



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

No. 128

Senate

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our King, we praise You for providing for our needs. Great is Your faithfulness.

Abide with our lawmakers, enabling them to discover the unshakeable even as they labor during shaken times. In this perishable world, show them what is truly secure and constant. Lord, keep them humble, tolerant, and open-minded, always aware of their limited, fallible knowledge. Remind them that the anvil of Your everlasting truth will wear out the many hammers of skepticism, cynicism, and despair.

Lord, thank You for being the same yesterday, today, and forever.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will begin consideration of the resolution to disapprove the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United King-

dom, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the United States. This resolution seeks to constrain Iran's nuclear weapons program. I will ask all Senators to be present in the Chamber beginning tomorrow afternoon to commence debate on this important issue.

Let me extend my appreciation for the time and research many of our colleagues have given to understanding the details, the strengths, and the weaknesses of this agreement. For many, this has been a very difficult decision. For some, it was made even more difficult by assertions from the administration that the only choice was between this agreement and war. Of course, that was never, never true. All such political statements really say is that the administration lacks the will and the leadership to pursue a stronger agreement, additional sanctions, and policies intended to end Iran's enrichment program if it cannot attain congressional agreement on the President's deal with Iran.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act passed the Senate by a vote of 98 to 1 earlier this year. It provided each of us with the opportunity to truly represent our constituents on this important issue. I expect that every Senator who voted for that measure is now entitled to an up-or-down vote—not a filibuster or artificial limits on passage but an important vote—on this resolution.

Along with the Americans we were sent here to represent, countries, businesses, and proliferation networks seeking to expand ties with Iran stand to have a simple question answered. All of the people involved in this around the world deserve to have a simple question answered: Does the Senate disapprove of this deal with Iran? Does the Senate disapprove of this deal with Iran? The Senate should not hide behind procedural obfuscation to shield the President or our individual views.

This debate should not be about a President who will leave office in 16

months; it should be about where our country will be in 16 years.

The Democratic leader said that his party strove to preserve the Corker-Cardin bill and that it was incumbent on Congress to review this agreement with the thoughtful, level-headed process this agreement deserves. I agree that is exactly what is needed right now. I know that is exactly what nearly every Senator in this body voted for. And I call on every Senator to resist attempts to obstruct a final vote and deny the American people and Congress the say they deserve on this extremely important matter.

The facts have already led many of our Democratic colleagues—including the top Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House, as well as the likely next leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate—to come out in opposition to this agreement. Certainly those were not easy decisions for them. But these Democrats are joined in their skepticism by Americans of every political persuasion who believe this deal will make our country less safe—less safe.

Even those lawmakers who have come out in favor of the President's agreement use terms such as “deeply flawed” to describe it. Let's remember why that is. The American people were led to believe that negotiations with Iran would be about ending its nuclear program, but that is not what the deal before us would do. We know the President's deal with Iran will not end its nuclear program but will instead leave Iran with a threshold nuclear capability recognized as legitimate by the international community—quite the opposite of the original goal. We know the President's deal with Iran will leave it with thousands of centrifuges, an advanced research and development program, and access to billions of dollars, at least some of which the President himself has acknowledged will be used to support terrorism. We know

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6437

the President's deal with Iran will allow it to further ballistic missile research and strengthen its economy. In short, by almost any measure, we know Iran will emerge stronger from this deal in nearly every aspect of its national power and better positioned to expand its sphere of influence.

The Iranian nuclear program was never intended to produce nuclear energy for peaceful civilian purposes. That was never what they had in mind. Certainly Iran does not need an underground enrichment facility for those purposes or long-range ballistic missiles. Iran has employed every aspect of national power to defend the regime and the Islamic revolution to include support for terrorism, unconventional warfare, public diplomacy, cyber warfare, suppression of internal dissent, and, of course, support for proxies and terrorist groups.

We already know Iran is undertaking many activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device. As the International Atomic Energy Agency revealed in a November 2011 report, it has attempted to, No. 1, procure nuclear-related equipment and materials through individuals and entities related to the military; No. 2, develop pathways for the production of nuclear material; No. 3, acquire nuclear weapons development information and documentation from a clandestine nuclear supply network; and No. 4, develop an indigenous design of a nuclear weapon, as well as test components. All of that has been done, according to the IAEA.

Moreover, as Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George Shultz recently observed:

The final stages of the nuclear talks have coincided with Iran's intensified efforts to expand and entrench its power in neighboring states.

They warned:

Iranian or Iranian client forces are now the pre-eminent military or political element in multiple Arab countries. Unless political restraint is linked to nuclear restraint, an agreement freeing Iran from sanctions risks empowering Iran's hegemonic efforts.

I will have more to say later in the week concerning my opposition to this agreement, and I expect every Senator will wish to explain his or her respective vote. But I would ask every Senator to keep this in mind as well: The President has said that "no deal is better than a bad deal." And while he will be out of office in a few months, the rest of the country and the world will have to deal with the predictable consequences of the President's deal for far longer than the next year and a half.

If lawmakers determine that this deal is indeed a bad one, then they have a duty to vote that way. We can work together to prepare suitable sanctions legislation and other measures required to maintain our capabilities to deal with the threat from Iran, but no matter what, we should conduct a respectful and serious debate that is

consistent with the serious ramifications of this agreement.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING EVERYONE BACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I am very happy to welcome everyone back from our long recess. I am sure everyone worked as hard as I did. I had a week off, and I enjoyed it very much.

I also think it is important to recognize the new class of pages we have. I am always very happy to see these bright young men and women here who will devote the rest of the semester to us. They do so much and get so little recognition for it, so I appreciate all they do for us.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I gave a speech this morning at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and it is, I think, directly how I feel about this. I am glad it got some coverage this morning.

I ask unanimous consent that the full remarks of the speech I made this morning at 10 o'clock be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR HARRY REID: REMARKS ON IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

When the Senate is gavelled into session a few hours from now, a debate that has ignited passions from Tehran to Tel Aviv, from Beijing to Berlin, and from coast to coast across the United States will take center stage in the world's greatest deliberative body.

The question at hand is no small matter: Is the agreement between Iran and the international community, led by the United States, the best pathway to peace and security for America, Israel and our partners and interests?

I believe the answer is yes. And today I am gratified to say to my fellow Americans, our negotiating partners, and our allies around the world: this agreement will stand. America will uphold its commitment and we will seize this opportunity to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

While the formal debate begins this afternoon, the private negotiations that brought us to this point have been going on for years—and the public's review of the agreement has gone on for months.

During that long period, President Obama and Secretary Kerry were clear in their goals: above all, that the United States will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon.

The United States also would not sign any agreement that takes Iran at its word or relies on trust Iran has not earned.

And at the most difficult crossroads of this time-consuming and technical negotiation, President Obama and Secretary Kerry made clear that the hard choices belonged to Iran.

Now it's our turn. Now the United States has a choice to make: We can enforce an

agreement that forces Iran to walk away from any nuclear-weapons program, or we can walk away from that agreement and assume responsibility for the consequences.

We can take the strongest step ever toward blocking Iran from getting a nuclear bomb, or we can block this agreement and all but ensure Iran will have the fissile material it would need to make a bomb in a matter of months. But we cannot have it both ways.

Make no mistake: blocking the bomb and blocking this agreement are two distinct choices that lead to very different futures.

I've spent a lot of time talking, listening, and thinking about the various elements of this agreement, and so have my colleagues. I've heard from nuclear scientists, the intelligence community and our military leaders.

I've listened to diplomats and experts.

I've been briefed by Secretary Kerry and Undersecretary Sherman, by Secretaries Lew and Moniz—the brilliant nuclear physicist who knows more than almost anyone of the reality of this threat, the science behind the agreement and the agreement itself.

I've heard ardent supporters and passionate opponents. I've talked with Nevadans from all walks of life. I've spoken with Israel's leaders, including Prime Minister Netanyahu and Ambassador Dermer. And I've read the text of this agreement carefully.

In all my years, I cannot think of another debate with so much expertise, passions and good faith on both sides.

It is clear to me and to the overwhelming majority of my caucus that this agreement gives us the best chance to avoid one of the worst threats in today's world—a nuclear-armed Iran. In fact, I believe this agreement is not just our best chance to avert what we fear most—I fear it is our last best chance to do so.

Before I explain why, let me first acknowledge some of the people who helped us get to this historic moment.

I mentioned President Obama and his Cabinet Secretaries, who achieved a remarkable diplomatic breakthrough.

I also want to acknowledge my colleagues, led by Senator Menendez, who helped set the stage for those negotiations by rallying the Senate and the world behind sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

I also acknowledge Senators Cardin and Corker for their leadership. The legislation they wrote created the process to review the agreement in the Congress.

I support this agreement—and the United States Senate will support President Obama's veto of any effort to undermine it—for two simple reasons:

First, this agreement will do a tremendous amount of good.

And second, blocking this agreement would lead to a tremendous amount of bad outcomes.

The bottom line is that enforcing this agreement can prevent the things we most dread—but undermining it would permit those very same dreadful consequences.

And those consequences are, in fact, unacceptable.

We all recognize the threat Iran poses to Israel, with powerful weapons and hateful words, with anti-Semitic smears and pledges of the Jewish state's destruction. No one can underestimate this menace. And no one should dismiss how much more dangerous Iran would be in this regard if it were armed with a nuclear bomb.

We also recognize the threat of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—the threat from Iran's support for Hezbollah and Assad—of Iran's brazen human rights violations toward its own people and the Americans it holds as political prisoners and those who have disappeared. We recognize the danger Iran poses

to our allies, our interests, and our own troops and diplomats serving in the Middle East.

No one is blind to the threat Iran poses. But again, no one should forget that Iran would become a threat of an entirely different magnitude if it ever were to have a nuclear weapon. I cannot think of a single challenge in the region that wouldn't get worse in that nightmare scenario.

That is why our goal, first and foremost, must be to keep Iran from getting its hands on one.

We have no illusions about the Iranian regime—which is exactly why when we are presented with the best way to stop its nuclear ambitions, we must not let that chance slip through our fingers. We must support and enforce the agreement we have reached.

The agreement that Congress now assumes the responsibility to review does a better job than any other proposal of reducing Iran's chance to get a bomb.

When our negotiators came to the table, they did so with Andrew Carnegie's advice in mind. The man who gave his name and fortune to this institution once said that "our duty is with what is practicable now—with the next step possible in our day and generation."

In our day, we know it is not practical to bomb away knowledge of how to build a nuclear weapon or erase that knowledge with sanctions. So our negotiators said, even though we cannot take away the recipe to build a bomb, we can take away both the ingredients and the use of equipment to cook one. That's what we're doing—but only if the United States upholds and enforces this agreement.

The good news is this agreement does more than take away Iran's ability to build a bomb—it gives us the ability to watch its every move.

Through strict limits and intrusive inspections, this agreement takes away Iran's highly enriched material, and takes away Iran's ability to make more of it.

This agreement takes away Iran's ability to build any facilities or fissile material secretly and with impunity.

The agreement Iran signed forbids it from pursuing, building, or having a nuclear weapon ever. There is no expiration date on that commitment—and it is not grounded in any way in trust.

This isn't a peace treaty with Iran or a gift out of the goodness of our hearts. If we trusted Iran, we wouldn't need the video cameras and inspectors and seals and all manner of technology to make sure Iran complies.

We're not asking Iran to promise us anything and taking it at its word—we are demanding Iran prove to us it is complying with every last letter of this agreement.

Before it gets sanctions relief, Iran has to take specific actions. And if it doesn't happen, as some fear, sanctions will be imposed on Iran.

We have done everything possible to make sure that if Iran cheats, we'll know, we'll know quickly, and we'll act immediately and with the international community behind us.

That makes us safer. That makes Israel safer. That makes the world safer. That's what nuclear experts around the world know, what diplomats know, and what the overwhelming majority of my caucus knows. That is why this agreement will stand.

And to make sure this agreement succeeds, Congress must provide the oversight to ensure monitoring and enforce verification. At the same time, Congress must continue to hold the line against Iranian arms trafficking, its funding of terrorism, and demanding the return of Americans who have been taken as political prisoners and those who disappeared—priorities that were never

meant to be part of this negotiation but must never be forgotten.

This agreement offers a number of different ways to cut off Iran's pathways to a bomb. There is, on the other hand, one sure-fire way to open Iran's path to destruction—and that is to reject this agreement.

As I mentioned, the second reason I support this agreement is because of what happens if we walk away from it. That would leave Iran with no limitations on any nuclear weapons program and leave the United States with no leverage to do anything about it.

