

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Ex.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—12

Blunt	Inhofe	Sessions
Boozman	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Moran	Sullivan
Crapo	Risch	Vitter

NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Sanders
Rubio	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this morning, I restated my commitment to working with Senators in a serious way to move our country ahead on trade in the economy of the 21st century. I said that we need to allow debate on this important issue to begin and that our colleagues across the aisle need to stop blocking us from doing so.

That is the view from our side, it is the view from the White House, and it is the view of serious people across the political spectrum. I have repeatedly stated my commitment to serious, bipartisan ways forward on this issue. Now, serious and bipartisan does not mean agreeing to impossible guarantees or swallowing poison pills designed to kill the legislation, but it does mean

pursuing reasonable options that are actually designed to get a good policy result in the end.

That is why I have agreed to keep my party's significant concession of offering to process both TPA and TAA on the table. It is why I have said we could also consider other policies that Chairman HATCH and Senator WYDEN agree to. That is why I will keep my commitment to an open amendment process once we get on the bill.

Of course, our friends across the aisle say they also want a path forward on all four of the trade bills the Finance Committee passed. This isn't just an issue for our friends on the other side, but there is a great deal of support on our side for many of the things contained in these other bills. However, as a senior Senator in the Democratic leadership reminded us yesterday, we have to take some of these votes separately or else we will kill the underlying legislation.

So the plan I am about to offer will provide our Democratic colleagues with a sensible way forward without killing the bill.

The plan I am about to offer will allow the regular order on the trade bill, while also allowing Senators the opportunity to take votes on the Customs and preferences bills in a way that will not imperil the increased American exports and American trade jobs that we need. We would then turn to the trade bill with TPA and TAA as the base bill and open the floor to amendments, as I have suggested all week. It is reasonable.

So I look forward to our friends across the aisle now joining with us to move forward on this issue in a serious way.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 10:30 a.m., tomorrow, May 14, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 57, H.R. 1295, and Calendar No. 56, H.R. 644, en bloc; that the Hatch amendments at the desk, the text of which are S. 1267 and S. 1269, respectively, be considered and agreed to; that no further amendments be in order; and that at 12 noon the bills, as amended, be read a third time and the Senate then vote on passage of H.R. 1295, as amended, followed by a vote on passage of H.R. 644, as amended, with no intervening action or debate, and that there be a 60-affirmative-vote threshold needed for passage of each bill; and that if passed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table. I further ask that following disposition of H.R. 644, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, the motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314 be agreed to, and that at 2 p.m. the Senate proceed to vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 1314; further, that if cloture is invoked, the 30 hours of postcloture consideration

under rule XXII be deemed expired at 10 p.m. on Thursday night.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

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

First of all, I want to take just a very brief minute and express my appreciation to all my Democratic colleagues who have been understanding and vocal in their opinions as to what we should do to move forward. I also extend my appreciation to the Republican leadership, the majority leader, for having this suggestion to go forward. We have worked together the last 24 hours, and I think we have come up with something that is fair.

The bipartisan majority of the Finance Committee reported out four trade measures, fast-track, trade adjustment assistance, trade enforcement, and a bill expanding trade for Africa. Democrats want a path forward on all four parts of this legislation. Yesterday, we made it clear that we didn't accept merely a fast-track for new trade agreements. We also must enforce the trade agreements we make.

The proposal before us today will provide us that path forward. I look forward to consideration today and tomorrow of the trade enforcement package and the Africa bill. Once we proceed to the fast-track measure, the majority leader has offered an amendment process that in his words will be open, robust, and fair. I appreciate that offer.

This is a complex issue and one that deserves full and robust debate. Once we get on the trade bill, then we have to debate and vote on a number of amendments. So with that background and the understanding that we have on both sides, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. While I do not rise with the intention of objecting, may I propound a question to the majority leader?

Mr. REID. Why don't we get the approval first.

Mr. ISAKSON. I would prefer to propound the question first. Mr. Leader, as I understand it, the Africa bill and the trade enforcement bill will be in tandem together and not subject to amendment, and then we will go to TPA and TAA, which will be open to amendments; is that correct?

Mr. McCONNELL. The Senator from Georgia is correct.

Mr. ISAKSON. In that case, I will not object, but I ask unanimous consent that Senator COONS and I be able to make a 1-minute statement.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in the committee on the AGOA Act, we put in an amendment to ensure an in-cycle and out-of-cycle review of South African trade practices vis-à-vis poultry and other issues important to the United States. We would have offered an amendment on the floor had it been

possible without this UC, but with this UC coming forward and not objecting, we have gotten permission to talk to Ambassador Froman, who has assured us he is willing to instigate an out-of-cycle review immediately or whenever necessary to review the trade practices of South Africa vis-à-vis poultry. I commend him on doing that and wanted to memorialize that in the RECORD.

I yield to Senator COONS for the purpose of confirmation.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague Senator ISAKSON of Georgia and express my shared concern that if we are going to proceed to a long-term renewal of the African Growth and Opportunity Act, which provides duty-free, quota-free access to the U.S. markets to all of sub-Saharan Africa—which I support and have worked hard with the Senator from Georgia and many others to make possible—that we also ensure there is effective trade enforcement. This is a basic principle that underlies all the proceedings here today; that those of us who support free trade and global trade also support fair trade and effective enforcement.

As the good Senator from Georgia recently commented, we are acting in reliance upon a representation by the U.S. Trade Representative that there will be enforcement action taken, if appropriate, on access to markets in South Africa.

With that, I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the majority leader?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I want to thank the Senate majority leader for working with us in a constructive fashion to make it possible for all of the vital parts of the trade package to be considered. I look forward to working closely with him.

Colleagues, I will say that what has been done through the cooperation of the majority leader and the minority leader is, in effect, to say that trade enforcement will be the first bill to be debated; and in doing so, it drives home yesterday's message of 13 protrade Democrats who together said robust enforcement of our trade laws is a prerequisite to a modern trade policy. In making this the first topic for debate, it is a long overdue recognition that vigorous trade enforcement has to be in the forefront, not in the rear, and a recognition that the 1990 NAFTA trade playbook is being set aside.

I am going to be brief at this point, but I would just like to give a little bit of history as to how we got to this point.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Oregon yield for a moment?

Mr. WYDEN. I would be happy to.

Mr. BROWN. I want to thank Senator WYDEN for his work on the Customs bill that we will be debating, the bill to

which he is referring, especially his amendment that we worked on, the prohibition of child labor, closing an 85-year loophole, if you will, allowing child labor in far too many cases, and we as a nation were allowing the importation of goods produced by child labor. I appreciate his support and Senator HATCH's support early in the process before the markup began on our "level the playing field" language, which is particularly important to a number of industries in this country, to make the playing field more level, as Senator WYDEN was saying and, third, the importance of currency. We know how many jobs we have lost in my State and all over the country because of what has happened with countries gaming the currency system. So I wanted to express my thanks to Senator WYDEN.

Mr. WYDEN. Before he leaves the floor, I want to thank Senator BROWN for again and again putting in front of the committee and all Senators the importance of this issue. I just want to read a sentence from the paper yesterday that really puts a human face on this enforcement issue that Senator BROWN has so often come back to. A quote in the New York Times says: "Candy makers want to preserve a loophole."

Now, this is the loophole that was closed in the Customs bill. The article goes on to say that "Candy makers want to preserve a loophole . . . that allows them to import African cocoa harvested by child labor."

What Senator BROWN has said is without, in effect, this enforcement language, this vigorous enforcement language that is in the Customs bill, we would basically be back in yesterday's policy, back in what we had for decades and decades, where youngsters would be exploited in this way.

So we are going to talk about trade here for a few days. I think colleagues and—certainly my colleagues on the Finance Committee know that I strongly support expanded trade. I look at the globe. There are going to be 1 billion middle-class people in the developing world in 2025. They are going to have a fair amount of money to spend. We want them to spend on the goods and services produced in the United States.

So we support expanding those opportunities, increasing those exports. The reality is expanding trade exports and enforcing the trade law are two sides of the same coin. Because what happens at home—I had community meetings in all of my counties, had several in the last couple of weeks. The first question that often comes up is a citizen will say: I hear there is talk about a new trade deal. Well, how about first enforcing the laws that are on the books?

That is why the group of 13 protrade Senators yesterday wanted to weigh in, right at the outset of this debate, talking about how important trade enforcement is to a policy that I call trade done right—trade down right, a modern

trade policy. I am going to be brief in opening this discussion, but I want to spend a few minutes describing how we got to this place.

