends to make major policy changes, then it needs to go through a regular notice-and-comment rulemaking, not a blog post.

This bulletin also, frankly, represents a backdoor attempt by the CFPB to regulate auto dealers, a group that is explicitly exempted from the CFPB's regulatory purview by the Dodd-Frank legislation that created the agency, in what appears to be yet another example of CFPB's overreach.

In conclusion, I will continue to work toward oversight of the agency to ensure accountability and transparency for the American people. Those who are trying to paint our demands as being extraordinary need to look at the extraordinary data collection and actions of this agency and look at our regulatory landscape with similarly situated financial regulators.

Those who are trying to portray these demands as another attempt to water down consumer protection need to realize that consumer protection divested from safety and soundness does not make for a better financial system or for greater benefit to consumers.

We found in our review of the CFPB that the agency does have serious problems in a number of different areas. The lack of prompt and complete responses from the agency regarding its big data collection of Americans' credit accounts is very troubling but is indicative of the lack of transparency established when this agency was created.

The expenditure of nearly \$100 million for building renovations is extremely troubling in these tight economic times.

While the confirmation of the nominee is now all but certain, there remains significant work and oversight to ensure the CFPB is an accountable agency and that it is transparent in its actions for all Americans to see.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, did my friend from Idaho suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, he did not.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I will talk for a minute about the National Labor Relations Board nominees.

The NLRB has helped to protect the rights and safety of workers for about 80 years. It is a vitally important watchdog for working Americans. It is also important for employers. It also protects employers. But unless we act before the Senate recess in August, the NLRB will lose its ability to operate. It will fail to have a quorum so it can't work or be effective. So the confirmation of full membership at the NLRB is a priority.

I understand Republican Senators were frustrated by President Obama's recess appointment of two members to the NLRB. I accept that. No one has raised any questions, however, about these two good people—Griffin and Block. They are fine public servants and the record should be spread with that fact. Republicans have insisted on the President's nominating new people, and he has done that. It is a right they have, and this is a compromise that was reached.

Republican Senators have also committed that the Senate will confirm these new nominees quickly, certainly before the end of this month—the month of July. To that end, I met earlier with Senators HARKIN and LAMAR ALEXANDER, the chairman and ranking member of that big HELP Committee, and they have given me their word they are going to file a notice tonight that the committee will hold a hearing on these nominees on Tuesday, they will then have a markup on Wednesday, and we intend to turn to these nominees next Thursday.

I have talked with the people at the White House, and I am confident these nominees will be staunch advocates for the NLRB—for the rights and safety of workers, and for employers that are also protected with this legislation. So when the Senate confirms them, the

NLRB will once again have a full team to protect the rights of workers—the workers in West Virginia, workers in Nevada, and all over the country—the same thing they have done for 80 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to Calendar Nos. 100, 101, and 104 be withdrawn; that the vote on the confirmation of the Cordray nomination occur at 5 p.m. today; that if the nomination is confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and President Obama be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the Hochberg nomination occur at 10 a.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, July 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARDIN. 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 question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Richard Cordray, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection?

Mr. CARDIN. 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 assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Graham	Murkowski
Baucus	Hagan	Murphy
Begich	Harkin	Murray
Bennet	Hatch	Nelson
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Portman
Boxer	Heitkamp	Pryor
Brown	Hirono	Reed
Cantwell	Isakson	Reid
Cardin	Johnson (SD)	Rockefeller
Carper	Kaine	Sanders
Casey	King	Schatz
Chambliss	Klobuchar	Schumer
Coburn	Landrieu	Shaheen
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Levin	Tester
Corker	Manchin	Udall (CO)
Donnelly	Markey	Udall (NM)
Durbin	McCain	Warner
Feinstein	McCaskill	Warren
Flake	Menendez	Whitehouse
Franken	Merkley	Wicker
Gillibrand	Mikulski	Wyden

NAYS—34

Alexander	Boozman	Cochran
Ayotte	Burr	Cornyn
Barrasso	Chiesa	Crapo
Blunt	Coats	Cruz

Enzi	Kirk	Scott
Fischer	Lee	Sessions
Grassley	McConnell	Shelby
Heller	Moran	Thune
Hoeven	Paul	Toomey
Inhofe	Risch	Vitter
Johanns	Roberts	
Johnson (WI)	Rubio	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader is recognized.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to a period of morning business with Senators allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator STABENOW be recognized for up to 3 minutes and that I be recognized for up to 5 minutes.

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

THE FARM BILL

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I appreciate my friend from Ohio yielding for a moment. I wanted to make a short statement as it relates to moving forward on the farm bill and congratulate the House for sending their version of the farm bill to us this morning.