If we walk away from the agreement we helped secure, think about what happens the very next day: Iran gets to keep as many centrifuges as it wants, and build as many more as it would like. Iran gets to build its stockpile of the kind of uranium and plutonium you'd need to build a bomb. Iran gets to test more advanced technologies that bring it closer to a bomb—and to do so as quickly as it wants. And when those weapons are ready, Iran gets to point them at Israel—or worse, launch them and make good on its threat to wipe Israel off the map.

Iran also gets to kick out the inspectors and hide all of this from the world.

Forget worries about 15 years or 20 years from now. All of this is what would happen tomorrow.

If we walk away from this agreement, the international sanctions regime also falls apart, meaning the tool Congress imposed to bring Iran to the table disappears from our arsenal.

Sanctions don't work if it's our idea alone—the world has to be on the same page. Here's why: America doesn't do business with Iran. We haven't for decades. But other countries made their own economic sacrifices in the name of pressuring Iran—and now they want to buy Iran's oil and trade with it.

So as much as we'd like for the sanctions that brought Iran to the table to also bring Iran to its knees, it's only with international cooperation that sanctions actually do anything. Like it or not, we need our partners in this effort. And our partners have told us in no uncertain terms that if the United States walks away, we'll walk away alone.

Sanctions have isolated Iran and brought us to this moment. But if we squander it and turn our backs on our international partners, it is we—the United States—who will be isolated. And worse, we would surrender our leverage to negotiate in the future.

Put it all together, and what does it mean if America blocks this agreement instead of blocking Iran's pathways to a bomb? It means Iran gets more money and more impunity to develop a nuclear weapon. It means we get far less scrutiny and far less security. It means we'll have put ourselves at a disadvantage at the very moment we let Iran become more dangerous.

Of course we still have the military option. President Obama has been crystal clear about that. But military strikes cannot solve this problem nearly as effectively as the solution before us today. Clearly, a military option could also come with significant costs and risks for both Israel and the United States. After all, that's why diplomacy is our first resort and the military option is our last.

This is why I believe blocking the agreement would actually achieve the opposite of what opponents intend. Instead of being tougher on Iran, voting against this agreement is a vote against a smart international sanctions regime, against inspections, against any international requirement that Iran backs off its nuclear program in any way. Blocking this agreement pushes the Iranians closer to a bomb rather than pushing it farther away.

General Brent Scowcroft's national-security expertise served four Republican presidents. As he said, we would be sowing further turmoil in the Middle East rather than seizing a chance and a responsibility to stabilize it. That would be a tragedy of our own making—one we cannot allow.

I respect greatly the concerns I've heard about what this agreement means for Israel. I believe this agreement makes Israel safer, and in no small part that is why I support it.

Over my decades in the Senate, my support for the safety and security of the Israeli people has been at the core of my views on the Middle East and the national security of the United States. From the Bonds for Israel dinners I attended 50 years ago, to the history of my own wife's family, my support for the State of Israel and the Jewish people has been personal and unimpeachable. And I have not been afraid to disagree with the President of the United States when it comes to Israel, whether on settlements or when the Administration opposed Congress passing specific sanctions.

We must build on our firm commitment to make sure Israel can defend itself. It will take more money and military support, but we must provide the one true democracy in the region and the one and only Jewish state in the world with the resources it needs.

The United States must also maintain its staunch support of Israel, including by using our veto in the United Nations for resolutions that isolate Israel unfairly or make it less secure.

I have read closely the letter that Secretary Kerry sent to the Senate on September 2. That letter lays out a number of important steps that the United States would take to support Israel's security.

One of those steps is protecting Israel's Qualitative Military Edge. Another is negotiating a new ten-year Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance. And yet another step is continuing to work with Israel on joint efforts to deal with shared threats, as well as confronting both conventional and asymmetric threats.

I've also closely reviewed the legislation that Senator Cardin is proposing, which will provide additional security assistance and assurances to Israel.

After looking at the letter and the legislation, I plan work with the White House and with both Democrats and Republicans to guarantee that the United States is doing everything possible to protect the safety and security of Israel.

And as the Administration has promised, we'll continue funding the missile-defense system that has already saved so many Israeli civilian lives. We'll also grow our strategic relationship even stronger, collaborating to detect and destroy tunnels used to terrorize Israeli civilians.

Now, after all the good this agreement will do in blocking Iran's pathways to a bomb—after all the dangers rejecting it will do by letting Iran grow more dangerous while our clout and credibility slip down the drain—after all the assurances that our commitment to Israel's security is stronger than ever—after all that, some still say they want a better deal.

But there is no such thing. There is no more plausible alternative. There is no better deal.

Opponents of this agreement, who I respect, talk often about how very real the Iranian threat is to Israel and the region—and it absolutely is. But for all the talk about what is real, the idea that we can somehow get a better deal is imaginary.

Diplomats, scientists and our international counterparts tell us it is fantasy. The agreement before us is the result of many years of hard work. We live in the real world—and in

the real world, this really is the best option to keep Iran from a nuclear bomb.

Let me say a brief word about the details of getting this done.

The Senate, of course, has an important oversight role to play. When we voted nearly unanimously for the Iran Review Act, we voted to give the Senate that role. We voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. It is absurd to argue—as some are doing now—that by voting for a process with three possible and very different outcomes, senators somehow obligated themselves to vote to advance a specific outcome. They did no such thing.

I hope we can avoid the usual and unnecessary procedural hurdles. Democrats have already agreed to forgo our opportunity to filibuster, and I've offered Leader McConnell the chance to go straight to a vote on passage of the resolution. But of course, as he has noted many times in the past, everything of importance in the Senate requires 60 votes. So passage will require 60 votes.

There is no precedent in recent history for an issue of this magnitude getting consideration in the Senate without having to secure 60 votes. This is not about how any one leader manages the floor—this is a precedent stretching back decades.

Finally, of all the many important things at stake here, American leadership is one of them.

After convening our international partners in common cause, rallying the world behind tough sanctions, after negotiating and negotiating and negotiating some more—the way America acts now will inform the way we are viewed on the world stage and the credibility with which we can negotiate in the future.

If America reneges on this agreement, we will lose more than the compliance of our adversary—we will lose the confidence of our allies.

America led the negotiations to stop any Iranian nuclear program, and now it is time for Congress to reaffirm America's leadership by supporting this agreement. We cannot and will not allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon. Neither the United States, nor Israel, our Gulf partners, a volatile Middle East, or anyone in the world can risk that danger. I believe it is our responsibility to avoid that threat.

Let's heed Andrew Carnegie's reminder of our duty to respect what is practical and to respond with pragmatic solutions—solutions like the one before us. As he said, "When a statesman has in his keeping the position and interests of his country, it is not with things as they are to be in the future, but with things as they are in the present."

The agreement on the table at present is a good one.

It is our best chance to ensure Iran never builds the worst weapon on earth. I will do everything in my power to make sure it is enforced and effective—to make sure, in turn, we are safer and more secure—in our day and generation, and in the days and generations to come.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I note that there are a lot of things in this speech that I think are important, but the one thing certainly that is so vitally important is that no one has come up with an alternative. Any alternative is imaginary. It is fantasy land. I speak about that in my remarks.

Today we face one of the most critical national security issues of our time: whether to support the Iran agreement which would stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. That is what the agreement is—to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

From the beginning, Senate Democrats have done everything possible to move the debate on the Iran agreement forward in the quickest way possible. We agreed to skip procedural votes and allow the Senate to begin debate on the resolution itself. And today I am proposing that the Senate move forward in the most efficient way possible. I am proposing that after the Senate concludes 3 days of serious debate on this issue, we then move to a vote on passage of the resolution, of course with a 60-vote threshold. But Republicans are insisting that the Senate go through all procedural steps, including cloture, on their own bill.

As the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has stated numerous times—not a few times, not many times, but numerous times—requiring 60 votes on matters of enormous importance is simply "the way the Senate operates."

Here are a few examples of the statements he has made. I could spend literally all afternoon talking about quotes that are very similar to what I am about to recite. July 30, 2011, Senator MCCONNELL:

Now, look, we know that on controversial matters in the Senate, it has for quite some time required 60 votes. So I would say again to my friend—

That is me—

it is pretty hard to make a credible case that denying a vote on your own proposal is anything other than a filibuster.

Listen, everybody, that is what Senator MCCONNELL said. Again, just a few days later:

I wish to make clear to the American people Senate Republicans are ready to vote on cloture on the Reid proposal in 30 minutes, in an hour, as soon as we can get our colleagues over to the floor. We are ready to vote. By requiring 60 votes, particularly on a matter of this enormous importance, is not at all unusual. It is the way the Senate operates.

Again he came back a few months later:

Mr. President, I can only quote my good friend the majority leader who repeatedly has said, most recently in 2007, that in the Senate it has always been the case we need 60 votes. This is my good friend the majority leader when he was the leader of this majority in March of 2007, and he said it repeatedly both when he was in the minority as leader of the minority or leader of the majority, that it requires 60 votes certainly on measures that are controversial.

He also said a short time later:

So who gets to decide who is wasting time around here? None of us. None of us have that authority to decide who is wasting time. But the way you make things happen is you get 60 votes at some point, and you move a matter to conclusion, and the best way to do that is to have an open amendment process. That is the way this place used to operate.

So says Senator MCCONNELL.

A few months later:

Madam President, reserving the right to object, what we are talking about is a perpetual debt ceiling grant, in effect, to the President. Matters of this level of controversy always require 60 votes. So I would ask my friend—

That is me—

if he would modify his consent request to set the threshold for this vote at 60?

We could fill in month by month, but let's go to August 6 of this year, just a short time ago:

Well, as we all know, it takes 60 votes to do everything except the budget process. We anticipate having a vote to proceed to the 20-week Pain-Capable bill sometime before the end of the year as well.

Recently, the Republican leader told his own Senators and conservative news outlets that any attempts to defund Planned Parenthood or repeal ObamaCare would need at least 60 votes. So why is the Iran agreement any different? It isn't.

Even more perplexing is that some would argue that because the Senate passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, all Senators would then be obligated to vote for any cloture vote. Voting for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was a vote to review the agreement, not a commitment to vote either for or against it. Voting for the Iran review act did not commit any Senator to take a particular position on the Iran agreement. Voting for the Iran review act was simply a vote to review the Iran agreement, and that is what we have done. It was a vote for three possible outcomes: a resolution of approval, a resolution of disapproval, or no action at all. It did not and does not obligate Senators to advance any one result. The Iran review act clearly included a 60-vote threshold for either a resolution of approval or disapproval. That is it. Every Senator knew that. For any Senator to suggest otherwise is absurd and factually wrong. Incorrect.

No Senator who voted for the Iran review act voted to give up the 60-vote threshold. In fact, everyone who voted for it actually voted for the 60-vote threshold. In fact, one Republican Member, the junior Senator from Arkansas, said the reason he didn't vote for it is because it required a 60-vote threshold.

If, however, we are forced to have a vote on cloture, it will be because the Republican leader has rejected Democrats' reasonable and responsible proposal.

There is not on either side of this aisle a more respected U.S. Senator than the Senator from Virginia, TIM Kaine. He was coauthor of the Iran nuclear agreement, referred to properly as the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. He said this morning:

I was the co-author of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act under which Congress is considering the international agreement to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The bipartisan bill—to give Congress a deliberate and constructive review of the final nuclear agreement with Iran—was drafted so that 60 votes would be required in the Senate to pass either a motion of approval or a motion of disapproval.

Let me read this again. One of the people who helped write this bill, a respected Member of this body, said:

I was the co-author of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act under which Congress

is considering the international agreement to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The bipartisan bill—to give Congress a deliberate and constructive review of the final nuclear agreement with Iran—was drafted so that 60 votes would be required in the Senate to pass either a motion of approval or a motion of disapproval.

He continued:

We should follow the procedure that was explicitly discussed and agreed to when we voted on this act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1.

That is a direct quote from one of the authors of this legislation.

It was never any Senator's intention to forgo the 60-vote threshold.

Republicans are trying to pull a bait-and-switch that is born out of desperation. They haven't had a good August; let's face it.

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with Democrats to keep our government open and funded? There wasn't a day that went by during the recess that we didn't have some Republican Senator talk about closing the government. Every time that happened, the Republican leader would say: Well, we are not going to do that. So there is a lot of talk among Republican circles about the Republicans doing everything they can to force votes on things that have nothing to do with funding this government long term. So are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with Democrats to keep our government open and funded? Do they want to wait until the last minute to jam us with something?

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with us on a bipartisan cyber security bill? Every day that goes by without legislation in this body is a day that bad guys are doing bad things to our businesses and to our country—stealing our names and addresses, trade secrets, everything they can, is what they are doing.

Perhaps Republicans are stalling on this critical legislation so they don't have to address our distressed infrastructure, insolvent highway system, crumbling roads and bridges?