A few weeks ago, the Finance Committee met and passed a bipartisan package of four bills. These were more than a year in the making. The message I sought to send right at the outset was a message that would respond to all the people in this country who want to know if you are doing more than just going back to NAFTA. Those four bills suggest that this will be very different.

The first, the trade promotion bill, the TPA as it is called, helps rid our trade policies of excessive secrecy. The reason this is so important is the first thing people say is, whether it is in South Carolina or Oregon or anywhere else: What is all of this excessive secrecy about? If you believe strongly in trade and you want more of it, why would you want to have all of this needless secrecy that just makes people so convinced that you are kind of sort of hiding things? So we have made very dramatic changes in that area.

A second strengthens and expands the support system for our workers. It is known as trade adjustment assistance. This is to make sure that when there are changes in the private economy, changes that so often take place and cause workers to see positions they have had be affected, this is a section of trade policy that gives them a chance, almost a springboard, into another set of job opportunities.

The third would finally put, as I have said, trade enforcement into high gear so we can crack down on trade cheats and protect American workers and exports. The reality is trade enforcement is a jobs bill. It is protecting jobs. That is another reason it is so important.

The fourth, which has been touched on by our distinguished colleagues, the Senators from Georgia and Delaware, involves the trade preference programs that are so crucial to both our employers and developing countries. Taken together, the bills form a package of trade policies that are going to help our country create more high-skill, high-wage jobs in my State and across the land.

As I have said so often, if you wanted to explain what a modern trade policy is in a sentence, what you would say is: This is the kind of approach that helps us grow things in America, make things in America, add value to them in America, and then ship them somewhere, particularly if you look to that developing world where there are going to be, in just a few years, 1 billion middle-class consumers. That strikes me as a real economic shot in the arm that will be of long-term benefit to our people.

Now, with respect to enforcement, I want to take just a few minutes to talk about why I think this is an appropriate opening step in the legislative process. Now, I already talked about the 13, 14 protrade Democrats who got

together yesterday and weighed in as a group. Why we did it is that trade enforcement in that particular bill, which is part of the initial debate here, is a jobs bill. It is a cornerstone of a new trade approach that is going to reject the status quo.

As the President said, to his credit, during the State of the Union Address, "Past trade deals have not always lived up to the hype." My own view is a lot of that can be attributed to subpar trade enforcement. That, in my view, is because so many of the same old enforcement tools from the NAFTA era and decades prior just are not the right kind of tool to get the job done in 2015.

Our competitors overseas use shell companies, fraudulent records, and sophisticated schemes to play cat and mouse with U.S. Customs authorities. Our competitors overseas, in a number of instances, intimidate American firms into relocating factories or surrendering our intellectual property. Our competitors often spy on our companies and trade enforcers to steal secrets and block our efforts at holding them accountable.

To mask their activities, they hide their paper trails and engage in outright fraud. For a number of years, I chaired the trade subcommittee of the Finance Committee. I can tell you, these examples I have given of modern challenges is just touching the surface of what we found in our investigation. At one point, we set up a sting operation to try to catch people who were merchandise laundering.

Not only does our trade enforcement need to catch up to these schemes, we have to have a trade enforcement policy that stays ahead of the game. That is why the bipartisan enforcement package, the Customs package, will take enforcement up to a higher level. This bill raises the bar for all of our trade enforcers, whether it is the Customs agents at the border checking inbound shipments, the Commerce Department investigator looking into an unfair trade petition or the lawyer from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative following up on possible violations of trade agreements.

So I want to just quickly tick through a few of the major parts of this trade enforcement package. A proposal that I pushed for a number of years to include will help Customs crack down on foreign companies that try to get around the rules by hiding their identity and sending their products on hard-to-trace shipping routes.

Another will close a shameful loophole—a shameful loophole that Senator BROWN and I just talked about—that allows products made with forced and child labor to be sold in our country. A third will build what I call an unfair trade alert to help identify when American jobs and exports are under stress before the damage is done. With this early warning system in effect, you will have warning bells ringing earlier and more loudly than ever before when a country attempts to undercut an

American industry like China recently tried with solar panels.

I think that is especially important, because when you are home and you are listening to companies and workers and organizations talk about trade enforcement, they say: You know, it just gets to us too late. By the time somebody back there in Washington, DC, is talking about enforcing the trade laws, the lights have gone out at the plant, the workers have had their lives shattered, and the community is feeling pain from one end to another.

So the point of the early warning system is we now have the kind of technology and access to the kind of information that can set off these early warning signals. That is what the unfair trade alert provision is all about.

Fourth, for the first time in decades, the Congress would set out clear enforcement priorities with the focus on jobs and growth that will build real accountability and follow through in our trade enforcement system.

Finally, it includes a proposal from Senator BROWN that goes a long way toward ensuring that our trade enforcers use the full strength of our anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws to fight unfair tactics. I said months ago, repeatedly, making it very clear, when Chairman HATCH and I began working on this package, that strengthening trade law enforcement was at the very top of the list of my priorities.

I did, in starting all of those discussions and the debate, repeatedly come back to the fact that for those of us who are protrade, who think it is absolutely key for the kind of export-related jobs and growth that we need in this country, we have to shore up trade enforcement because it is not credible to say that you are pushing for a new trade agreement if people do not find it credible that you are going to enforce the laws that are already existing on the books and relate to the past trade agreements.

So strengthening trade enforcement has been at the top of my list of priorities for many, many years. The Finance Committee passed this enforcement measure with a voice vote. So that ought to indicate alone that this was not some topic of enormous controversy. We had votes on the trade promotion act, we had votes on the trade adjustment act. There was pretty vigorous debate on those—voice vote on the enforcement provision and the Customs package because it includes so much of what I think Members, actually on both sides of the trade debate, feel strongly about.

I have talked about why as a protrade Democrat I feel so strongly about enforcement. My colleague Senator BROWN speaks eloquently about another point of view, but he feels strongly about trade enforcement. So I am very pleased the Senate is on this bill, is beginning debate on this legislation. I am thoroughly committed to getting this legislation passed before

we leave for the recess. No one can ever make guarantees, but I am sure going to pull out all the stops to do it.

I just want, as we close the opening of this debate, to thank both the majority leader and the minority leader for working with myself and Chairman HATCH and others to get us to this point. We had a bipartisan effort in the Finance Committee, and we are very pleased to see the distinguished Presiding Officer join us on the Finance Committee. We had a bipartisan package, as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows, in the Finance Committee, which passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis.

Now, starting with this debate and with what is ahead of us, we have a chance to build on the bipartisan work that took place in the Finance Committee. It is very appropriate that we begin this discussion focusing on trade enforcement, as the 14 protrade Democrats did yesterday in making an announcement with respect to the importance of this topic. It is going to be a good debate.

The stakes are enormously high. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get this legislation passed and to get a bill to the President of the United States to sign.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have a concern. It is not about trade. Quite frankly, trade is one of the things we have done as a nation all along. We were free traders before we were a nation.

One of the grievances we had in the Declaration of Independence was the fact that King George was restricting our trade. We have always been individuals in a nation of trade.

My issue is particularly with this Preferences bill. Again, it is not about the protections in it; it is about the way we pay for it. Now, as odd as it sounds, while we are doing trade and while we are trying to engage in things, we can't lose track of this simple thing called deficit that is hanging out there as well.

We have basic rules on how we actually handle budget issues. For anything that we set out that is going to take several years to pay for, we have basic rules. Those rules include that it has to be deficit neutral in year 6 and it has to be deficit neutral in year 11.

The way that is set up and the reason that it is set up is so that you cannot game the system that way. You can't just backload the whole thing and say: We are going to be deficit neutral in the very last year, but every other year we are going to run up the bill and have some pretend pay-fors at the very end.

So the way this is set up is to have this basic gap. Halfway through, you are deficit neutral. At the other end of it, you are also deficit neutral. Well, this is what the Preferences bill does.

The Preferences bill sets up this unique something called the corporate payment shift.

So this is how it works. Six years from now, every corporation that has \$1 billion or more in assets has a 5¼-percent tax increase in year 6. In year 7, every one of those companies that has \$1 billion or more in assets gets a 5¼-percent tax refund.

Let me run that by you again. This is set up, in the way the bill is written, so that 6 years from now taxes go up on every company—that is 2,000 companies in America that have \$1 billion or more in assets—by 5¼ percent, and in the next year they get a refund of that same amount.

Can someone help me understand why every company in America has to gear up, change the way they do all their tax policies, pay an extra tax that year, and so that the next year they can get a refund? That is additional cost. That is additional expense—only to help this body circumvent the basic rules that we said we are going to abide by.

Now, in all likelihood, those companies won't actually do that 6 and 7 years from now because, in all likelihood, this body will come through and will waive the corporate tax shift because it is now not years 6 and 7. Now, it is years 7 and 8, and so it doesn't apply.

