

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

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

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

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

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

lowed me to make a few comments at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

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

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

known as both a drug expert and a tactical expert.

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

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

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

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

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

THE CREED OF AN ALASKA STATE TROOPER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

third is horses for export by sea intended for slaughter.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I continue with his quote.

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

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

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

He says:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

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

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

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

REMEMBERING RACHEL JACOBS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

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

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

NIH-SUPPORTED RESEARCH AND ALZHEIMER'S DISEASE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

milestones the scientific community has established.

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

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

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

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENE GIETZEN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GERALD "JERRY" DECKER

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

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

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

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

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

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

NORMAN EMINETH

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

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

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

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

LAWRENCE ESSER, JR.

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

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

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

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

JOSEPH "JOE" FISCHER

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

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

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

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

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

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

WENDELL KELLER

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STANLEY OTTMAR

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

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

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

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

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

JOHN RENNER

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

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

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

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

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

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

VIRGIL GREANY

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

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

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

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

ROBERT "BOB" SIME

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

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

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

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

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

THOMAS "TOM" SPITZER

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

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

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

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

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

DONALD "DONNY" VOLLMER

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

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

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

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

ROBERT BROTHEN

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

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

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

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

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

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

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The minority leader.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

ENSURING TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS THE RIGHT TO APPEAL ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

AMENDMENT NO. 1221

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1221.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH] proposes an amendment numbered 1221.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of May 12, 2015, under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1243 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 1243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. FLAKE, proposes an amendment numbered 1243 to amendment No. 1221.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To strike the extension of the trade adjustment assistance program)

Strike title II.

AMENDMENT NO. 1237 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I call up the Lankford amendment No. 1237.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Utah [Mr. HATCH], for Mr. LANKFORD, proposes an amendment numbered 1237 to amendment No. 1221.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To establish consideration of the conditions relating to religious freedom of parties to trade negotiations as an overall negotiating objective of the United States) At the end of section 2(a), add the following:

(13) to take into account conditions relating to religious freedom of any party to negotiations for a trade agreement with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 1242 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I call up Brown amendment No. 1242.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] proposes an amendment numbered 1242 to amendment No. 1221.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To restore funding for the trade adjustment assistance program to the level established by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011)

On page 118, strike lines 19 through 23, and insert the following:

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking "shall not exceed" and all that follows and inserting "shall not exceed \$575,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021."

(2) OFFSET.—

(A) CLARIFICATION OF 6-YEAR STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN CASE OF OVERSTATEMENT OF BASIS.—Subparagraph (B) of Section 6501(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(i) by striking "and" at the end of clause (i), by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clause:

"(ii) An understatement of gross income by reason of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis is an omission from gross income;" and

(ii) by inserting "(other than in the case of an overstatement of unrecovered cost or other basis)" in clause (iii) (as so redesignated) after "In determining the amount omitted from gross income"; and

(iii) by inserting "AMOUNT OMITTED FROM" after "DETERMINATION OF" in the heading thereof.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraph (A) shall apply to—

(i) returns filed after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) returns filed on or before such date if the period specified in section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (determined without regard to such amendments for assessment of the taxes with respect to which such return relates has not expired as of such date).

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, if the chairman of the Committee on Finance and Senator WYDEN will indulge me, I would like 2 or 3 minutes to explain the amendment and the importance of it.