I hope that instead of forcing the Senate to jump through unnecessary procedural hurdles, the Republicans will join with the Senate Democrats and agree to vote on final passage.

It takes a lot of nerve for the Republican leader, after the numerous speeches he has given about the 60-vote threshold on everything important—is he suggesting this Iran agreement is not important?

Let's hope that instead of forcing the Senate to jump through unnecessary procedural hurdles—in fact, the Republicans are filibustering their own resolution. I hope they will join with Senate Democrats and agree to vote on final passage.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a substitute amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2640.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. 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:

Strike line three and all that follows and insert:

That Congress does not favor the agreement transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, under subsection (a) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e) for purposes of prohibiting the taking of any action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to such agreement under subsection (c)(2)(B) of such section.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2641 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2641 to amendment No. 2640.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.
“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2642 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2641

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2642 to amendment No. 2641.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2643

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2643 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2644 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2643

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2644 to amendment No. 2643.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2645

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a motion to commit with instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit the joint resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2645.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2646

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2646 to the instructions (amendment No. 2645) of the motion to commit H.J. Res. 61.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2647 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2646

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2647 to amendment No. 2646.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "6" and insert "7".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments, with the exception of the McConnell substitute amendment, be withdrawn; that no other amendments, points of order, or motions be in order to the joint resolution or the McConnell substitute prior to the vote on the McConnell substitute; that at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 10, the Senate proceed to vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; further, that if the McConnell amendment is agreed to, H.J. Res. 61, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the time today until 5 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that following leader remarks on Wednesday, September 9, until 6 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Thursday, September 10, until 5:30 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. President, that is my unanimous consent request.

Let me say a brief word, and I will turn it over to my friend the Republican leader.

If the Republicans want more debate time, they can have it, but I think 3 days would be adequate. There is a definite time for doing this, and I think that is important.

If anyone thinks this is not a serious issue, I don't know what could be a serious issue. Based upon the underlying foundation that has been laid by my friend for these many years, this is going to require a 60-vote threshold. Everyone knows that. This goes back long before this dialogue started today on the floor. It has been going on for some time, as my friend the assistant Democratic leader, when he has an opportunity to address the Senate, will discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 be agreed to, the joint resolution, as

amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I also want to propound the following request. I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61, the amendment be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time, and there be 4 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for all the reasons I have mentioned previously and the fact that I believe the Republican leader is way ahead of himself, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this has been one of the most extraordinary measures that has come before the Senate in the time that I have served here. It is rare to have an issue of this historic moment, of this importance, one that literally raises a question about war and peace in the Middle East, and one that has been considered so carefully by both sides of the aisle for such a long period of time.

When I left for the August recess, here in the Senate most of the Members on my side of the aisle—the Democratic side—were still processing and reviewing the proposed agreement. And, over the course of August, these Members announced their public positions on the matter.

As of today, there are 41 of the 46 Democratic Senators who have announced they will support the Iran agreement. There are another four who are opposed to it, and one who is yet to announce her position. We expect that to happen shortly.

This is a unique matter. I asked my staff and others to research one particular aspect of this debate. The aspect I asked them to research was a letter sent on March 9 of this year by 47 Republican Senators. Forty-seven Republican Senators sent a letter to the leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Ayatollah.

To take you back in history, at that point in time when 47 Republican Senators sent that letter, the United States of America was in negotiation with Iran to see whether or not we could come to any kind of an agreement or understanding when it came to limit Iran's development of a nuclear weapon, something that I am sure all of us—both political parties—want to stop from happening. But in the midst of this delicate negotiation that was going on in Switzerland, 47 Republican Senators, including every Member of

the Senate Republican leadership, sent a letter to the Ayatollah in Iran. It said:

It has come to our attention while observing your nuclear negotiations with our government that you may not fully understand our constitutional system. Thus, we are writing to bring to your attention two features of our Constitution—the power to make binding international agreements and the different character of federal offices—which you should seriously consider as negotiations progress.

Forty-seven Republican Senators wrote to the Ayatollah in the midst of these delicate negotiations. It went on to say:

First, under our Constitution, while the president negotiates international agreements, Congress plays the significant role of ratifying them. In the case of a treaty, the Senate must ratify it by a two-thirds vote. A so-called congressional executive agreement requires a majority vote in both the House and the Senate (which, because of procedural rules, effectively means a three-fifths vote in the Senate).

Forty-seven Republican Senators are advising the Ayatollah in Iran, in March, that he should know more about our constitutional form of government and understand that it will take Senate approval, which they say effectively means a three-fifths vote. They continue:

Anything not approved by Congress is a mere executive agreement.

Second, [the 47 Republican Senators advised the Ayatollah] the offices of our Constitution have different characteristics. For example, the president may serve only two 4-year terms, whereas senators may serve an unlimited number of 6-year terms. As applied today, for instance, President Obama will leave office in January, 2017, while most of us will remain in office far beyond then—perhaps decades.

Then the 47 Republicans Senators, in their March letter to the Ayatollah of Iran, say:

What these two constitutional provisions mean is that we will consider any agreement regarding your nuclear-weapons program that is not approved by the Congress as nothing more than an executive agreement between President Obama and Ayatollah Khamenei. The next president could revoke such an executive agreement with the stroke of a pen and future Congresses could modify the terms of the agreement at any time.

We hope this letter enriches your knowledge of our constitutional system and promotes mutual understanding and clarity as nuclear negotiations progress.

Forty-seven Republican Senators in March of this year, writing to the Ayatollah and basically telling him: Don't get your hopes up if you are negotiating with the United States, reminding him they will have the last word as Members of Congress, and also stipulating that a three-fifths vote will be required in the U.S. Senate.

Then they go on to say: Keep in mind we are going to be here a lot longer than any President; we may be the last person or the last group to make a decision on the future of these agreements. Then they are basically reminding them that Presidents come and go, and don't assume the next President

will even honor an agreement reached by this President.

Think back 12 years ago. What if 47 Democratic Senators—in the midst of our negotiation as to whether or not we should invade Iraq—had sent a letter to Saddam Hussein saying: Don't negotiate with President Bush. Don't pay any attention to his negotiations. We are the Congress. We will have the last word.

I cannot imagine what the public response would have been, but that is exactly what happened here—47 Republican Senators intervening in a negotiation process with Iran, basically telling those sitting at the table: Don't worry about reaching an agreement with the United States of America and this President.

I know what would have happened if that would have come up when Dick Cheney was Vice President of the United States. We would have had 47 Democrats up on charges of treason.

Well, in this circumstance, this was not good judgment. I would like to stipulate that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not sign this letter. I want to make sure that is clear on the floor. But the 47 who did have to answer a question: Why? When we are in delicate negotiations as the United States of America, and we don't have a final agreement, why would 47 Republican Senators want to intervene in those negotiations? Why would they want to say to the Ayatollah: Don't waste your time negotiating with this President.

It is troublesome. Many of them had reached a conclusion even before the agreement was written that they were going to oppose it. Witness this letter.

But others took time to consider it, to measure it, and to announce their position when it came to this matter. I respect them for doing that, even if they came to a different conclusion than I did. I know what happened on our Democratic side because I was in contact with virtually with every Member of our Senate Democratic Caucus during the month of August, talking to them about this.

There is real soul-searching here, real serious consideration. Some of them, of course, went to the source, met with our intelligence agencies, the State Department, Department of Defense, and came back to Washington when we were in recess. One Senator I know sat down for 5 hours in closed meetings with our intelligence agencies to ask questions that were on his mind about this agreement.

Others, of course, met with their constituents, talked about it, found differences of opinion within their own States. They thought about it long and hard, prayed over it.

I talked to them, always wanting to hear where they were, but never pushing them because I knew this was serious, and they took it seriously. That is where we find ourselves today.

I salute the Senator from Tennessee. As the chairman of the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee, he and I may disagree on substance, but I respect him very much. He is a man of honor and a man of integrity, and he brings to this process the kind of attitude toward the Senate as an institution which I respect and I will continue to respect.

I also believe my colleague from Maryland, a close personal friend, Senator CARDIN—though we see this issue differently—has really thought long and hard about it. We have been on the phone together many, many times during the course of August. I ruined a lot of his vacation trying to figure out where he was and what his process was. He took it very seriously. I respect him, although we came out to different positions on this matter.

That is the way it should be, and what the American people expect of us now is a debate befitting this great institution of the Senate. They expect us to come and conscientiously consider this matter on its merits and express our points of view, and virtually every Senator has already done that publicly, save one. In the course of this debate, the American people can follow it because it is a critical debate. What is at issue here is whether Iran will develop a nuclear weapon.

We believe that they have the capacity now to create as many as 10 nuclear weapons. We don't want that to happen. It would be disastrous for the world—certainly disastrous for the Middle East and Israel—and that is why leaders from around the world, 100 different nations, support what President Obama is striving to do.

What the President is trying to do is something I believe should be the starting point in every critical foreign-policy decision: Use diplomacy, use negotiation, and try to solve our problems in a thoughtful, diplomatic way. And if that fails, never rule out other possibilities, but start with diplomacy. That is what the President has done.

During the course of this Presidency, he organized nations around the world to join us in this effort. If this were just the United States versus Iran, we wouldn't be where we are today, but the President engaged countries which historically and recently have not been our allies.

Before we left for the August recess, we sat down with the five Ambassadors from nations that joined us in the negotiation. I looked across the table there to see the Ambassadors from China, from Russia, from the United Kingdom, and representatives of the embassies of Germany and France. I thought to myself, if you are a student of history, this is an amazing coalition: China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the United States all working together. And we brought into the sanctions regime other countries that didn't have the same direct involvement in negotiations but were with us. South Korea is a good example. Japan, another good example, joined us in this effort to put

pressure on Iran. President Obama led this effort, and he was successful in this effort. The Iranians came to the negotiating table because we put the pressure on them—economic pressure that brought them to that moment.

Now we have before us this agreement. Some have said: You can never trust Iran no matter what they say. I would just harken back to the days of Ronald Reagan, who said of our enemies around the world when it came to agreements: "Trust, but verify."

Just recently we had an announcement made by Colin Powell, a man I respect very much, in support of this agreement. It was an announcement which surprised me in a way. I didn't know if he was going to take a position on this matter, but this article states:

Former Secretary of State Colin Powell expressed support for the [Obama] nuclear agreement with Iran on Sunday, calling the various planks Iranian leaders accepted "remarkable" and dismissing critics' concerns over its implementation.

"It's a pretty good deal," he said on NBC's "Meet the Press."

Critics concerned that the deal will expedite Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Powell added, are "forgetting the reality that [Iranian leaders] have been on a super-highway, for the last 10 years, to create a nuclear weapon or a nuclear weapons program with no speed limit."

He said the reduction in centrifuges, Iran's uranium stockpile and their agreement to shut down their plutonium reactor were all "remarkable."

"These are remarkable changes, and so we have stopped this highway race that they were going down—and I think that's very, very important," Powell said.

He also pushed back on skeptics who have expressed worries about the ability of independent inspectors to verify that Iran is following the agreement. Powell said that, "with respect to the Iranians—don't trust, never trust, and always verify."

"And I think a very vigorous verification regime has been put into place," he said.

"I say, we have a deal, let's see how they implement the deal. If they don't implement it, bail out. None of our options are gone," Powell added.

I think he hit the nail on the head. General Colin Powell, who served our country in the military and as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then as Secretary of State, brings a perspective to this which very few can. He is a man who risked his life on the battlefield, a man who knows the true cost of war, but a man who was empowered by another Republican President to lead us in diplomatic negotiations. This is the kind of clear-eyed approach that we need and want when it comes to an issue of this gravity.

I will have other things to say on this matter, as others will.

I yield the floor to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am going to have more lengthy comments to make on this topic a little later, but I did want first of all to thank the Senator from Illinois for his comments, and I certainly want to thank Senator CARDIN—and I will do so more fully in

just a moment. But I would like to remind the body that, yes, we went through several steps along the way to get to where we are today that certainly created consternation on both sides of the aisle. There were lots of things that occurred. A letter was referred to. There was an address to the joint Congress. There have been numbers of things along the way that have caused people to concern themselves that maybe this debate would end up being something that was partisan and of low level.

What we have done is that we have actually marshaled ourselves through that, and we ended up with the Iran review act in short terms. That gives us the opportunity, as the distinguished Senator mentioned, to actually review this. We have done that. We have had 12 hearings on this topic—extensive hearings—in the Foreign Relations Committee, and many other committees have done the same.

What we ended up putting in place, with 98 votes in the Senate—98 to 1; we had one Senator who was absent—is a process where all Senators could review this, could have the documents at their disposal to go through it, to go to classified briefings so they could understand—and should understand—fully what this agreement says and then have the right to vote.