This is ridiculous. This is a problem—that this body is playing a game in how we are trying to actually accomplish a basic rule.

Now, if anyone can stand in this body and say that is a good idea—that we are going to raise taxes 6 years from now on all these companies and refund the same amount in the 7th year—if anyone can actually tell me that is a good idea, please do. All that this is set up to do is to be able to help us in our CBO scoring.

This is what I think we should do. Option No. 1 is to have a real pay-for—not have some pretend and say this is a deficit-neutral bill, when it is not a deficit-neutral bill.

We have a \$3.7 trillion budget. I think we can find a real pay-for to be able to put it into this bill. If you are lacking for any of those, my office can give you many options that are real pay-fors rather than something fake in year 6 and year 7.

This is option No. 2. At least admit that this is not a deficit-neutral bill and that these pay-fors are fake. There is something that this body has called a budget point of order, and it should apply in this sense because this is not a real pay-for.

Now, I have had these conversations with staff behind the scenes and with individuals in this body, and I have been told the same thing over and over: This is how we always do it. In other words: You are a new guy here. You don't know this is how the game is played on the budget-neutral deficit, eliminating bills that really don't do that.

Yes, that is true. I am the new guy here, and I have heard this is an old practice—and it needs to go away, because no one can defend this.

How about this. How about next week I try to go get a car loan, and I try to negotiate with the car dealer for a 5-year loan, and I tell him: I will pay all of my loan off year 4, but I want a full refund in year 5 for all that I have paid off.

Do you think I am going to get that car loan? No, I am not going to get that car loan because he is going to say: That is fake. And I will say: I have paid it off completely in year 5.

Yes, but we paid it all back in the next year.

We have to be able actually to have real accounting at the end of the day. This is not invisible money. This is debt that is being added. And with a \$3.7 trillion budget, we can find real pay-fors.

This is a practice that has happened in this Congress and in previous Congresses that has to stop. We have the ability to do that.

I oppose this bill because it is not genuine in how we are actually paying for it. Saying that we pay for it in year 6 and refunding it in year 7 is not real, and we know it.

In the days ahead, I hope we can address this practice and not just eliminate it for this bill, but that we can eliminate it from ever being used again in any bill as a gimmick pay-for.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMTRAK TRAIN DERAILMENT

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today with a very heavy heart because of the horrific tragedy that occurred and is still unfolding right now.

Late last evening, an Amtrak train, train No. 188—a train I myself have traveled on—carrying 243 passengers and crew derailed in Philadelphia. It has been confirmed now that seven people have died, including Associated Press employee, husband, father of two, and Plainsboro, NJ, resident Jim Gaines. More than 200 people were injured. My deepest thoughts and prayers are with those who are suffering today.

I am so grateful for the work of the hundreds of first responders, Amtrak crew, doctors, nurses, and many others who quickly, courageously, and very professionally did their jobs and who no doubt saved lives. As we speak, the search through the wreckage for more people, living or dead, is still in process. All people have not been accounted for, and I hope and pray our brave first responders can soon account for everyone who was expected to have been on board.

The 243 people—including passengers and crew—many of whom boarded Amtrak regional train No. 188 just half a mile from where I stand right now—were headed to New York. They were on their way home, on their way to work, to see their husbands and their wives, their children, and their journey was horrifically interrupted when the train derailed around 9:30 p.m. in Philadelphia.

Since the incident, my staff and I have been in contact with Amtrak, the National Transportation Safety Board, the Federal Railroad Administration, and the Department of Transportation. The exact cause of the derailment is unknown, although speed was definitely a factor. We are in close contact with Amtrak officials and Federal investigators who are working quickly to identify exactly what happened to cause this disaster.

Amtrak train No. 188 was on a very familiar path. So many people take this route. The train that derailed was traveling on the Northeast corridor, which is one of the busiest corridors, a 457-mile rail corridor that is the most traveled in North America. It is a transportation lifeline, one of our main arteries connecting the people of Washington, DC, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. The Northeast corridor transports 750,000 passengers every day and moves a workforce that produces \$50 billion each year toward our gross domestic product.

More people are traveling with Amtrak on the Northeast corridor than ever before. Just last year, 11.6 million passengers traveled the Northeast corridor. In New Jersey alone, 110 trains run daily along this route. New Jersey Transit works in cooperation with Amtrak to move trains along the Northeast corridor, where New Jersey Transit customers take 288,000 trips on the corridor each day and 63.6 million trips a year.

Yet, none of these numbers—none of them—are as important today as that number of 243, the number of people riding on and working on Amtrak train No. 188 last evening, or the 7 people who died. We are in a time of great sadness.

As the ranking member of the Senate subcommittee that has jurisdiction over rail safety, I want to also say that my colleagues and I have been working in the Senate to develop policies and implement new safety technologies that will improve rail safety and save lives, and we have been working diligently to finalize a draft of a passenger rail authorization bill.

Congress has not passed a passenger rail bill since 2008, and authorization for that bill expired in 2013. It is unacceptable that Congress has not acted to provide the needed improvements, investment, and long-term certainty for Amtrak, and I will work hard to make sure that we pass passenger rail, that it is a priority for this body.

In fact, today we had intended to introduce this bill authorizing funding and improvements to passenger rail in the United States. Today, that was our intention. However, in light of this tragic event, Senator WICKER and I have decided to monitor the incoming information and take this opportunity to evaluate what other actions might need to be taken as a part of the legislation.

I am proud of my colleagues who have worked so diligently to ensure we get this bill done, and I thank the leadership, Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, for their support. If there is an action that needs to be taken to improve safety in the wake of this tragedy as we are finalizing this bill, I know we can work together to make it a reality.

That said, I must say I am disappointed in the direction of the House appropriations process, which risks starving Amtrak of vitally important funds at the very moment we need to be investing more in passenger rail and our country's crumbling infrastructure.

Failing to make the proper investments in our Nation's infrastructure is indeed crippling our competitiveness in a global economy. A 2012 Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco report estimated that every dollar invested in our national infrastructure increases economic output by at least \$2. Failing to invest properly in infrastructure improvement is threatening the public's safety.

My thoughts and prayers are with the family, friends, and loved ones of the individuals who were killed or injured in last night's train derailment. We still aren't certain of the exact cause, but this incident is a searing reminder of the fragility of life. It is important that we also remember that we should do everything necessary to safeguard life, to make sure we have it and have it more abundantly.

Nothing can fix the damage that has been done to these families and their communities. We all grieve as a nation for the loss of life and pray for those injured, that they recover.

I say now that we must work tirelessly to prevent another tragedy like this from occurring and that we must do everything necessary so we as a nation can have a rail infrastructure and highways, roads, bridges—have an infrastructure as a whole that reflects the greatness of the people of our country.

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.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about an issue that,

by some estimates, has cost the United States as many as 5 million jobs, which is a lot of jobs, and that is the issue of currency manipulation.

We are going to have an opportunity, now that there is an agreement, to move forward on all of the issues related to trade, whether it is fast-track or helping workers or enforcement issues or the other pieces that will be in front of us. We will have an important opportunity to seriously move forward in a positive way for our manufacturers and for agriculture and for all those who are impacted by currency manipulation.

In fact, currency manipulation is the most significant 21st-century trade barrier that American businesses and workers face today and is the least enforced against. We take the least amount of action against currency manipulation, and yet it is the most significant 21st-century trade barrier. If we don't take meaningful action to address this issue, we stand to lose even more jobs at a time when our economy is desperately trying to recover.

Our workers are the best in the world, and we can compete with anybody—our businesses can compete with anybody as long as there is a level playing field and the rules are enforced. But we can't win when our trading partners cheat, and that is what is happening right now. When they manipulate their currency—when Japan does it, when China does it, when other countries do it—they are cheating.

A strong U.S. dollar against a weak foreign currency, particularly one that is artificially weak due to government manipulation, means foreign products are cheaper here and U.S. products are more expensive there. For example, one U.S. automaker estimates that the weak yen gives Japanese competitors anywhere from a \$6,000 to \$11,000 advantage on the price of a car, depending on the make and model. It is hard for our American carmakers to compete when they are effectively seeing a \$6,000 to \$11,000 higher sticker price—more expensive than Japanese vehicles not because of any other difference at all, just currency manipulation. That is a large difference that is based on currency manipulation. In fact, we have seen some numbers that—at some points in time, the entire profit on a vehicle will be from currency manipulation.

We keep hearing about opening Japan's markets to U.S. automakers. While that is fine and that sounds nice, it is really a red herring when we look at what is going on because Japan right now has zero percent tariffs on U.S. cars. So it is not the tariffs that are keeping out our cars; it is the complicated web of nontariff barriers that Japan uses to keep out American automobiles.