Tomorrow it will be our intent—Senator COCHRAN and I—to go through the motions that it takes to be able to send our farm bill back and ask for a conference committee. I wanted to let all the Members know that. If there is a concern, I would appreciate that Members approach me or Senator COCHRAN directly because this is an opportunity for us to move forward and actually put together this bill. The farm bill affects 16 million people in this country who work in agriculture, as well as everyone who counts on the great work of our farmers in order to have the healthiest, most affordable food system in the world.

Tomorrow it is our intent to move forward on the farm bill, so if there are any questions or concerns from Members, we are happy to work with them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I thank the chairwoman of the agriculture committee for her work. This is legislation that saves taxpayers literally tens of billions of dollars while

strengthening the safety net. The bill provides adequate revenue and nutrition for literally millions of people—children, seniors, people on disability, and people who work in low-income jobs—and that is also important in this agriculture bill.

CORDRAY CONFIRMATION

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, in the years leading up to the financial crisis, the biggest banks and lenders created new ways to make record profits off of consumers. They made predatory loans to working-class families, created prepaid cards with exploitative fees, and gave out student loans to first-generation college students with interest rates sometimes as high as 20 percent.

Today millions of consumers are still trying to recover from these unscrupulous practices while companies keep looking for new ways to increase their profits at the expense of these consumers. Congress created the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect Americans from consumer fraud and abusive fees and products.

I thank the Presiding Officer for her role in this before she came to the Senate.

More than 700 days since its creation, American citizens are now just getting to vote for a consumer watchdog to head the organization. Because of the CFPB, consumers can now decipher credit card applications and have help correcting erroneous credit reports.

Because of these successes, confirming Richard Cordray as the Director was right. We know where he stands. We know for whom he stands—as a strong advocate for consumers, families, and small businesses.

No one doubted Richard Cordray's qualifications or temperament for the job. This is the first time in American history when one party refused to confirm a nominee because they didn't like the agency. A terrible precedent was being set. Thankfully a number of our colleagues understood—as we discussed last night—it was important to move past that.

Richard Cordray served as Ohio's first State solicitor. He represented the U.S. Government before the Supreme Court. He has been elected the attorney general and State treasurer of Ohio. He has received bipartisan accolades and support from Ohio's business and consumer groups.

Let me share a bit of a letter written by a Republican Member of Congress from my home State, Representative STEVE STIVERS.

Rich has always proven himself hard-working, collaborative, and pragmatic.

If you take the time [...] to evaluate Rich's character and disposition, you will find him to be an individual who listens to your opinion and seeks mutually acceptable solutions.

Representative STIVERS is right. Under Cordray's leadership, the Bureau has earned praise from industry and

consumer groups alike for the rules it has come up with. It has already recovered millions of dollars for consumers from credit card companies, credit repair companies, and others. That is why consumers won a victory today and should be happy that the 2-year-long process that has prevented Richard Cordray from being considered has finally come to an end and we can now move forward.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD EARL GIDCUMB

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to a distinguished Kentuckian who is looked up to and admired by many in the Commonwealth for his character and his service to our country: Mr. Edward Earl Gidcumb. Mr. Gidcumb, or "Earl" to his friends, celebrates his 88th birthday this July 31. He served America during World War II as a storekeeper, second class, in the U.S. Navy, and survived some harrowing experiences.

Earl's story is commemorated in a book titled "WWII DC: The Long Overdue Journey," which details the experiences of World War II veterans from Kentucky and describes a trip made by these Kentucky veterans to the Nation's capital in 2004 to visit the National World War II Memorial. Earl still is an active participant in the Kentucky veterans community as one of the few buglers left in western Kentucky; he plays taps at military funerals and civic events. Earl also contributed to the establishment of the Kentucky Veterans and Patriots Museum in Wickliffe, Kentucky.

Earl was a high-school student when the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. He graduated from high school on May 23 of 1943; on May 25, he was sworn into Naval service in Marion, IL.

Earl underwent training in Chicago and then served aboard several vessels, the first of which, the U.S. Navy ship LST 218, was bound for Pearl Harbor. Earl recalls, "water supply was very short and we took salt-water baths using a special soap for bathing in salt water. We slept in bunks stacked six high and down below the main deck . . . I started out in the Atlantic Ocean and ended up on the Pacific Ocean."

Earl spent time in Pearl Harbor before being posted to the USS *Indianapolis* CA 35, a heavy cruiser. He received five battle stars while serving on the *Indianapolis* for 10 months. A few months after being transferred off that ship, the *Indianapolis* was sunk by a Japanese submarine.

"I would not be here today if I had remained aboard the *Indy*," Earl says. "The second torpedo of the two that sunk it hit the part of the ship where I slept each night. There [were] 1,196 aboard, 800 went down with the ship, [and] 317 survived after several days in the water. Some died from their wounds, some were eaten by sharks,