Certainly, some things happened along the way that, as I mentioned, created some consternation, but as a body, in Senate fashion, in lieu of letting that divide us and letting that create a scenario where we wouldn't review it and not vote on it, we created a process where we would review it and vote on it.

It is my hope—and I know I have had a very nice conversation with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and certainly multiple conversations with the distinguished Senator from Maryland—that over the process of this week that is what continues. I know that is what all of us want to see happen.

I do think the American people deserve to know where Senators and House Members stand on this serious piece of foreign policy that is before us, and I want to thank everyone for their role in getting it here.

As a matter of fact, I will move on, if I could, to what I had planned to say. I first want to thank Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID for allowing this debate to take place this week without having a motion to proceed. I couldn't thank Senator CARDIN more for being a colleague who really works to try to figure out a way for the Senate to play its appropriate role in foreign policy. It has been nothing but outstanding in dealing with him since he assumed this role, and I want to thank him for the way he has conducted himself.

I would also like to remind people that without the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act there would be no role for Congress. One of the things I

think has confused a lot of the American people—and there are a lot of people who would prefer this to have been a treaty—is the fact that under our form of government, the President is able to decide whether he is going to submit an agreement as a treaty or as an executive agreement. An executive agreement stays in place during the duration of that President's tenure and could be altered by the next President. A treaty is binding on future Presidents.

This President, as we know, decided to go directly to the U.N. Security Council and, by the way, lift some congressionally mandated sanctions that we all helped put in place that actually brought Iran to the table. So with the knowledge of that, Congress stepped in and passed this piece of legislation that now gives us the right to review what the President has negotiated and to prevent him from lifting those congressionally mandated sanctions should we decide we disapprove of this deal.

So this is a place where Congress came together and said: No, we want to play a role, even though a role is not contemplated under an executive agreement. I know this has been confusing to numbers of people, but this was the only vehicle capable of winning a veto-proof majority to provide Congress with this chance—a chance for the American people to have us, on their behalf, review this agreement and then vote.

As I mentioned, we have had more than a dozen hearings. I have spent a great deal of time, as has the ranking member, as have all of our committee members—and the Presiding Officer the same—as have so many people going through this agreement, and I oppose implementation of this deal. I oppose its implementation.

When the President first stated his goal—his goal of ending Iran's nuclear program—that was something that could have achieved tremendous bipartisan support in this body. As a matter of fact, onward there were discussions of dismantling the program. And as we all know today—and I will speak more fully on this tomorrow—rather than ending it, this agreement industrializes it. It allows the industrialization of the program run by the world's leading state sponsor of terror, and it does so with our approval.

Now, that is a large step from where we began these negotiations. Had the President achieved the goal, I think what we would have in this body is 100 Senators standing up and supporting what he said he wished to do with these negotiations. But we have ended up with something that certainly is a far cry from that.

Instead of having anytime, anywhere inspections, I think everyone understands there is a managed inspection process. Certainly, there are some issues relative to the IAEA that have given many Members tremendous concern.

The thing that is one of the most troubling aspects of this is that

through the course of these negotiations, the leverage—where right now, basically, the world community has had its boot on a rogue nation's throat—in 9 months the leverage shifts from these nations—our nation being one of those—having them in a position where we might negotiate something that ends their program to now, where instead what happens is the leverage shifts to Iran. The leverage shifts to Iran.

They are going to receive, as we know, billions of dollars. Most people think the number is around \$100 billion. By the way, they have a \$406 billion gross domestic product. That is the size of their economy. We are going to release to them over the next 9 months about \$100 billion—25 percent of their economy in 9 months.

The President has said, and surely others, that some of this is going to be used to sponsor terrorism. We know that. Think about if we had 25 percent of our GDP given to us over the next 9 months. We have an \$18 trillion GDP—\$4 trillion or \$5 trillion given to us over the next 9 months. Certainly, this is going to have an impact on what they are able to do.

What Iran is going to be able to say in 9 months—when we push back on violations in the agreement, when we push back on terrorism and we push back on human rights violations—is that because most of the sanctions will be lifted at that moment, they will have their money, and their economy will be growing, well, look, if you push back, we think this is unfair. They are already making these statements in Iran: We will just resume our nuclear program.

So instead of our having leverage over them, they are going to have leverage over us. They are going to have leverage over us. This is in the vacuum of having no Middle Eastern policy. I don't say this to be pejorative. We know we have no policy in the Middle East to push back against Iran. We know that. So this agreement is going to end up being our de facto policy, and everything is going to be measured by this: What will Iran do if we push back?

What if we push back against the fact that they are giving Hamas rockets to fire into Israel? What if we push back against what Hezbollah is doing in Lebanon and what they are doing in Syria? What if we push back against what the IRGC—the arm of the Supreme Leader—is doing right now to protect Assad? They are the shock force to keep Assad in power right now.

We know that right now in prisons in Syria people are being tortured. We saw it firsthand. The ranking member and I went over to see what was happening at the Holocaust Memorial Museum presentation where Caesar, someone working for the Assad regime, took photographs. We know as we stand here in these comfortable settings in the Chamber of the Senate, people are being tortured, their genitals are being removed, and Iran is supporting that.

We know that—the fact that they are going to have some resources to do more of that, to do the same thing with the Houthis in Yemen, to support terrorists and people who are trying to disrupt the Government of Bahrain.

Look, the leverage shifts to them. All they can say—what they are going to be able to say—if we push back against those activities is this: Well, look, we think you are being unfair. We are just going to resume our program.

I don't understand. This is beyond me. I have had no one explain it to me. I know the Senator from Illinois had the diplomats from the other countries come in. I have no idea why in this last meeting in Geneva we agreed to lift the conventional weapons ban after 5 years. What did that have to do with the nuclear file? And then we lifted the ballistic missile technology embargo in 8 years? What was that about? Then, as we know, with some really weird language that is in the agreement, we immediately lifted the ban on ballistic missile testing.

I think everyone here knows—the people sitting in the audience, people watching—that Iran has no practical need whatsoever for this program—none. Let me say that one more time. Here is a country with 19,000 centrifuges—10,000 of them operating. They have an underground facility at Fordow. They have a facility at Arak that produces plutonium. They have all kinds of research and development.

And by the way, this agreement approves further research and development of their centrifuges. As a matter of fact, it paves the way for them and also times it out perfectly for them to be in a position to be at zero breakout time, which is exactly what the President said they would be at, in 13 years. They can just agree to this agreement, and they can just continue to implement this agreement and be in that position. But they have no practical need—none.

Some people have said: Well, if they really want to pursue the technology of medical isotopes, maybe—maybe—they could use 500 centrifuges. Think about this. We have a country with one nuclear reactor, a country that could buy the enriched uranium to provide the energy for that cheaply on the market. Instead, they have put their entire society through grinding sanctions that have harmed families. They have been doing that for years for something they have no practical need for. There is only one need, and we all know that, which is to be in the position to be a nuclear-armed country.

So let me say one more time that every Senator here supported this process except for one. The American people deserve to know where their elected officials stand on this consequential agreement. I hope people on both sides will cause this to be a sober debate. I know it will be impassioned, and people will certainly be speaking strongly about the pros and cons of this agreement.

I do hope at the end of the day—while I was gone—I digress—there were discussions about filibustering the right to vote on this Iran agreement. I read about it in some magazines here, that instead of this being about people expressing themselves relative to a policy they felt was important to the country, apparently all of a sudden it became about something else.

I would just say to my colleagues, I don't know how we can be in a place where we have said to our constituents that we want to review and vote on this agreement and then, over some revisionist statement or thought, come up with a process that says: No, we are going to filibuster it; we really don't want people to vote.

It is my hope that over the course of the next several days cooler heads will prevail and that we of course will have, I believe, a very sober debate. I think my friends on the other side of the aisle have seen what the leader just did to try to ensure that we keep the debate about approval or disapproval—in this case, disapproval—of this particular deal, and I hope that very soon we will all be able to express ourselves with a vote on the deal itself, whether we believe it is in our Nation's interest. I do not. Some do. Let's have a debate in a sober way.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORKER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee how much I appreciate his good work, together with the ranking member Senator CARDIN, whom he alluded to earlier, but the Senator from Tennessee just said something which I think every American should find troubling, and that is perhaps the single-most important national security issue facing the country since the authorization for use of force in Iraq in 2002; that there might be a partisan filibuster of our ability even to have that up-or-down vote on the resolution of disapproval.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee, is he aware of reports that the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khomeini has said the Iranian Parliament will have the final word on this deal in Iran?

I wonder how the Senator would characterize a partisan filibuster in the U.S. Senate, preventing such an up-or-down vote in the Senate, while the Iranian Parliament would have the ability for that up-or-down vote in that institution.

Mr. CORKER. I did read those reports. I said to my friend from Illinois earlier: Look, there has been so much that has occurred from the very beginning that has caused people on each side to, in some cases, raise the partisan flag or think that this is a debate which could devolve into something that was of that orientation. What we have done, as the Senator mentioned, is we have risen above that, and we

passed something that allows us to debate and to vote.

I read with interest what the Supreme Leader has said. I think he is hedging his bets, and no doubt he is going to take it to their Parliament and allow them to vote and debate. I hope that here, the citizens of our country will be shown that same respect and expect that their Senators and their House Members will have the opportunity to vote on the actual policy which has been negotiated and agreed to by these various countries. I hope that will be the case and, yes, I was very aware of that.

With that, without objection, I wish to yield the floor to my great friend, the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee. Together, we have marched through some incredible hearings. I think all of us have studied this dutifully. That could not have occurred without his incredible cooperation and that of his staff. I thank him for his leadership. I thank him for his willingness to seek a place where the Senate can deal with this in the appropriate way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me first thank my friend Senator CORKER for his leadership but, more importantly, thank him on behalf of the Senate for standing up for what I think is the appropriate role of the United States Senate in reviewing a major foreign policy issue.

I have had the opportunity to serve with four different chairmen in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since I have been in the Senate: Senator CORKER, Senator MENENDEZ, Secretary Kerry, and Vice President BIDEN. All four fought for the Senate having the appropriate role in establishing foreign policy.

We are a country that believes our system of democracy serves our country the best; that is, with separation of branches of government. We don't have a parliamentary system. We have an independent Congress—a Congress that is expected to provide independence in its reviews of the laws of our country and the policies of our Chief Executive, and that is exactly what we are doing in this debate.

I thank Senator CORKER for his extraordinary leadership of our committee. I know I speak for both Democrats and Republicans in saying that we support the independence of the Senate in reviewing our work.

Senator DURBIN—I listened to his comments. Senator DURBIN is a dear friend of mine. The two of us have fought together on human rights issues around the globe. We have fought for civil liberties in the United States. We have worked together on so many important issues, including in the Middle East. I deeply respect his views.

There are Members on both sides who have reached different conclusions, but we are all committed to making sure

Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state, and we honestly believe our view is the best way for that to be accomplished. I don't challenge any other Member's decision, and I certainly don't question their resolve against Iran becoming a nuclear weapons state or their support for our regional allies. I think each has demonstrated that throughout their career. Some of us have come to different conclusions.

I strongly believe we must prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. It is a game-changer in the region. We have already heard from my colleagues that Iran is one of the principal purveyors of terrorism in that region. It would accelerate an arms race that already has too many arms in its region. It would make it so much more difficult to confront Iranian policy if they possess a nuclear weapon. President Obama is right to say we will not let that happen and that all options are on the table to make sure that doesn't happen, and Congress is right to say we support all options being on the table to make sure Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state. That is a goal we all have.

In this independent review, some of us believe the best way to accomplish that is to move forward with the agreement negotiated by the Obama administration. Others believe that is not the case.

I wish to second what Senator CORKER said about the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I was proud to be part of putting that bill together and gaining broad support in the Congress and the support of the administration. I think it put us in a much stronger position in negotiating in Vienna. I think the fact that we had set up the right way for a congressional review—that it was going to be a transparent review, a critical review—put our negotiators in the strongest possible positions in Vienna. I also think it provided the right type of review, so that after the agreement was reached, information would be made available to us, we would have an open process, the American people would learn more about it, and we would be in a better position to make our own judgment. It was clear in the review act that no action is required. We can't pass resolutions of approval or disapproval.

I wish to mention one thing, though, that I disagree with Senator CORKER, but maybe in the end we will come together on this issue. I wasn't part of the original negotiations on the review act. I came into it and was able to resolve the differences between the White House and the Congress and many Members of Congress, but it was clear, in talking to the architects of this legislation, that they always anticipated there would be a 60-vote threshold for the passage of this resolution in the Senate.

I agree with Senator CORKER that we shouldn't have to use filibusters and we shouldn't have to have procedural votes; that we should have a vote on

the merits. I thought Senator REID's suggestion was the right way to go. I hope we can find a way that we can avoid the procedural battles and be able to take up this issue and let every Member vote their conscience as to whether to support or disapprove of the resolution.