Beyond that, what is significant and what we have learned is there is little appetite for American cars in Japan. Last year, Ford's share of imports in Japan was 1.5 percent. Chevy was less

than one-third of 1 percent. There were 13 times as many Rolls Royces imported into Japan last year than Buicks, but that is not because there were all kinds of Rolls Royces going into Japan. It is because there were only 11 Buicks, not 1,100, not 11,000—11.

One of the things that is interesting is that in Japan they buy Japanese vehicles. I wish in America we bought American-made vehicles. We would not be seeing as much of this challenge. It is a different culture there in terms of the pride of buying Japanese vehicles and, in fact, doing what they can to keep others out through nontariff trade barriers. Taking down the trade barriers is a good thing. I support it, but it is not enough. That is not what this is about when we are talking about the transpacific trade agreement and the worries of American automakers and other manufacturers as we do that. That is not the big challenge. It is not about just trade barriers, making life easier for the handful of Japanese consumers who are looking to buy an automobile from outside their country. Our manufacturers tell us that is not the main concern. It is not about competing in the United States or Japan; it is about competing everywhere else in the world. That is the problem.

Japan has a population of 120 million people, but Brazil has a population of 200 million people. India has a population of 1.2 billion people. In emerging markets, American-made vehicles are at a severe competitive disadvantage compared to vehicles produced in Japan or Korea, when those countries choose to manipulate their currency, which has happened many, many times.

We are competing, Japan is competing, and the United States is competing for those 1.2 billion customers. If they can artificially bring down their price \$6,000, \$7,000, \$10,000 or more to sell into those areas, even though it is illegal in terms of the international community—they have signed up saying they will not do it. But if they are allowed to do it and if our trade agreements allow them to do it, it is not fair.

Why would we do that to American companies? Why would we do that to American workers? Why would we allow that kind of cheating to occur? That is what the amendment that Senator PORTMAN and I have is all about, that we will be offering and asking support for.

This is not an issue that only impacts the auto industry or other manufacturers. As everyone knows, I care deeply about agriculture, as the current ranking member and former chair of the agriculture committee. Agriculture is impacted by currency manipulation as well. As a competitive sector in the global economy, any practice that distorts the economy, disrupts trade, and threatens employment has an impact on U.S. farmers and ranchers as well.

Unfortunately, the language currently included in the TPA bill does not adequately address these issues, because if we are going to be effective around currency provisions, we have to make sure they are enforceable. There is some language there, but unlike other parts of the TPA, there is not language requiring that any provisions in a trade agreement be enforceable. That is why Senator PORTMAN and I have introduced an amendment to this bill—to the TPA bill—that simply adds clear language to require that any future trade deals must include enforceable currency provisions. Very importantly, the provisions will be consistent with existing International Monetary Fund commitments that all of these countries have made. They signed up saying they are not going to do currency manipulation, but we do not have enforcement to make sure it does not happen. Also, importantly, this does not affect domestic monetary policy.

I understand the arguments. I have great respect for our Secretary of the Treasury, whom I work with all the time, and 99 percent of the time we are singing the same song—not on this one and the same thing with the President, someone whom I admire deeply. I have to say this administration has done more than any other White House, I think, that I have worked with as a Senator or even in the House, to make sure we are enforcing our trade laws, taking trade actions, winning trade cases in the WTO. I am very grateful for that. But when it comes to currency, there has been a debate saying that somehow our Fed policy, quantitative easing—what we do inside our country is somehow impacted by the definitions of the IMF, which is not accurate. A country can say it is. Anybody can say anything, but it would not hold up because it is not accurate. We are talking about foreign transactions, the monetary policies of foreign competitors in the global economy.

I am very pleased that we have bipartisan support for our amendment. We are adding supporters all the time. Senator ROUNDS, Senator BURR, Senator CASEY, Senator SHAHEEN, and we have other Senators that will be joining us as well. We have growing support and understanding of how critical this is.

The inclusion of strong and enforceable currency provisions in our trade agreements make clear to our trading partners that this uncompetitive trade practice will no longer be accepted. We are not just going to talk about it. We talk a lot about it. We talk a lot about this issue and the loss of American jobs because of currency manipulation. But by putting it in the core instructions for our negotiators as they walk into a trade negotiation, to have listed alongside critical provisions regarding labor laws and environment and intellectual property rights and human rights and other areas, to say currency manipula-

tion, your policies around currency we believe are critically important in a global economy if we are going to compete on a level playing field and not continue to lose American jobs.

Some would call this amendment a poison pill to the TPA. That could not be further from the truth. It is absolutely possible. In fact, we have Members supporting our amendment who also support TPA, the underlying bill. They want to make sure it is a clear outline of the priorities and instructions for any negotiations.

I have not heard from a single one of my colleagues that he or she will oppose the bill because our amendment is not adopted. This is not a poison pill. What I do hear repeatedly, though, is that one of the principal justifications for granting the administration trade promotion authority, fast-track—a process where we can amend it, a simple majority vote—is that Congress sets forth its priorities in trade promotion authority.

We are laying out what is important for the people of our country, for our businesses, for our workers in trade negotiations. If that is the case, then how can something deemed appropriate, deemed a priority by all of us be a poison pill?

It is not our job to match our priorities with their negotiations. The negotiations are supposed to match our priorities. They are laid out in TPA. Otherwise, why do we give fast-track authority?

It is our responsibility on behalf of American businesses, American workers, and American communities to tell the administration what we expect them to fight for on behalf of the people of our country. We already insist on enforceable standards in other negotiating objectives. I support these, and I believe they should be as strong as possible, including issues around labor law, environment, and intellectual property rights. Why should currency manipulation be any different?

This is about Congress setting up the list of priorities for negotiating objectives, and then in return for that, we then allow a fast-track process where any final bill cannot be amended. If we are going to give up that authority, that power, I think we have a right to lay out the conditions under which we would do that.

If we lost 5 million jobs around the globe—5 million jobs because of currency manipulation coming predominantly from Asian countries that we are now negotiating with—we have a right to say we want that to stop. We expect there to be a strong, enforceable currency manipulation provision in any law we pass that then gives up our right to amend a trade agreement.

There is no way that I believe the entire transpacific agreement hinges on whether we include enforceable currency provisions. If that is true, it calls into question what else is in the agreement. Why are there TPP countries that are so concerned about enforce-

able standards—which, by the way, they have all signed up through the IMF as part of the global community—they have all signed that they will not do it. If the argument now is that they are not doing it, then why are people fighting so hard to keep this requirement out of TPA if they are so confident this will never occur again?

Our ability to address currency issues in trade agreements is not complicated, again, by our own domestic monetary policies, including quantitative easing. In fact, we specifically put in the amendment that it does not affect domestic monetary policies.

We have heard this over and over again. There has been confusion that has been spread. The IMF has rules about what is and what is not direct currency manipulation. They are clear rules. They are rules that all of the IMF countries have agreed to. They are rules that the United States has followed while they are doing quantitative easing. They are rules that Japan has flagrantly violated not once or twice but 376 times since 1991.

We are hearing that we do not need enforceable language as a negotiating objective in the fast-track bill because Japan is not manipulating the currency anymore. Well, 376 times they have chosen to do that. Once we pass this, there is nothing stopping them from making it 377. What stops them is if they know that Congress is giving direction to the negotiators to make sure there is enforceable provisions in the trade agreement.

Let's be clear. The United States is clearly following the rules with our domestic monetary policy. We are following the rules. Therefore, we would not be affected by this, and our amendment specifically references that. We are not talking about domestic policy. Other countries could say that. They would be wrong. They would have no legal standing to say it. You can say anything. But we do know this: Japan has flagrantly violated the rules of the IMF—that they signed on the dotted line to support—376 times since 1991. Adding enforceable currency provisions to a trade deal simply adds enforcement to the commitments that Japan and 187 other countries have already made as a part of the International Monetary Fund.

On that point, I appreciate the efforts this administration has made to engage on this issue with our trading partners both bilaterally and through multilateral forms such as the G-20 and the IMF. But, quite frankly, we have not seen enough meaningful progress despite, I am sure, our good efforts. The progress we have seen can be wiped out at a moment's notice and without any meaningful recourse if we do not require enforceable provisions in the fast-track law.

Then there is China. While they are not currently a party to the TPP, it is no secret they are interested in joining

it down the road. While China's exchange rate may be up nearly 30 percent since 2010, the Treasury's own report to Congress released just last month concludes that China's currency remains significantly undervalued, which, by the way, is the reason we also need to make sure the Customs bill, which will be coming before us, maintains what we did in the Finance Committee. It should maintain the important legislation which Senator SCHUMER and Senator GRAHAM have been leading for years. I am proud to be a part of that, along with Senator BROWN and many others. We came together on a bipartisan basis to make sure that China, which is not involved in the negotiations right now, is also held accountable for currency manipulation.

These two issues are not mutually exclusive; they are part of the whole effort. If they are part of a negotiating agreement and it is TPP or any other one, we want to make sure our negotiators put this in the deal. If they are outside of it, we want to also make sure they cannot cheat. That is why both of these are very important policies, and I strongly support both of them in order to move forward in a comprehensive way on currency manipulation enforcement.

For too long, we have relied on handshake agreements and good-faith assurances from our trading partners around the world that they would adhere to the same standards we set for ourselves. For too long, we have seen our trading partners ignore their commitments by breaking the rules and leaving American workers and businesses at a competitive disadvantage. It is time for us to say enough is enough. We don't have to keep doing this to ourselves.

I am very pleased that we have taken a step forward in a couple of directions. I mentioned the Schumer bipartisan proposal which so many of us have worked on. That is a very important piece of this puzzle. The other piece of this puzzle is the Portman-Stabenow amendment. As I said, these are not mutually exclusive; they are complementary. I hope my colleagues will support both of them to demonstrate a serious commitment. It is not enough to support a policy in one bill and not support a similar policy in the other part of the picture here, the other bill. If you support enforcing against currency manipulation—you either do or you don't. You do or you don't. We want to make sure we are doing it against those not part of the TPP negotiations and those who are. We want to make sure that they get signed into law and that they, in fact, are the law of the land. It is long past due that we take meaningful action on this issue.

I don't know how many times I have come to the floor since coming here in 2001 to speak about this and to be a part of this effort. It has always been bipartisan, and I am glad to see that. We need a strong, bipartisan vote on

the Portman-Stabenow amendment. We have understood—those of us who represent manufacturing and agricultural States—that this is a critical piece that will help to level the playing field so our businesses, our farmers, our ranchers, and our workers have every opportunity to compete and win. I know they will. I don't have a doubt in my mind.

Our job is to make sure that there is fairness, that we have the best trade deals, that they are enforceable, and that we have the tools to enforce them, which is also in front of us with the Customs bill. We have to have all of it. We are in a global economy. Everybody is competing. Our job is to make sure we are exporting our products and not our jobs.

If we do not focus in a very serious, real way on addressing currency manipulation, we will, in fact, leave a giant loophole which those companies will drive right through and will allow them to continue cheating and taking our jobs. We can fix that, and I am hopeful my colleagues will join us on a bipartisan basis for a very strong vote so we can send a message to the administration that we are serious—including this as one of the instructions to them—as to what we expect to be in trade agreements going forward.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this week, I introduced a bipartisan resolution to commemorate National Police Week, which this year began on Monday, May 10, and ends on Saturday, May 16. Senator LEAHY, the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary, and 32 others have joined me as original cosponsors of this measure. The theme of this year's Police Week is "Honoring Courage, Saluting Sacrifice."

Police Week is dedicated to the brave men and women in blue who selflessly protect and serve our communities every day, every week, in every community all across the country. The week affords an opportunity to honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice while striving to make our neighborhoods safer and more secure.

Events are scheduled in Washington, DC, this week not only to remember those officers who tragically lost their lives in the line of duty but also to honor outstanding acts of bravery and service by many others.

Tens of thousands of police officers, as well as their friends and family members, will gather in our Nation's Capital for these events, which include

a candlelight vigil and a Police Unity Tour arrival ceremony, among other events.

On this day, the 34th Annual National Peace Officers Memorial Service takes place here on the Capitol grounds. This solemn service offers an opportunity for all of us to pay our respects to fallen officers and their families, communities, and law enforcement agencies that have been permanently altered because these officers paid the ultimate sacrifice. We owe these brave men and women our utmost respect and gratitude as we honor them on this important day.

A report by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund showed a 9-percent increase in the number of officers killed in the line of duty in 2014 compared to the previous year's fatalities. Gunfire was the leading cause of death among law enforcement officers last year, and ambushes were the leading circumstance of officer fatalities in these deaths, according to this report. The number of firearms-related deaths in 2014 represents a 24-percent increase over the previous year.

This is the fifth consecutive year that ambushes have been the No. 1 cause of felonious deaths of law enforcement officers, according to the National Sheriffs' Association. In my home State of Iowa, there have been nearly 200 line-of-duty deaths over many years. The fallen include numerous law enforcement personnel who were shot and killed or struck by vehicles while on duty.

At the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, the names of these Iowans and approximately 20,000 other men and women who have been killed in the line of duty throughout U.S. history are carved in the memorial's wall. Regrettably, 273 new names will be added to the rolls this week to depict the loss of a loved one who did not return home safely at the end of his or her duty.

Already, in 2015, we have witnessed 44 tragic deaths and senseless murders of our law enforcement protectors and our guardians of the peace. Just this past weekend, we all heard on television that Hattiesburg, MS, Police Department Officers Benjamin Deen and Liquori Tate were quickly and violently murdered during a traffic stop that was anything but routine. Our hearts go out to their families and the families of all who have lost their loved ones in the line of duty.

The men and women of law enforcement go to work shift after shift, frequently missing celebrations of birthdays, anniversaries, and holidays because they believe in serving something greater than themselves. The work of law enforcement is not a job; it is a calling to these people. That calling and those officers' devotion to duty merits our utmost respect and gratitude.

As I conclude, I call on all Americans this week to pause and contemplate

the safety and security we all enjoy. We all must recognize that such peace is the result of sacrifices made by brave men and women of law enforcement.

I also wish to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues for their overwhelming support of this year's resolution designating National Police Week, which this week passed the full Senate by unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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, we have all now heard the good news with regard to our ongoing efforts to advance U.S. trade policy. We are talking about trillions of dollars over the years. After a lot of discussion and back and forth, we have come to an agreement on a path forward. I am very happy to say that finally, at long last, common sense has prevailed.

On April 22, the Senate Finance Committee reported four separate trade bills—a bill to renew trade promotion authority, or TPA; another to reauthorize trade adjustment assistance, or TAA; a trade preferences bill; and a Customs and Enforcement bill.

Throughout the recent discussion on trade policy, the TPA bill has gotten most of the attention. That makes sense. After all, it is President Obama's top legislative priority. If we could get it passed, its impact would be felt immediately. And he is right on that, President Obama is right on this issue, and I am happy to help him get this through, if we can.

The TAA bill—the trade adjustment assistance bill—although I am not ecstatic to admit it, is part of the effort. We have known from the outset that in order to ensure passage of TPA, that TAA must move along with it. That is a concession we were always willing to make, although most of us on the Republican side are not all that crazy about TAA and many will vote against it, including me. TAA is trade adjustment assistance, and that is what the union movement has insisted on. Democrats are unanimously in favor of it. Republicans are not ecstatic about it at all. In fact, we think it is a waste in many ways, but it is the price of doing business on TPA.

The path to the other two bills, the preferences bill and the Customs bill, has always been a bit more uncertain, but once again, we knew that from the beginning.

I am pleased to say that we have reached an agreement that will allow us to consider and hopefully pass all four of the Finance Committee trade bills in relatively short order. Under the agreement, the Senate will vote to-

morrow on our Customs bill as well as our trade preferences bill. This will pave the way for another cloture vote on the motion to proceed to a vehicle to move TPA and TAA.

Although I am wary of counting my proverbial chickens before they are hatched—no pun intended—I expect we will get a strong bipartisan vote in favor of finally beginning the debate on these important bills, and we should.

This is, in my opinion, the best of all possible outcomes. This is what Republicans have been working toward all along—and, I might add, some courageous Democrats as well. While we could not and still cannot guarantee that all four bills will become law, we certainly want to see the Customs and preferences bills pass the Senate. I am a coauthor of both of those bills. They are high priorities for me. It was never my intention to let them wither on the legislative calendar. I was always going to do everything in my power to help move them forward. That is why at the Finance Committee markup I committed to work with my colleagues to try to get all four of these bills across the finish line. That is the agreement which was made, and as of right now, it appears we will be able to make good on that commitment on a much shorter timeline than I think any of us expected.

Yesterday was a difficult day. I think it was pretty obvious to any observer that I was more than a little frustrated. Today, I am very glad to see that my colleagues have recognized our desire to move all of these important bills and that they have agreed with us on a workable path forward. But now is not the time to celebrate. While this agreement solves a temporary procedural issue, now is when the real work begins.