I told the people of Maryland after the review—let me say how this review went. We had 2½ weeks of review before the recess, and Senator CORKER worked our committee unmercifully as far as what we did. We had hearings, we had briefings, we had classified briefings, we had Member meetings, and to the credit of the Members of the committee, all 19 showed up. These meetings went on for about 4 hours each. So we were back-to-back-to-back in our briefings and in trying to understand what was in the agreement for the 2½ weeks we were here.

I then went back to Maryland, as I am sure my colleagues went back to their States, and had a chance for the first time to meet with Marylanders and to talk with Marylanders, to express and talk with them and get their views, and to evaluate whether I thought it was best to go forward. It was a close call, but I decided I could not support the agreement.

I just wish to share why I cannot support the agreement—and Senator CORKER mentioned this: It places Iran, after a time period, in the position of enrichment of uranium that is dangerously close to being able to break out to a nuclear weapon in compliance with the agreement. Being legal, they can get to that point. At that point, they have already gotten sanctions relief, so they are in a much better financial position to be able to withstand any pressures that could be put on Iran. We know they want to become a nuclear weapons state. They have tried in the past. We know that. That has pretty well been documented. We have no reason to believe they are going to change their intentions. So if they want to become a nuclear weapons state and they make the calculation that we really don't have a sanctioned way to stop them—because at that point their economic strength is strong enough and sanctions take too long to really bite and take effect—it would not be an effective deterrent to erase the breakout.

Here is the key point of concern to me—and I acknowledge to all my colleagues that I don't know what is going to happen in the future. This is a close call, but I think there is a higher risk of potential military operation if we go forward with this agreement because we don't have effective sanctions once they have been removed. That concerns me because I don't think a military option is a good option. I don't believe it will eliminate the threat, and it has a lot of collateral issues involved with the military operation.

I acknowledge that if we do not go forward with this agreement, there is a risk. There is no question about it.

There is high risk in either direction. But if we were to reject the agreement, what would happen? Well, no one can tell for sure. No one can tell for sure. There is a risk factor.

In my conversations with our European allies, they certainly want us to approve this agreement—don't get me wrong—but they know they have to work with the United States. They know Europe and the United States need to be in this together, and for their companies to be able to get full access to Iran, they have to work with the United States on a sanctions regime. They understand that.

Iran also understands that if we reject this agreement and they were to rush out to try to develop a nuclear weapon, it would ignite unity in the international community of action against Iran. They know that. They have to make that calculation. Iran also wants sanctions relief from the United States.

I can't predict the future, but I believe all parties will want a diplomatic solution. I understand that is not going to be easy, and maybe we will have to mix it up a little bit and put some other issues on the table. We have a lot of issues with Iran. We know about their terrorism, their interference in the region, et cetera. It may give us that opportunity. My point is, no one can predict the future. I came to that conclusion, and I understand others came to different conclusions.

There are other concerns I have with the agreement, including the 24-day delay. That doesn't concern me on known sites. It concerns me on undeclared sites and whether that will be adequate based on our intelligence information.

I am concerned about the possible military dimension that there isn't any consequence, as I see it, in the agreement if there is not an accurate account of what happened in the past. I wish it was more clear. I don't think the arms embargo relief should have been in this agreement.

I must say, I am concerned with the language in the agreement that talks about the United States and Iran with mutual respect and normalization. I don't know how we can have mutual respect for a country that actively foments regional instability and advocates Israel's destruction, kills innocents, and shouts "Death to Americans," so I came to the conclusion that I couldn't support the agreement.

Others came to opposite views. Each of us did what we thought was best, and I respect that this is a vote of conscience. I do want to point out one comment that was made a little bit earlier by my colleague about the Iraq war. I voted against the Iraq war. It was not a hard vote for me because, quite frankly, I didn't see the intelligence information that would have justified the authorization for use of military force. But it was a controversial vote.

In my congressional district, it was an extremely unpopular vote, and the

reactions were not too much different than the reactions we are getting today in regards to this particular agreement with Iran. I voted against that, along with a lot of my colleagues.

When that vote was over and it was a done deal and we pursued our military operations in Iraq, I joined with all my colleagues and the administration to give us the best possible chance for America to succeed because that is our responsibility. That is our system. Our system is independent review. But when the review is over, it is time for us to come together.

So, yes, I have been talking to my Republican colleagues. I have been talking to my colleagues who are voting for the agreement and those who are voting against it as to how we can work together in a responsible manner when this debate is over so the United States can be in the strongest possible position, working with the administration, to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon state. Working together, I think we can help the administration have a stronger position, knowing the independence of Congress.

The administration has said and we can underscore that all options are on the table to make sure Iran will not become a nuclear weapon power. The administration has said and we can underscore that there is a need for a regional security strategy so that our partners know of our commitment to the region against whatever happens with Iran. The administration has suggested and we can reinforce that our closest ally in the region, Israel, will have the security it needs as a partner with the United States. The administration has stated and we can reinforce that we will be active and pursue terrorism by Iran if they increase their terrorism or attempt terrorism against the United States. We can speak to that. We can make sure that we are better informed and that we have the information we need to see whether Iran is using their sanctions relief so that we can act timely with the administration to protect U.S. interests.

I think we can speak with a strong voice when this debate is over, and I hope that during the next 2 weeks the debate that takes place on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives reflects the best tradition of the Congress in our independent review and our firm commitment to work on behalf of America. We must stand firm in our determination to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We must agree to counter Iranian support for terrorism and confront Iranian violations of ballistic missile protocols and international human rights obligations. Congress and the administration cannot dwell on past disagreements. Together we must find a functional bipartisan approach to Iran. I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the administration to achieve such a result.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments and his tremendous leadership on this issue. I note that Senator COLLINS is here to speak. It is my understanding that she will speak for approximately 30 minutes. Senator CORNYN may be down shortly thereafter to speak and then Senator Kaine.

I know some people referred to the fact that it is only those who wanted to go to war with Iraq who are supporting this. But not only did the ranking member not support going to war with Iraq, neither did Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, who, again, opposes this agreement. That type of characterization certainly is not the way that this is. The two most knowledgeable Democrats in the Senate on this issue by far both oppose it.

With that, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Maine, who represents a beautiful State. We thank her for her contributions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership on this issue, for briefing us, for arranging for briefings, and for his very thorough analysis. I also want to commend the Senator from Maryland for his vote of conviction, for doing what he believed was correct, for showing the courage to cast a vote of true conscience. I was honored to be here on the Senate floor to listen to his comments today.

President Obama's agreement with the Iranian Government with respect to its nuclear program is one of the most important foreign policy decisions ever to face the Senate. The vote that we shall cast will not be an easy one. The security of our Nation and the stability of the Middle East, as well as America's leadership in the world, are affected by this agreement, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

Thus, I have devoted countless hours to studying the agreement and its annexes, attending Intelligence Committee sessions and other classified briefings, questioning Secretary of State John Kerry, Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz, and our intelligence officials, including the top manager for Iran, talking with our negotiators and with ambassadors, and discussing the agreement with experts with divergent views to ensure that my decision is as well informed as possible.

Let me begin by making clear that I supported the administration's undertaking these negotiations with Iran. Indeed, I was heartened when President Obama initially said in October of 2012 that "our goal is to get Iran to recognize it needs to give up its nuclear program and abide by the U.N. resolutions that have been in place." He went on to say: "The deal we'll accept is, they end

their nuclear program. It's very straightforward."

I was optimistic that the administration would produce an agreement that would accomplish the goals the President laid out. Along with six of my Republican colleagues, I did not sign a letter to the leaders of the Iranian Government sent in the midst of the negotiations because I wanted to give the administration every opportunity to complete an agreement that would have accomplished the goals the President himself originally set forth as the purpose of these negotiations.

I have long believed that a verifiable diplomatic agreement with Iran that dismantled its nuclear infrastructure and blocked its pathways to the development of a nuclear weapon would be a major achievement—an accomplishment that would make the world a safer place. Regrettably, that does not describe the agreement that the administration negotiated. The agreement is fundamentally flawed because it leaves Iran as capable of building a nuclear weapon at the expiration of the agreement as it is today. Indeed, at that time, Iran will be a more dangerous and stronger nuclear threshold state—exactly the opposite of what these negotiations should have produced.

Mark Dubowitz, a noted expert on sanctions, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Even if Iran doesn't violate the JCPOA . . . it will have patient pathways to nuclear weapons, an ICBM program, access to heavy weaponry, an economy immunized against sanctions pressure, and a more powerful regional position . . ."

Under the agreement, not a single one of Iran's 19,000 centrifuges, used to enrich uranium to produce the fissile material for a nuclear bomb, will be destroyed. Not a single one. Iran will be able to continue its research and development on advanced centrifuges able to enrich uranium more rapidly and more effectively. Not only will Iran retain its nuclear capability, but it will also be a far richer nation and one that has more conventional weapons and military technology than it possesses today.

The lifting of sanctions will give Iran's leaders access ultimately to more than \$100 billion in the form of frozen assets and overseas accounts. Iran also will once again be able to sell its abundant oil in global markets.

The administration has repeatedly argued that Iranian leaders will invest those billions of dollars into their own country to improve the lives of their citizens. The record strongly suggests otherwise.

Iran today is the world's foremost exporter of terrorism, pouring billions of dollars into terrorist groups throughout the region and into funding the murderous Assad regime in Syria. If Iran is financing, arming, and equipping terrorist groups in Iraq, Lebanon, Gaza, Syria, and Yemen when its own economy is in shambles and its citizens are suffering, why would anyone believe that it would invest the proceeds

of sanctions relief only in its own economy?

I do expect that Iran's leaders will invest in a few high-profile projects to help their own citizens. But given their history, it is inevitable that billions more will be used to finance terrorism and strengthens Iran's power and proxies throughout the Middle East.

It is deeply troubling that the administration secured no concessions at all from Iran, designated by our government—by the Director of National Intelligence—as the number one state sponsor of terrorism, to cease its support of terrorist groups. Whether it is Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Shiite militias in Iraq or the Houthis in Yemen, Iran's proxies are terrorizing innocent civilians, forcing families to flee their homes, and causing death and destruction. And incredibly, the JCPOA will end the embargoes on selling Iran intercontinental ballistic missile technology and conventional weapons, which the Russians, among others, are very eager to sell them.

Think about that for a moment. Why would Iran want to buy intercontinental ballistic missile technology? It already has the deeply troubling capacity to launch missile strikes at Israel, which it has pledged to wipe off the face of the Earth. ICBM technology poses a direct threat to our Nation from a nation whose leaders continue to chant "Death to America."

We should also remember that the Iranian Quds forces were the source of the most lethal improvised explosive devices that were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers in Iraq.

Why would we ever agree to lift the embargo on the sales of conventional weapons that could endanger our forces in the region?

Let me now turn to the issue of the enforcement of the agreement by posing the obvious question: Will Iran abide by the agreement and the corresponding U.N. Security Council resolution or will it cheat? Despite being a signatory to the U.N. Charter, Iran has repeatedly violated or ignored the United Nations Security Council resolutions aimed at curbing its nuclear program.

In 2006, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution prohibiting Iran from enriching uranium. What happened? Iran cheated. It has literally thousands of centrifuges spinning to enrich uranium. Multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions require Iran to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, and to come clean on what is known as the possible military dimensions of its nuclear activities to understand how far Iran has progressed toward developing a nuclear device and to have a verified baseline to evaluate future nuclear-related activities. What happened?

Iran cheated. Not only did it never report to international arms control experts about the experiments at its military installation at Parchin, where

Iran is suspected of developing detonators for nuclear devices, but also Iran sanitized buildings at Parchin in a manner that the IAEA has described as likely to have undermined the agency's ability to conduct effective verification. Remarkably, according to public reporting, Iran has continued these sanitation activities while Congress was holding hearings on the agreement this summer.

In 2010, the U.N. Security Council adopted another resolution requiring Iran to cease any activities related to ballistic missile activities capable of delivering nuclear weapons. What happened?

Iran cheated. It launched ballistic missiles in July 2012. Given this history, there is no question in my mind that Iran will try to cheat on the new agreement and exploit any loophole in the text or in the implementing Security Council resolution that was, by the way, as the chairman has pointed out, adopted before Congress even had a chance to vote on the agreement. Given Iran's history of noncompliance, one would think an ironclad inspection process would be put in place. Sadly, that is far from the reality of this agreement.