As I mentioned yesterday, it has been years—decades even—since we have had a real debate over U.S. trade policy here on the Senate floor, and I am quite certain we have a spirited debate ahead of us. I am looking forward to a fair and open discussion of all of these important issues. It is high time we let this debate move forward. Indeed, it is what the American people deserve.

I am glad we now have a pathway forward. This is something into which the President has put an awful lot of effort. He has an excellent Trade Representative in Michael Froman, one of the best Trade Representatives we could possibly have, a very bright man. He has worked very hard on these trade deals. They won't come to fruition until we pass trade promotion authority. Keep in mind that is the procedural mechanism which will enable the administration to get final approvals by these 11 countries in Asia and the 28 countries in Europe, plus ours.

This is very important, and I for one am very pleased that we have been able to get this through the Senate Finance Committee. That couldn't have happened without the help of Democrats on the other side and in particular Sen-

ator WYDEN. We did part ways in this fiasco that occurred, but hopefully we are back together now.

All I can say is that this is one of the most important bills in this President's tenure, and it is a bill that could benefit every State in this Union and especially my State of Utah, where we did \$7 billion in foreign trade last year alone. For a State our size—3 million people—that is pretty good, but I expect us to do a lot better under trade promotion authority.

Hopefully, the final agreements that are made in TPP and TTIP will be agreements that everybody can agree will help our country move forward. It will help us to have greater relations with other countries throughout the world. It will help us to encourage our own industries to be improve and be the best in the world and will be one of those approaches that literally will shape the world at large.

TPA is an important bill. I hope we can pass it. I believe we will. As I have said, I am not a fan of the TAA bill and never will be, but we understand why that has to pass as well—because the bipartisan coalition that supports it would probably not permit trade promotion authority without it.

All I can say is that I have faith that we have arrived and resolved this impasse, and I hope that in the coming days we will be able to pass trade promotion authority and really put this country back on the trade path which it really deserves to be on and on which the rest of the world will be pleased to have us, where we can have greater cooperation and greater friendships and greater feelings throughout the world than we have right now.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, as this body moves to consider trade legislation, it is our obligation to make sure that our existing and future trade laws are enforced and that we are looking out for those hurt by our trade agreements.

Nearly everyone who supports these agreements—conservatives, Republicans, Democrats—nearly everyone who supports these agreements, even the most vocal cheerleaders for free trade, such as the Wall Street Journal editorial board, all admit that trade agreements create winners and losers.

So if this body is going to vote for a new trade agreement, if the President is going to insist that we pass a new trade agreement, it is up to all of us that when there are winners and losers, we take care of the losers. If people lose their jobs because of a trade agreement passed by Congress, because of a

trade agreement pushed and negotiated by the White House and ultimately ratified by Congress, approved by Congress, it is up to us to take care of those people who lost their jobs because of what we do; that is, to make sure they get the training and support they need, whether they are 30 years old, 40 years old or 55 years old, to find new careers. We owe it to American companies, and we owe it to American workers to make sure the laws we make are enforced and that they create a more level playing field.

We cannot have trade promotion without trade enforcement. That is why the provisions contained in the Customs bill are so important.

Let me go through three provisions—probably the most salient, probably the most important provisions in the Customs bill.

Now, go back a few weeks, and in the Finance Committee we worked on four bills. We worked on the African Growth and Opportunity Act, and it passed overwhelmingly—no opposition.

We worked on the Customs bill that had a number of trade enforcement provisions. Those are the three I will talk about in a moment—the three major provisions.

We also passed training adjustment assistance, where workers who lose jobs because of trade agreements get help from the Federal Government, because we made these decisions here that ultimately cost them their jobs.

And fourth is trade promotion authority, so-called fast-track.

What this Senate did yesterday, when Senator MCCONNELL tried to bring up just trade adjustment assistance and fast-track to the floor, is that the Senate said no—a denial of cloture—because so many of us wanted to make sure that we didn't leave the trade enforcement behind. You simply shouldn't send a trade agreement to the President's desk—or trade negotiating authority to the President's desk—without helping those workers who lose their jobs, without provisions to enforce trade laws.

Let me talk about the three. First, there is currency. For trade to work, all parties have to play by the same rules. We must protect American workers and American companies from foreign governments that artificially manipulate their currencies. This puts U.S. exports at a serious disadvantage and results in artificially cheap imports here at home.

So in other words, when a Chinese company, benefiting from manipulation of currency, sells a product into the United States, they can sell it 15, 20 or 25 percent less expensively—more cheaply—because of their currency advantage. Because they have cheated on currency, they can sell it more cheaply than it would cost otherwise, which undercuts our businesses' ability to compete.

Conversely, when American producers try to sell something in China, it has a 15-percent, 20-percent or 25-per-

cent add on the price, almost like a tariff. It is not really a tariff. It is really a currency advantage that the Chinese have created that makes our goods not particularly sellable when trying to compete with Chinese goods.

China's currency manipulation has been a problem for years, resulting in artificially expensive American imports to China and artificially cheap Chinese exports to the United States. It is not only China. The Peterson Institute for International Economics estimates at least 10 other countries engage in these practices—many of them mimicking what China does.

This puts our American manufacturers at a serious disadvantage. Currency manipulations already cost our Nation up to 5 million jobs. It continues to be a drag on Ohio's economy and on our Nation's economy. Diplomatic efforts to address this cheating simply haven't worked, and we will continue to lose jobs if we don't take action.

This is a problem under Presidents of both parties. We have been asking for currency legislation for over a decade—with President Bush, who opposed it; with President Obama, who opposes it. That doesn't mean we shouldn't do that.

The Economic Policy Institute estimates that addressing currency manipulation could support the creation of up to 5.8 million jobs and reduce our trade deficit by at least \$200 billion. This provision contained in the bill before us today would clarify that current countervailing duty law can address currency undervaluation. It would make it clear that the Department of Commerce cannot refuse to investigate a subsidy allegation based on the single fact that a subsidy is available in other circumstances, in addition to export. American businesses have been put at a disadvantage for too long, and it has hurt American workers. Now is the time to crack down on currency manipulation.

Issue No. 2 is leveling the playing field. This year I introduced the Leveling the Playing Field Act, which was included in the Customs bill we are debating. It would strengthen enforcement of our trade laws. It would give U.S. companies the tools they need to fight back against unfair and illegal trade practices. It would restore strength to antidumping and countervailing duty statutes. It would allow industry to petition the Commerce Department and the International Trade Commission when foreign companies are breaking the rules.

It has been a particular problem in the steel industry. The domestic rebar industry, making steel reinforcement bars—the rebar used in highways, bridges, and roadways—is operating at only 60 percent, an historic low, due to foreign dumping. I met today with a rebar steel manufacturer from Cincinnati to talk about this. He has been involved in trade disputes with Turkey and other countries.

Finished steel imports grew 36 percent last year. In the first quarter of

this year, finished steel imports are up another 35 percent. Imports of these finished steel products have captured 34 percent of the U.S. market as of March 2015.

An Economic Policy Institute report shows that the American steel industry risks long-term damage, including putting more than half a million steel-related jobs at risk, nearly 34,000 in my State, unless the U.S. Government fully enforces its trade remedy rules. We know that when foreign steel is dumped illegally in our country, American workers pay the price.

Leveling the Playing Field—title V of the Customs bill, that section that was amended that was put in the bill prior to markup—is critical to all American companies facing a flood of imports. It would restore strength to U.S. trade remedy laws to ensure that our American workers and our companies are treated fairly.

The last issue is child labor. This bill includes a provision to end an embarrassing, shameful, disgusting loophole in our trade laws. It would close an outdated, 85-year-old loophole that allows some goods made with either forced or child labor—unbelievably, for 85 years we have allowed this—to be imported into the United States. It would strike language in section 307 of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act that provides an exception to our prohibition on the importation of goods that are made with forced labor.

This loophole, called the consumptive demand loophole—that sounds not nearly as bad as the child labor loophole—allows goods made with forced labor, including child labor, to be imported into the country if there isn't enough domestic supply to meet domestic demand.

This exception was included in Smoot-Hawley in 1930, before the United States passed a law banning child labor. That is how outdated this provision is. So when this provision was adopted, child labor was still legal. We banned child labor, but we have let this loophole stand to allow the importing of goods produced by child labor for 85 years. The Fair Labor Standards Act, which outlawed child labor in the United States, was signed into law in 1938, and yet this loophole still stands.

The United States has ratified the International Labor Organization Convention 182 against the worst forms of child labor. We have ratified the International Labor Organization Convention 138 on the minimum age of work. We have passed laws against child labor in Congress and in State legislatures. We are a strong partner in international efforts to eradicate child labor. Yet, the consumptive demand loophole—child labor, forced labor—allows those products produced in that fashion to come into the United States. We have allowed the consumptive demand loophole to stay on the books.

Since the 1990s, there have been valiant efforts by some of my colleagues

to fix this. I want to acknowledge Senator Harkin for his efforts. He has since retired, at the beginning of this year. Senator SANDERS, the junior Senator from Vermont, has been involved in this issue for a long time.

Child labor is never OK. We are talking about children being forced to work in deplorable conditions, often under extreme duress. There is never—never a justification for that. And there is no compromise on this issue. No product made with forced labor should be allowed to come into the country, period. End of discussion. It is immoral. It is imperative to fix this, and we can fix this. The Senate should not remain silent on this issue. Now is the time to shut the door on this ugly chapter of U.S. law. We do it by passing the Customs bill today.

All these provisions were added to the bill with strong bipartisan support in the Committee on Finance. It is imperative they make it to the President's desk. If we are going to continue to pursue an aggressive trade promotion agenda, we must combine it with equally strong trade enforcement language. Without enforcement, we are willfully stacking the deck for our foreign competitors and against American businesses and American workers. We see what happens when steel mills close. We see what happens when manufacturers close their doors because they can't compete with artificially cheap imports.

Trade agreements and trade law without enforcement amount to no free trade at all. They amount to lawlessness. Without proper trade enforcement, American producers who play by the rules will continue to be undersold by foreign producers who are cheating the market. We can't leave our companies and our workers with no recourse against unfair, illegal business practices. That is why the Customs bill is so important. That is why the currency provisions, the level-the-playing-field title V provision, and the ban on child labor are so very important.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor to talk a little about the customs legislation that is now before us. As my colleague from Ohio just talked about, there are some very important provisions in this legislation that help to ensure that, yes, while we are expanding exports, we are also ensuring we have a more level playing field for our workers and our farmers.

My State of Ohio is a State where we like exports. We have about 25 percent of our factory jobs there because of exports. But we want to be sure we are getting a fair shake. Working with Senator BROWN and others, we put together some great provisions that are going to be part of this customs legislation. I am hopeful we can get this passed. It is part of the Customs bill as it passed in the Committee on Finance,

but I am also hopeful it will be in whatever provision goes over to the House and also is signed by the President into law.

Growing exports, of course, is a top priority—I hope it is a top priority for everybody here in the Chamber—and therefore trade-opening agreements are a good idea because we want to knock down barriers for our farmers and our workers, who are doing everything we have asked them to do to be more competitive and yet still face unfair trade overseas. So we want to knock down those barriers. Some are tariff barriers and some are nontariff barriers.

Where we have a trade agreement, we tend to export a lot more. Only about 10 percent of the world has a trade agreement with the United States. We don't have trade agreements with Europe or Japan or with China. But in that 10 percent of the global economy, we send 47 percent of our exports. So, yes, trade agreements are important to open up markets for us.

Ninety-five percent of consumers live outside our borders, so we want to sell to them. By the way, when we don't continue to sell to them and expand that, what happens is other countries come in and take our markets, and therefore our economy becomes weaker and we lose jobs here in this country. That is what is happening right now. For the last 7 years, we haven't been able to negotiate agreements because we have not had this promotion authority to be able to knock down barriers to trade. So that is important.

But, colleagues, while we do that, we also have to be darn sure this level playing field occurs because otherwise we are not giving our workers and our farmers a fair shake. That is where we ought to be with a balanced approach—opening up more markets to our exports but also ensuring that trade is fair. There are a lot of ways to do that, and in this legislation before us we really help to keep our competitors' feet to the fire to make sure they are playing by the rules. One is with regard to trade enforcement cases. There is language in here that makes it easier for American companies to seek the relief they deserve when another country is selling products into the United States unfairly because they subsidize the product illegally or because they sell it at below their cost, which is called dumping.

There are a lot of companies in Ohio that have had the opportunity to go to the International Trade Administration to seek remedy and some help, but often they find that it is so difficult to show they are injured, by the time they get help, it is too late. So what this legislation does is it says that when we have these trade cases, we want to have the ability to actually make our case and in a timely manner get some kind of relief. Otherwise, why do we have these laws? If you can't get timely relief, sometimes you find yourself so far underwater you can't get back on your feet. That is why I am

really excited about passing this Customs bill, because if we do that, we will put in place a better way for companies to go to their government and to seek the relief their workers deserve and to get it in a timely manner so it can really help them.

I was recently in northwest Ohio meeting with steelworkers to discuss one of these cases that has to do with Chinese tires coming into the United States. These particular workers were at Cooper Tire in Findlay, OH, which, by the way, just marked 100 years in business. We want them to be in business another 100 years, but they are having a tough time because they can't compete with tires being sold at below their cost. In response to the concerns they raised with me, I sent a letter to the Secretary of Commerce and called on the administration to vigorously investigate this case and to stand up for United Steelworkers in northwest Ohio.

We now have a trade enforcement case we are working on involving the uncoated paper product made in Chillicothe, OH, at Glatfelter. Again, these are United Steelworker workers who are just asking for a fair shake. They want us to be sure that the paper being sent into the United States from other countries is being fairly traded and not illegally subsidized and not sold at below cost or dumped.

So the tire case and the paper case are two examples where the material injury standard would really matter.

This is an important time for us because in Ohio we have a lot of other cases too. In 2014, we had a couple of important trade victories. Last year, I worked with Senator BROWN to support Ohio pipe and tube workers in Cleveland and the Mahoning Valley who are manufacturing parts to support the energy renaissance taking place in our State and around the country. I visited these pipe and tube manufacturers and met with the workers.

By the way, these workers are doing a great job. Again, they have made concessions to be more competitive. The companies have put a big investment in their training and a big investment in technology, and they can compete if there is a level playing field, and they can win in the international competition.

We won two trade enforcement cases just last year, among others against China, where they were illegally underselling and subsidizing their products. These victories brought some relief for Ohio pipe and tube makers and again gave us a chance to get back on our feet.

We had another win just last month with regard to extending those tariffs to ensure we do have this more level playing field. That followed trade enforcement wins I supported for workers who manufacture hot rolled steel at ArcelorMittal in Cleveland; AK Steel in Middletown; washing machines at Whirlpool in Clyde, OH; and rebar at the Nucor plant in Marion, OH, but

also rebar made elsewhere, including Byer Steel in Cincinnati. I visited both of those plants and talked to the workers. They are working hard. They understand they have to compete. They understand it is a global marketplace. They are willing to compete, but they want to be sure it is on a level playing field, and if we do pass this legislation, it will help them in terms of getting that.

Again, I don't think it is fair for American companies to see products coming in here that are being subsidized and undersold and yet they are not able to get the relief they need. So I am hopeful we will be able to pass this legislation as part of the customs law that is going to come before the Senate. That material injury standard is what it ought to be to ensure that, although companies now have access to seek this remedy, that they can actually get the relief they need by having this relief provided more quickly and having the standard be one that can be met by American companies and workers who are being hit with these unfair trade practices.

I am pleased this effort is supported by a lot of manufacturers all around the country. Today, I met with the fasteners from Ohio. These are the folks in Ohio who makes the nuts and bolts and so on. They are interested in this case because, again, they see the ability for them to get a remedy when they need it. It is also supported by US Steel, Timken Steel, Nucor Steel, United Steelworkers, and others. Again, it is a classic example of working together to help protect workers and jobs in places such as Ohio.

By the way, I hope it will pass as part of the Customs bill, but, again, I hope it is also made part of whatever legislation goes over to the House and to the President for his signature, and that may well be the legislation that includes trade promotion authority.

I am also pleased that this Customs bill includes a measure that protects American workers and manufacturers called the ENFORCE Act. It is also part of this package of bills that is in the customs legislation. I have supported and cosponsored this bipartisan bill with Senator WYDEN since it was introduced back in 2011. I have been proud to be the lead Republican on this legislation because, just as I talked about how that bipartisan bill with Senator BROWN on the material injury standard is so important, we have to be sure that once we win a trade case, countries don't use diversion to go around whatever provisions are put in place.

Let me give an example. Sometimes a case is won against one country, but then they evade those higher tariffs by moving the production to another country, and they do it precisely because the trade case has been won. It is kind of hard to keep up with that, and that is why this legislation allows the administration to go after this issue of customs evasion. Sometimes compa-

nies are spending millions of dollars a year fighting these evasion schemes. A lot of time and effort is put into it.

It extremely concerning that these goods continue to illegally enter the country through illegal transshipment and falsified country-of-origin labeling, sometimes undervalued invoices to pay less for duties, and sometimes misclassifying goods so they can slip through our customs without being subject to tariffs.