Let me make four points about how Iran can stymie inspections. First, throughout the term of the agreement, Iran has the authority to delay inspections of undeclared sites. Those are the sites where inspectors from the IAEA believe that suspicious activities are occurring. Inexplicably the JCPOA establishes up to a 24-day delay between when the agency requests access to a site and when access is granted. The former Deputy Director General for Safeguards at the IAEA notes that 24 days is sufficient time for Iran to sanitize suspected facilities and points out that past concealment activities carried out by Iran in 2003 left no traces to be detected. This is a long way from the anytime, anywhere inspections that should have been part of this agreement given Iran's sorry history.

Second, no American or Canadian experts will be allowed to be part of the IAEA inspection team unless these countries reestablish official diplomatic relations with Iran. I recognize that the IAEA has many highly qualified experts, but the exclusion of some of the most highly skilled and experienced experts in the world does not inspire confidence.

Third, and most outrageous, according to press reports, the Iranians themselves will be responsible for the photographs and environmental sampling at Parchin, a large military installation where nuclear work is suspected to have been conducted and may still be underway. IAEA weapons inspectors will be denied physical access to Parchin. Note that I said "according to press reports." That is because the actual agreement between the IAEA and Iran is secret and has been withheld from Congress.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have been briefed on the

agreement, but like every other Member of Congress, I have been denied access to the actual document despite how significant this issue is. The actual text matters because of Iran's repeated efforts to exploit loopholes and particularly in light of press reports on what is in that document.

Fourth, Iran is not required to ratify the Additional Protocol before sanctions relief is granted, if ever. The Additional Protocol allows the IAEA permanent inspection access to declared and suspected nuclear sites in a country in order to detect covert nuclear activities. Ratification of the protocol would make the AP permanently and legally binding in Iran.

Mr. President, 126 countries, including our country, have already ratified the Additional Protocol. Yet the agreement negotiated by the administration only requires Iran to "seek ratification" of the Additional Protocol 8 years from now—in the 8th year of the agreement—and to comply with its terms until then. If Iran's past behavior is any guide, Iran may never ratify the Additional Protocol and thus be subject to its permanent, legally binding inspection regime.

To prevent Iran from cheating, the administration has repeatedly pointed to the prospect of an immediate snapback of sanctions as the teeth of the agreement. I will be surprised if they work as advertised. First, the rhetoric on the snapback of sanctions is inconsistent. On the one hand, the administration says the United States can unilaterally cause the international sanctions to be reimposed. At the same time, the administration repeatedly warns us that the sanctions regime is falling apart. Which is it?

Second, Iran has already made explicit in the text of the agreement that the imposition of any sanctions will be treated as grounds to restart its nuclear program. Included in the JCPOA is this clear statement: "Iran has stated that if sanctions are reinstated in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitments under this JCPOA in whole or in part." In effect, Iran has given advance notice that if the United States or any of its partners insist on reimposing sanctions, Iran can simply walk away from the deal. Given their investment in the deal, I am very skeptical that any of the P5+1 countries will be willing to take that action.

After the United Nations Security Council endorsed this agreement on July 20, the Iranians actually released a statement saying they may reconsider its commitments if new sanctions impair the business and trade resulting from the lifting of nuclear sanctions, "irrespective of whether such new sanctions are introduced on nuclear-related or other grounds."

Let's think about the implications of that for a moment. The Iranians are saying a sanction is a sanction is a

sanction, and Iran appears ready to resume its nuclear activities if any sanctions are reimposed, even if the purpose is nonnuclear, even if the purpose is to halt Iran's financing of terrorists groups.

That means, if the United States reimposes a sanction in response to the Iranians continuing to finance, train, arm, and equip terrorist groups all over the world, Iran, the foremost exporter of terrorism, according to our own Director of National Intelligence, can just walk away from the agreement we are being asked to approve.

Third, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the agreement states that sanctions would not be applied "with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party and Iran or Iranian entities prior to the date of application." This grandfathering clause will create an immediate rush of businesses to lock in long-term business contracts with Iran. Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif assured Iranian lawmakers that the swarming of business for reinvesting their money is the biggest barrier to the reimposition of sanctions, and he is right.

The State Department insists that each case will be worked on an individual basis, but there is no guarantee that any case, much less every case, will be resolved in the short time period necessary.

There are alternatives to the deeply flawed agreement reached in Vienna. While I recognize that it would be difficult, the fact is, the administration could renegotiate a better deal. As Orde Kittrie, the former lead State Department attorney for nuclear issues, recently noted in the *Wall Street Journal*, the Senate has required changes to more than 200 treaties that were ultimately ratified after congressional concerns were addressed.

This is not unusual. For example, the 1997 resolution of ratification regarding the multilateral Chemical Weapons Convention included 28 conditions inserted by the Senate. The treaty was ultimately ratified and currently is in force in 191 participating nations, including Iran and the United States. Similarly, the Senate insisted that the Threshold Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union have additional provisions strengthening compliance measures before it was ratified.

Of course, one of the problems with this agreement is that it is not in the form of a treaty, which precludes the Senate from inserting reservations, understandings, or declarations. But that does not mean this agreement cannot be renegotiated, and there are so many precedents for side agreements or renegotiations of treaties themselves—more than 200 times.

Another alternative to this agreement would be to further wield our unilateral financial and economic power against those conducting business with key Iranian entities. Juan Zarate, the first Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorist Financing and Finan-

cial Crimes, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

We can't argue in the same breath that "snapback" sanctions as constructed offer a real Sword of Damocles to be wielded over the heads of the Iranians for years while arguing that there is no way now for the United States to maintain the crippling financial and economic isolation which helped bring the Iranians to the table.

Every country and every business would have to choose whether to do business with a nuclear Iran or with the United States. I am confident that most countries and most businesses would make the right choice.

Despite these options, the administration negotiated a pact in which its redlines were abandoned, compromised, or diluted, while the Iranians held firm to their core principles.

The Iranians have secured the following if this agreement moves forward: broad sanctions relief, a U.N.-blessed domestic uranium enrichment capability, international acceptance of Iran as a nuclear threshold state, international acceptance of its indigenous ballistic missile program, the lifting of the arms and the ICBM embargoes, repeal of all previous U.N. Security Council resolutions, and removal of the Iranian nuclear issue from the U.N. Security Council agenda.

Accordingly, I shall cast my vote for the motion of disapproval. I believe Iran will bide its time, perfect its R&D on advanced centrifuges, secure an ICBM capability, and build a nuclear weapon as the JCPOA is phased out.

It is time for Congress to reject the JCPOA and for the administration to negotiate a new agreement, as has been done so many times in the past when the Senate raised serious concerns. The stakes are simply too high and the risks too great for us to do otherwise.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

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

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT JOE GLINIEWICZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are many brokenhearted people today in the small town of Fox Lake, IL. They are mourning the loss of Lieutenant Charles Joseph Gliniewicz. His friends and family called him Joe. At work they called him GI Joe. That all-American nickname was an admiring tribute to Lieutenant Gliniewicz's nearly 30 years of service to the U.S. Army, the Army Reserves, and to his appearance and demeanor.

At age 52, Lieutenant Gliniewicz was fit and strong. He stood ramrod straight. He wore his hair high and tight like a drill sergeant. But the physical characteristic people mention most about Lieutenant Gliniewicz was his smile.

Everyone knew GI Joe in Fox Lake, IL. He served on the town's police force for 32 years. He was supposed to retire

at the end of last month, but he stayed on just 1 more month to ensure the smooth transition of a volunteer youth program to which he devoted thousands of hours over nearly 30 years.

A week ago today, September 1—the day that would have been Lieutenant Gliniewicz's first day of retirement—he was shot and killed in the line of duty. It was 8 o'clock in the morning. Lieutenant Gliniewicz was driving down a road lined with open fields and abandoned-looking businesses when he spotted three men who raised suspicion. He radioed the police dispatcher that he was going to pursue them on foot. The dispatcher asked if he needed help. Lieutenant Gliniewicz said: Sure, send them. When backup officers arrived 3 minutes later, they couldn't find him. A few minutes later, they found Lieutenant Gliniewicz 50 yards from his patrol car. He had been fatally shot.

Law enforcement agencies are still searching for the three men responsible. They have only a very sketchy description: three men, two White, one Black.

In the days that followed the murder, hundreds of law enforcement officers poured into Fox Lake in Lake County. They were joined by members of just about every major law enforcement agency, all people can think of, including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the FBI, and even the Secret Service. Dozens of officers suffered heat exhaustion as they searched the woods and swamps. They are still searching today for his killers. We all want to see them brought to justice swiftly.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was married for 26½ years to his wife Melodie. They call her Mel for short. They were parents of four sons ranging in age from early twenties to their teens. One of his sons serves in the U.S. Army.

The day after Lieutenant Gliniewicz's murder, hundreds of local folks turned out for a rally in Fox Lake to show their love for him and his family. It would just break your heart to see pictures of Melodie Gliniewicz and her four now fatherless sons smiling through their anguish, trying to support each other and their grieving neighbors.

Folks in Fox Lake said that Joe Gliniewicz loved his town and he was always the first to volunteer at whatever local administration needed help with an event. One resident told the local newspaper:

Everyone in town knew who he was. Whether you were on a first-name basis or knew his rank, you knew he was a great guy.

This resident added:

Just being involved in his community, he took pride in it. This is where he lived, and it's what he fought to protect. He took great pride in making the town of Fox Lake the place it is.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was a volunteer with the Special Olympics and a lot of other groups. The organization he was closest to was the Fox Lake Police Department Explorers, a group

who mentors young people who want to aspire to law enforcement. Joe Gliniewicz established Fox Lake's Explorer Post No. 300 nearly 30 years ago. Over the years, he has seen hundreds of explorers in training get into law enforcement and the military. His death is felt so deeply by these young people, by Lieutenant Gliniewicz's family, friends, and neighbors, and by his brothers and sisters in blue not only in Fox Lake but throughout Illinois and across America.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was the first on-duty officer fatally shot in Lake County, IL, since 1980 and the third law enforcement fatality in Illinois this year, according to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. According to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, firearms-related deaths of law enforcement officers in the United States are down 24 percent this year compared to the same period last year, January 1 to September 8. There were 34 last year and 26 this year. While that downward trend is good news, even one police officer killed in the line of duty is way too many.

In Fox Lake and in towns across America, countless families have replaced the lightbulbs on their front porches with blue lightbulbs to show their support for their local police.

Yesterday, on Labor Day, there was a memorial service at the high school for Lieutenant Gliniewicz. They packed it with law enforcement officials from all over—not just Lake County, IL, but the Midwest and across the Nation. It was an 18-mile funeral parade or funeral caravan that went off to the cemetery afterward—18 miles long—and it was filled with admirers and friends and people standing on the roads with homemade signs.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz really made a difference in people's lives. It is sad to lose him. When we reflect on the great contribution he made to his community, to his county, to my State of Illinois, and to our Nation, it is with heartfelt gratitude that we say to his family: We are by your side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as have all of our colleagues, I have been traveling around my State over the last few weeks listening to my constituents and trying to understand what their concerns are. I have to tell my colleagues that Washington is not in high repute. People sense the country is heading in the wrong direction. They have entrusted us with the way to navigate that, and they feel as though we have not succeeded in getting our country back on the right track. I know that when it comes to security issues—and of all the issues the Federal Government deals with, national security is the only one we can't delegate to someone else. It is our No. 1 responsibility as a Federal Government. State government can't do it. Local

government can't do it. We can't do it for ourselves, so we depend on the Federal Government to make sure our Nation is safe and secure, which is a precondition for all of the other liberties and privileges we enjoy.

As part of the roundtables and visits I had, I took part in one in Houston, TX, where we addressed a wide variety of issues, but the No. 1 issue that came up was the Iranian nuclear deal. There is no issue more compelling or concerning to this particular group of folks or my constituents back home than the President's deal with Iran because people recognize that Iran is a state sponsor of international terrorism, and what this does is it paves the way to them getting bigger and more lethal weapons.

They are also very concerned, as they should be, that this deal requires us to trust an adversary who has done nothing to earn it. I know the President has said there is no trust involved, but in the absence of trust, one would at least think there would be adequate verification mechanisms.

Of course, I know Secretary Moniz has disavowed his earlier comments about anytime, anywhere inspections, and we then learned that there is this convoluted process of 24 days' notice and some arbitration before the IAEA will gain access to some sites and then, as the Associated Press reported, the sidebar deals, which, if these reports in the public domain are accurate, would basically require Iran to inspect itself.

The reason people are so anxious and concerned about this is there is no doubt about that. Their concerns are well taken, but I think of all the things that concern my constituents and the people I talked to during August about this deal, it is Iran's long history of supporting terrorism, including attacks on the United States and our allies.

It is no exaggeration to say the Iranian regime has American blood on its hands, and it has had for many years. Former Secretary of State and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice put it well when she said: Iran has been the country that has, in many ways, been kind of a central banker for terrorism. It is Iran that has been conducting these proxy wars against Israel, the United States, and our allies since the regime came into power as a result of the revolution in 1979.