Let me give an example of this. Workers in Ohio produce prestressed concrete steel wire strand, called PC strand. It is one of our big products in Ohio. We are proud to produce it. It is actually made from carbon wire rod that is used to compress concrete structural members to allow them to withstand very heavy loads. This would be for let's say bridges, parking garages, and certain concrete foundations.

There are 250 workers at American Spring Wire in Bedford, OH, and I visited them and talked to them. They are very interested in this provision because it helps them. Along with two other producers, they were a petitioner in a successful trade case against China a couple of years ago.

As a result of that action, both anti-dumping duties and also countervailing duties were put in place. Why? Because this product was coming in illegally subsidized and it was dumped—in other words, sold at below cost. So they went through the right process and were able to get these tariffs in place as it related to China; however, Chinese traders began to approach U.S. producers and importers with proposals even before the case ended to circumvent this so that the trade orders that would be in place with regard to China would be circumvented by sending this product through a third country, where this strand would be re-labeled and possibly repackaged to reflect a different country of origin. By doing so, these antidumping and countervailing duties would be avoided.

And once these trade orders against PC strand were entered, Malaysia did indeed become a new source—a significant new source of imports through use of this transshipment approach.

So that is what this legislation goes after. It says, look, when you do this—these kinds of schemes, the U.S. Government is required to investigate these cases, and requires Customs to make a preliminary determination when they have suspicion of this happening. This is a big step forward. Again, it is going to help companies, not just successfully go through the process and the great cost of winning one of these cases but actually having it mean something to them and their workers by ensuring companies don't evade it by going to a third country.

Another way we can support American jobs that is in this customs legislation is called the miscellaneous tariffs bill. I am pleased it includes a bipartisan bill that I coauthored. I au-

thored this bill with Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL of Missouri. I thank her, and I also thank a couple of other cosponsors who have been very helpful in getting this legislation into the Customs bill and getting it onto the floor of the Senate. That includes Senator BURR of North Carolina and Senator TOOMEY of Pennsylvania.

Senator TOOMEY has been very helpful, because under the old way, if we dealt with miscellaneous tariff bills, it was really considered an earmark because it was sort of a rifleshoot, where individual Members would take up the cause. He has been very helpful in bringing that issue to the fore and ensuring that under our legislation we are not going to have earmarks. In fact, we are going to be able to have the International Trade Commission be involved to determine what the merits of the cases are, not individual Members of Congress. That is very important to me. Senator BURR has been very helpful to kind of bring the textile interests to bear here, to ensure that as we are looking at this issue of miscellaneous tariff bills, we are ensuring that the textile industry is protected as are our other manufacturers.

The miscellaneous tariff bill is interesting. This is for extension of miscellaneous tariffs that suspend or lower tariffs on a product that is an input to a manufacturing facility in the United States, where there is no available product in the United States of America.

Right now we are paying tariffs on products coming in here where there is no competition in America. If we can, through these miscellaneous tariff bills, either reduce or eliminate these duties, it will be less costly for our manufacturers to compete around the world and less costly for our consumers. So this is a good thing for our economy. It is something we ought to be promoting, and I thank our leadership for getting this into the customs legislation. Let's deal with this MTB issue.

By the way, the old legislation expired back in January of 2013—January of 2013. Since that time, American manufacturers and consumers have been paying a much higher import duty, which is essentially higher taxes, than they should have to pay. That means they can't put money into raising wages, increasing benefits for American workers, and maintaining our competitiveness.

There is a recent study out showing the failure to pass this MTB legislation has resulted in a tax hike on U.S. manufacturers of \$748 million—an economic loss of \$1.8 billion over the past several years.

This legislation is backed by the National Association of Manufacturers, along with 185 associations and companies that urge us to quickly act on this, including 8 of those companies and associations in my home State of Ohio. So this is a reform bill that immediately restarts this MTB process

later this year, resolves these earmark concerns that we had previously, and allows us to preserve Congress's traditional and constitutional role in trade policy. It is the right balance. I am excited it is in this Customs bill, along with the other provisions I talked about.

Next week, I plan to talk more about another issue. It is not in the customs legislation, but it will be in the legislation debate regarding trade promotion authority.

We talked earlier about the importance of expanding exports through trade promotion authority but also ensuring we had this level playing field. Part of the level playing field is ensuring that countries do not manipulate their currency, which takes away so many of the benefits of a trade agreement. Chairman Volcker of the Fed has said something I think that is interesting in this regard. He has said that in five minutes, exchange rates can wipe out what it took trade negotiators ten years to accomplish.

We will talk more about this next week as we talk about trade promotion authority, because I do intend to offer an amendment that is targeted, that is not going to be a poison pill in any respect because I think it will actually help us get more votes for trade, which is an important thing, and it is also something that, frankly, does not affect the TPP countries immediately because none of them are violating the provisions of the IMF—International Monetary Fund—which is what we use for our definition of currency manipulation, but they have in the past, and we don't want them to in the future. We don't want them to take away the very benefits that American workers and farmers get from these trade agreements.

I appreciate the time today to talk about this customs legislation. I am excited to have it on the floor tomorrow and have the chance to vote on all these very important enforcement provisions, to ensure that our workers and our farmers are getting a fair shake.

Then, next week, I hope we will have the opportunity to take up trade promotion authority and move that forward, again, in a way to ensure that we are lowering these barriers overseas for our farmers, our workers, our service providers, so we can access those 95 percent of consumers who are outside of our borders and send more stuff stamped "Made in America" all around the world, adding jobs in Ohio and America.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in 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.

TRADE PROMOTION AUTHORITY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, yesterday, I voted in opposition to cloture on fast-track trade promotion authority.

This was a difficult vote for me. Maryland is pulled in two directions on this issue. On one side Maryland's agricultural industries, such as poultry on the Eastern Shore and the Port of Baltimore, where they believe this trade deal will bring economic benefits for the State. On the other side, I have constituents in Dundalk who don't have a steel industry anymore and wonder why Congress didn't do more to protect them from the effects of trade.

Let me be very clear on one point. I support trade. I encourage trade. Trade is very important to my State. Maryland workers can compete successfully in a global marketplace if they are given a level playing field. That is why I support expansion of fair trade.

In the past, I have supported bilateral trade agreements. We have leverage in those situations and can get strong, enforceable labor and environmental provisions into those agreements to improve living standards and stop child labor in sweatshops. But I have always been suspicious of multilateral agreements like NAFTA. I have seen too many of these big deals fail to deliver the promises of new jobs and businesses.

Why is the role of Congress so important? To make sure the American people get a good deal. I am ready to support trade agreements that are good for America, agreements that are good for workers and good for the environment. Congress should consider trade legislation and amendments using the same procedures we use to consider other legislation.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to ensure fair competition. That means workers in other countries should have the right to organize into unions. Without the strength of collective bargaining, their wages will always be below ours. They should also have worker safety protection and retirement and health care benefits.

We should use the leverage of our trade agreements to encourage countries to respect the basic human rights of their citizens. Everyone deserves the right to live in a healthy, clean, unpolluted environment, and every worker should be guaranteed their fundamental rights at work.

When considering trade deals, I also have to consider the impact on my State of Maryland. I am a blue-collar Senator. My heart and soul lies with blue-collar America. I spent most of my life in a blue-collar neighborhood. My mother and father owned a neighborhood grocery store. When Bethlehem Steel went on strike, my dad gave those workers credit. My career and public service is one of deep commitment to working-class people. In the last decade, working people have faced the loss of jobs, lower wages, a

reduced standard of living, and a shrinking manufacturing base.

I believe that a renewal of fast-track negotiating authority means more Americans will lose their jobs in the name of free trade. More people will get TAA benefits, but more people will need them.

Proponents of fast-track say it is inevitable that there will be winners and losers. The problem is America's workers and their families always seem to be the losers. They lose their jobs. If they keep their jobs or find new jobs, they lose the wage rates they have earned. I have said before that I don't want to put American jobs on a fast-track to Mexico or a slow boat to China.

I had to base my decision on the facts and what I know to be true in my State. I have to be with my constituents who have felt repeatedly betrayed by the trade deals. I voted to stand up for American workers and consumers. I voted to stand up for the right and responsibility of Congress to fully consider trade agreements. That is why I voted against cloture on fast-track.

HONORING DEPUTY SHERIFF JOE DUNN

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I wish 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 thank Deputy Dunn for his service to our Nation and his 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, and they had two children Joey and Shiloh, who were the center of his universe.

Deputy Dunn's deep commitment to Jesus and 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 eight mile stretch of Interstate 15 outside of Great Falls, MT 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.