Even President Obama and his National Security Advisor Susan Rice admitted earlier this summer that the Iranian Government could use the \$100 billion in cash they are going to get as a result of sanctions relief to help fund terrorist attacks, to help fund these terrorist groups.

Here is what the President said. I guess he has resigned himself to it. He said: "The truth is that Iran has always found a way to fund these efforts." Well, that does not make me feel any more at ease, nor should it make any of our allies feel any more at ease about Iran and its intentions and

what it will do with these funds that will be relieved from sanctions. That does not even address the million barrels of oil a day which now Iran will be able to ply to markets all around the world and the revenue they will be able to generate from that.

The President may believe that there is nothing we can do about Iran funneling money to terrorist groups that seek to attack us and our allies, but we cannot afford to just shrug our shoulders with indifference. That seems to be what the President's reaction is: Well, Iran has always done it and they will do it with this money. But he acts as if there is nothing he nor we can or should do about it. Iran's history of bankrolling terrorist activity deserves our attention and should be the focus of this deal, and it should be a major consideration as we proceed to assess the merits of this nuclear arrangement and vote on a resolution of disapproval.

I wish to pause a minute just to tell the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, not just because he is sitting next to me but because it is true, that I admire and appreciate his leadership through this very convoluted maze we have had to proceed down until we have gotten to this point. But how ironic would it be that after the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, working with the ranking member and getting a vote of Congress and a signature of the President allowing a resolution of disapproval—how ironic would it be if a partisan filibuster blocks an up-or-down vote on that resolution of disapproval. It is just shocking to me, but that is what the minority leader, Senator REID, and indeed the President of the United States himself apparently are talking about—blocking a vote on the resolution of disapproval that they cooperated in crafting and that bears the President's signature, that process by which that is to play out.

But, again, that is another reason people get so disgusted with what they see in Washington—because they feel there is no accountability. People get away with whatever they can. There is no right and wrong anymore. There are no rules that apply to everyone evenly and evenhandedly. There is no—in the words above the Supreme Court of the United States—there is no "equal justice under the law." It does not seem to apply.

Well, just digressing a moment and talking again about this threatened partisan filibuster of the resolution of disapproval—and again I hope and pray our colleagues across the aisle, the 41 who have said they will vote against the resolution of disapproval, I hope they will reconsider if they are even thinking about a partisan filibuster of the resolution itself and not even getting to the resolution of disapproval.

They have every right to vote according to their conscience and as they believe they should vote on the resolution of disapproval, but the idea of blocking a vote by a filibuster—it just

strikes me as reckless and irresponsible, especially in light of this: I mentioned this to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a few moments ago, but I will come back to it because I find it so shocking.

A few days ago in the *Wall Street Journal*, there was a discussion or actually a report from the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the Supreme Leader of Iran, who declared Thursday—it said in this story of September 3—that the Iranian Parliament would have the final word on the deal. It says the Parliament speaker delivered a similar message to reporters in New York later in the day, saying he supports the deal which would lift crippling economic sanctions on Iran in return for curbs on the country's nuclear activities. The speaker of the Iranian Parliament said the agreement needs to be discussed and it needs to be approved by the Iranian Parliament. There will be heated discussions and debates.

I would hate the fact, if it was to occur—and I hope it does not—that the Iranian Parliament would have a more open, accountable, and democratic process than the Senate. I hope we do not head down the road of a partisan filibuster, no matter how this resolution turns out. It would be a mistake, it would be a self-inflicted wound to the Senate and to the respect which we would like to garner from the American people.

They would see this as business as usual, and I think it would add to their disgust. I hope Members, as they return to Washington today and as we begin to debate this deal, I hope they will recall—and let me, just in a brief few minutes, refresh some of their collective live memories about Iran's long history of terrorism against the United States and our allies. I actually had a chance last week when I was in Dallas, TX, to discuss this matter with a gentleman named Rick Kupke in Dallas, TX. He actually lives in Arlington, TX, right between Fort Worth and Dallas.

But Rick was a former U.S. Foreign Service officer. He has learned firsthand how the Iranian regime targets and attacks Americans because he was the last American captured in 1979 at the U.S. Embassy in Iran during the Iranian hostage crisis. He was one of dozens of Americans held in captivity for 444 days under the constant threat of death. But many will also remember two other terrorist bombings that occurred in 1983 that targeted American citizens. One blew up the U.S. Embassy in Beirut and the other blew up the U.S. Marine barracks at Beirut International Airport. Combined, these bombings killed more than 250 American citizens, including 8 Texans, 7 of them marines and another a soldier.

It is well known and documented that these attacks were perpetrated by the terrorist group Hezbollah under the direction of the Iranian regime. That is how the Iranian regime does its dirty work. It does it through proxies, not

directly but through proxies like Hezbollah.

Iran, while it has denied any involvement in these attacks, does not shy away from celebrating these bombings that have killed hundreds of Americans. In 2004, a little more than 20 years after the bombings, the Iranian Government erected a monument—a monument in its capital to commemorate the “martyrs” who carried out those attacks.

Later in 1985, Hezbollah, together with another terrorist group, hijacked a Trans World Airlines flight, holding hostages and beating its passengers for 2 weeks. More than half of those passengers were American citizens, including a group of six U.S. Navy sailors, one of whom was murdered.

In 1996, a bombing on a housing complex in Saudi Arabia was linked to Iranian officials that resulted in the death of 19 U.S. servicemembers, wounding more than 500.

More recently, the Defense Department has acknowledged that during Operation Iraqi Freedom, at least 500 Americans died at the hands of Shiite militias who were equipped by Iran with different types of lethal weapons. It became well known that the explosively formed penetrators, which melted the armor used to shield Americans and our allies in Iraq, were produced by the Iranian Government, and the Quds Force trained people to use those against Americans and our allies.

Then, right here in our Nation's Capital just 4 years ago, Iranian officials were implicated in a plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States. That plot reportedly included plans to bomb the Israeli Embassy in Washington as well. That is a staggering list of aggressions against the United States and our allies, both at home and abroad since the Iranian regime came to power in 1979.

I don't have the time right now to discuss the Iranian fingerprints on the havoc being wreaked in the Middle East, from Yemen to Syria, to Iraq. In all the major hotspots of the world, Iranian fingerprints are all over these activities. Of course, Iran has long sponsored militant groups on Israel's borders, which have attacked Israel with rockets, hundreds of rockets and terrorism.

In southern Lebanon, Iran funds and supplies Hezbollah, which threatens Israel's northern border, against which Israel went to war in 2006. In Gaza, on Israel's southwestern border, Iran has long sponsored Hamas. Particularly as Iranian-Hamas relations have frayed in recent years, Iran has sponsored the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

Suffice it to say that over the years, Iran has sown chaos across the Middle East, attacking the United States and our allies, while publicly celebrating the death of Americans in Tehran. So with this regime's long history of aggression against the United States and its allies, I find it troubling that the President characterizes any thoughtful

questioning of the merits of this deal as akin to warmongering. That is what the President has said: If you don't like this deal, the alternative is war. To which I would say: Wrong, Mr. President. The alternative to this deal is a better deal.

According to the President's twisted logic, those who are skeptical of this same Iran, which I have described has time and time again demonstrated its aggression against the United States and which has articulated its principle opposition to this deal—the President would characterize the critics of this deal as the real belligerents encouraging war. In fact, he went so far as to say that Republican opponents of this deal—he has not said this yet about the opponents of this deal who are members of his political party, but he has about Republicans, that those who share the concerns are “making common cause” with Iranian hardliners who chant “Death to America.”

Well, this debate and this vote are simply too important for it to degenerate into partisanship. I know this is something the Senator from Tennessee feels very strongly about. He has tried to elevate the debate and to work in a bipartisan way to bring us to this vote on a resolution this week.

I hope we don't follow the President down this low road of partisan rhetoric, which actually only serves to distract us from examining the deal and identifying the true character of the regime that we are somehow making common cause with and hoping against hope that they won't continue at some point to break out and pursue those nuclear weapons.

This is not like the Soviet Union. This is not Ronald Reagan negotiating with the Soviet Union. This is a theocratic regime that is led by an Islamic extremist who has American and other allied blood on his hands and makes no bones about it.

So this debate needs to help the American people find the answer to this crucial question. I think it boils down to this: Will this deal make America and our allies safer? I think that ultimately is the question.

As we prepare to vote on this resolution of disapproval, I hope that we will have a civil, enthusiastic, and spirited debate, as the speaker of the Iranian Parliament said they will have in their body, and we will be able to openly and honestly discuss different points of view. That is the Senate is supposed to be—a place where that can happen and where it should happen. The American people deserve that kind of debate, not a partisan filibuster that cuts off the debate prematurely and tries to hide accountability for the ultimate outcome on the resolution of disapproval.

I look forward to that spirited debate, and I hope any thought that any of our colleagues might have had about engaging in a partisan filibuster of this important resolution will fade quickly from their minds.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

REMEMBERING ALISON PARKER AND ADAM WARD

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today for a sad occasion, and that is to remember the lives of two Virginians, Alison Parker and Adam Ward, the journalists who were gunned down on live TV in Roanoke, VA, just a couple of weeks ago, as they covered a local news story.

There was a third victim in that shooting, Vicki Gardner, the president of the local chamber of commerce at Smith Mountain Lake, who is recovering. She was released from the hospital today, but she still has a long recovery ahead of her.

We saw during the summer a set of these tragedies in Roanoke, VA, my wife's hometown, in Charleston, SC, in Lafayette, LA, and in Chattanooga, TN. My friend, the Senator from Tennessee, is on the floor.

In Virginia, the shooting in Roanoke, which was carried out on live television, was horrific in itself, but it also was horrific because it brought up a lot of bad memories. The Roanoke community is within about 25 miles from Virginia Tech, where the horrible shooting happened in 2007 that killed 32 people and wounded dozens of others.

I spoke on the Senate floor in April on the eighth anniversary of that shooting. I talked, as is my habit to do in April, about the lives of those who lost their lives but also about some who survived and what they are doing today. I am saddened to be here because it is just another example of a horrible shooting in my Commonwealth. It is also sad because we really haven't made any progress in this body since I came to it in terms of trying to address this issue.

There is a lot of work to be done—legislative and otherwise—to try to address the growing litany of these horrific crimes, which deeply scar our own psyche and, frankly, I think, portray a picture of who we are as a nation to the rest of the world that is not accurate about who we are. I am going to introduce a bill that I think can help us address it. It is not the end-all solution because there isn't a single solution. But I am going to talk a little bit about Alison and Adam, and then I wish to talk about the bill.

Alison and Adam worked on a show on WDBJ, the "Mornin'" program. They were sort of hometown heroes. Not only were they popular because they worked for the station, they were both from the hometown. Roanoke is where my wife grew up. I am very, very familiar with the wonderful Roanoke community. They both interned at WDBJ when they were in college. They were passionate members of this journalistic profession, and they were just starting on these great careers.

Alison Parker grew up in Martinsville, which is just up the road from Roanoke, about a 45-minute drive. She played the trumpet and French horn in high school. She graduated

from James Madison University. When she was at James Madison, she interned at WDBJ. They loved her work, and they gave her a recommendation.

Her first job was not there at WDBJ, but it was in North Carolina. But as soon as she could move from North Carolina back to Virginia, that is what she did. She came back to her hometown station. She covered all kinds of news and human interest stories, including a recent piece on child abuse that was a very powerful one. Her colleagues describe her as "proactive" and "wise beyond her years." She met her boyfriend, whom she was planning to marry, while working at WDBJ.

Adam Ward went to Salem High School. Salem is the city that adjoins Roanoke. He graduated in 2007 and played football on two State championship football teams. Teachers there describe him as "vivacious," "kind," "giving," "respectful," and "genuine." He had passion for Virginia Tech, the local college. He started to go to Tech football games with his dad when he was 3 years old. He interned also at WDBJ when he was a communications student at Tech.

His colleagues remembered him as somebody willing to get the image that reporters need. We all know in this line of work the guys behind the camera are so important to it. They make the on-camera talent shine, and that was the way Adam was. He loved to play tricks on the on-camera talent, kind of tweak them and make them not get above their station in life, but he was a wonderful guy.

He found love at the station too. He had become engaged to a producer at the station who sadly was watching in the station the day that the footage of him being killed was shown, which shocked the world.

I really feel for these families. I know we all do. You couldn't have watched that without having a feeling, even if you were a thousand miles away from the Ward and Parker families.

I remember having said to the Virginia Tech families this: It would be presumptuous of me, and so I am not going to say I know what you have lost, because I don't know what you have lost. But when you hear about these people, I do feel like I have a sense of what the world lost, I have a sense of what the community lost. I don't know what the parents and the siblings lost, but you kind of have a sense when you hear about these people from those at WDBJ, the Roanoke community, the community of journalists. You kind of have a sense of what we lost as a society when they were killed.

I should just say a word. Since 2002, Vicki Gardner has worked at the Smith Mountain Lake Regional Chamber of Commerce. It is a major tourism area in Virginia, a State park. It is a feature that was created by a hydroelectric dam, and they were celebrating its 35th anniversary. She was deeply involved in the planning.

Again, she was badly wounded. She has described maneuvering around to try to duck bullets as she was shot in her back. She has had a couple of operations, but, thank God, she has been released to go home today, and we are thinking about her too.

I said the shooting opened a lot of old wounds in Virginia, and especially in this community, sadly, because Virginia Tech is so close. When I spoke on the floor in April, I talked about two of these young people, Colin Goddard and Lily Habtu, who survived that shooting. Just think of the effect upon their lives 8 years later, as they deal with injuries that continue to be a challenge, and they deal with the horrible memories of that day. That was probably one of the most scarring events in modern history in Virginia. Everybody knows where they were, and everybody knew somebody connected to it.

We have revisited the cycle of shock, then anger, then calls for change, then wondering what the right changes were, and sympathy for the families. But we haven't really changed, and I would just humbly submit that I think there are things that we can do—reasonable things we can do that will bring some accountability. It will not eliminate these instances. It is beyond our power to eliminate evil. We cannot do that. We have to be humble about it. But in every area we work on, we can work in this body with the thought that we can do things that will make situations better and that will promote incremental improvements.

RESPONSIBLE TRANSFER OF FIREARMS ACT

Mr. President, I wish to speak about a bill that I am going to introduce called the Responsible Transfer of Firearms Act. As we all know, current Federal law prohibits nine categories of people from getting weapons. Probably the most known are convicted felons, people who have been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous, and people who are under domestic violence prevention orders.

This is a bipartisan Federal law. Categories have been added over time in a bipartisan way by the House and the Senate. As far as I know, there is bipartisan support for this provision because you never see bills introduced to eliminate these categories of what I will call prohibited persons. These are people whom many in Congress—bipartisanly and bipartisanly—have determined should not possess weapons.

Now, the problem is a whole lot of those people do get weapons because folks either give or sell them to them.

What is the current law with respect to giving or selling a weapon to somebody who is prohibited?

The current law basically is kind of a no-responsibility law. You are criminally liable if you give or sell a weapon to somebody who is in those nine prohibited categories, but you are only criminally liable if you knew or should have known that they were prohibited. I practiced law for a while. That makes prosecution virtually impossible, because somebody will give somebody a

weapon or sell it to them and then they will say: Well, I didn't know he was a felon. I didn't know he had been adjudicated mentally ill or dangerous.

There is no obligation on behalf of the seller. Now, we have put obligations on sellers all the time—affirmative duties and obligations—but in this area, we don't put an obligation on the part of a seller other than a registered and licensed gun dealer, who must go through a background check. We don't put any kind of obligation on anybody to do even minimal, reasonable steps to make sure that somebody is lawfully able to possess a weapon.

So what the Responsible Transfer of Firearms Act would do is it would revise the current formula. The current formula does have a liability for sellers but only under an elevated standard that really is almost impossible to meet. We would amend the Federal code, not to change the nine categories—those are the same—not to change the punishments for selling or transferring to them—that would stay the same—but we adjust the responsibility. It is a responsibility and accountability act.

So if you are putting a weapon in somebody's hands, either selling it or transferring it, you have to take "reasonable steps" to determine that the recipient is not prohibited from having that weapon. "Reasonable steps" is included in the statute—just those words. We don't say: You can only do that by showing one of the following five things. You can take any reasonable steps you think are necessary, but you have to take reasonable steps.

That is what this change in law would do. If you cannot show satisfaction to a court that you have taken reasonable steps, then you will be liable for putting the weapon into somebody's hands whom the Federal Government has said is not able to possess such a weapon.

This shift from the current framework would promote accountability and responsibility. Why should we let a seller just casually put a firearm into the hands of somebody who is prohibited by law from having it? Why should we do that? Why shouldn't there be some minimal accountability for a seller who is putting a weapon in the hands of somebody who has been determined not able to possess a weapon?

We put burdens on sellers. This is not a precise analogy, but if you go in and try to buy beer in a place, you are going to get carded. Why is that? Well, because we have put an affirmative burden on the sale of alcohol so that the seller has to make some effort to determine that the recipient is not prohibited from having it. We do the same thing with tobacco. There are other laws that put burdens on sellers as well, and this a minimal one—take reasonable steps.

To me the lives of some of these people who have been gunned down in those horrible crimes are just worth it. Let's just take reasonable steps. The

reasonable steps won't solve all the cases, but it will help keep weapons out of the hands of those whom we have determined, in this body, shouldn't have them.

I close and just say this: Of course, we have to be humble enough to acknowledge there is no one solution to the epidemic of gun violence nor is there a complete solution to it. There is nothing that we can do that will eliminate the possibility that we could wake up tomorrow and see the same thing on TV. Human beings will do evil things. That is not going to change. That is not going to be eliminated by what we do here.

But what we do as legislators in legislation is basically believe—and if we didn't believe this, we wouldn't be in this body—that as we legislate, we can improve situations. We cannot eliminate the possibility, but we can improve it. We can make it less likely that one of these prohibited individuals will get a weapon in their hands and use it against others.

So I just conclude where I started.

Alison and Adam were wonderful people. This is a community that is still really grieving. What compounds grief in my experience—not as a legislator but as a person—what compounds and deepens grief is a sense of hopelessness. Wow, this horrible thing happened. We have had this horrible loss, and there is nothing we can do about it. That tends to turn grief into despair and depression.

Sadly, I was Governor when the shooting at Virginia Tech took place, and I had to deal with 32 families and more who had been injured, and the broader community was hurting so much. When you have gone through an experience—and we see this in our own personal life because everybody has had grief in their own personal lives. If you go through an experience where there is a lot of grief and loss and you feel that it is pointless or there is nothing you can do to improve it or transform it into something better or improve it so that maybe somebody else won't have to suffer through the same experience, that tends to take grief and turn it into something even more damaging—despair and hopelessness. I think one of the things we are called to do as legislators in situations where there is grief is to show there is some hope we can improve, because I believe we can improve. I have seen too many instances legislatively and in the lives of people that we can improve and we can get better, and as a nation we need to get better on this issue. This bill won't do it all, but I think it will be a sensible way to get better and to show those who are suffering and maybe even despairing under this epidemic of gun violence that we are not just going to accept it and sink deeper into despair and grief, but grab on to it and try to make improvements.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the Iran nuclear deal. We are here today because several months ago Senators CORKER and CARDIN, the respective chair and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee worked out an agreement to allow us to have this debate voted on here in the Senate, and there were 98 votes in support of allowing a vote on the Iranian nuclear agreement. In fact, it went to the President's desk, and the President then signed it into law. That set in place a process, which is where we end up today.

I certainly hope our colleagues who voted for this allow us to have that debate. It is an important debate. It has serious consequences for America's national security interests, and it certainly is something that shouldn't be minimized in any way. The American people need to have their voices heard in this discussion, which will take place if we are allowed to get on that resolution here in the U.S. Senate.

So I would hope that our colleagues on the other side—there was some discussion I read reporting of statements made by the President or by members of his administration, statements made by some of our colleagues here that perhaps they might block us from even proceeding to this resolution. I think that would be a big mistake. It would be a tragic outcome with respect to something that is this important to America's national security. It certainly is something which the American people deserve and have a right to have their voices heard.

So I am looking forward to this discussion. I hope throughout the course of the next few days we will have a chance to air this out because it is clear that one of the greatest threats to our national security is the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran and a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, President Obama's Iran nuclear deal, which is really a nuclear concessions deal, increases rather than decreases that possibility.

There are numerous reasons to be concerned about a nuclear-armed Iran. Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. That is well documented. It has been talked about a lot. Iran actively supports Hezbollah and Hamas, both of which pose an immediate threat to our ally Israel.

Iran incites regional instability, supporting the Houthis in Yemen and the Assad regime in Syria. Iran continues to commit human rights abuses against its own people, and Iran has a history of taking extreme measures to hide its nuclear enrichment program from the international community.

In response to Iran's nuclear activities 9 years ago, in 2006, the U.N. and the United States began to impose sanctions on Iran's nuclear enrichment

program. These sanctions were dramatically increased in 2010. The sanctions targeted Iranian businesses and financial institutions as well as members of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or IRGC, who were responsible for killing hundreds of Americans and froze Iranian assets that would have been used by Iran to support terrorism throughout the region. This had a tremendous impact, effectively bringing Iran to its knees.

Thanks to the pressures the sanctions exerted on Iran's economy, Iran's leadership was under immense pressure to negotiate with the United States and its allies. In 2013 Iran agreed to engage in talks regarding its nuclear program. However, soon after Iran agreed to come to the negotiating table, the Obama administration inexplicably began making concession after concession, with Iran giving up very little in return. The result—a weak deal that is highly unlikely to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear power.

We have already heard from many of my colleagues why this agreement is a bad deal. Once this deal goes into effect, right off the bat Iran will have access to roughly \$140 billion, which even President Obama and Secretary Kerry acknowledge would be partly used to finance terrorism. The deal will also increase access to conventional weapons, allowing Iran to defend its nuclear infrastructure from military strike. By lifting the ban on ballistic missiles, Iran will be able to purchase a delivery system capable of carrying a nuclear warhead well beyond the confines of the Middle East. The deal will also allow Iran to continue its research and development into advanced centrifuges, permitting Iran to modernize its enrichment infrastructure and reducing the breakout period for a nuclear weapon to a few weeks instead of months.

The outcome of this agreement will be a more prosperous, better armed, more dangerous Iran, exerting its regional influence and continuing to sponsor terror. All of that will be achieved without Iran violating the terms of the agreement.

However, if Iran does decide to cheat, this deal will make that more possible. To begin with, for suspicious sites not currently on the list of Iran's nuclear facilities, Iran gets 24 days' notice before inspections can take place. Even more concerning, however, is the information leaked recently that the secret International Atomic Energy Agency agreement with Iran will allow Iran to provide its own soil samples to inspectors from enrichment sites such as the facility at Parchin. Think about that. The regime which has broken these agreements in the past and cheated in the past—again, well documented—will be able to furnish its own soil inspections.

Unfortunately, instead of acknowledging this when it was raised in committee, Secretary Kerry took on the role of apologist for Iran, defending the

deal by saying that private agreements with the IAEA are the norm. However, if the leaked information regarding soil samples is correct, this calls into question the entire credibility of the inspections regime. For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose President Obama's nuclear arms concession agreement with Iran, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

By rejecting this agreement, we can negotiate a better deal—one that will actually stop Iran's nuclear program and prevent Iran from getting a nuclear bomb. It is unfortunate that when we have the majority of the American people clearly opposing this deal that the President is not only willing to veto their opposition but to call doing so a victory.

I would like to expand a little bit of detail on some of the national security concerns with this nuclear agreement with Iran.

Since the Iran agreement was first announced in July, the Obama administration has repeatedly stated that we should at least give this deal a try, arguing that if Iran breaks its side of the agreement and pursues a nuclear weapon, we will have the same military options down the road that we have today. However, that is not true. We will not have the same options in the future that we have today. Right now, if a situation arose where Iran entered a breakout period and was pursuing a nuclear weapon, the United States or our allies in the region could conduct a targeted air strike on Iran's enrichment facilities.

For example, if we knew that Iran was using its nuclear enrichment facility at Fordow to enrich weapons-grade uranium, we could utilize our air superiority with bunker-buster bombs. Obviously, we would prefer to avoid a military strike, but if needed, we have that option, and Iran knows this.

However, under this agreement, in 10 years' time, Iran will have faster, far more efficient centrifuges that can operate in significantly smaller facilities that can be placed deeper underground with increased levels of fortification, making a military strike much more complex.

Right now Iran is using IR-1 centrifuges, which are basically 1960s technology; but under this agreement, starting around year 8, Iran can begin testing IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges. In fact, as stated in page 10 of Annex 1, after the agreement has been in place for 8½ years, Iran can construct up to 30 IR-6 centrifuges and 30 IR-8 centrifuges. Why is this so significant? IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges are far more advanced and estimated to be up to 15 times more efficient than the IR-1 centrifuges that they are using today. By increasing the efficiency of the enrichment process, Iran can significantly reduce the breakout period that is necessary to create a bomb.

On page 17 of Annex 1 of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, under

the section titled "Centrifuge Manufacturing," the agreement states that at the end of year 8:

Iran will commence manufacturing of IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges without rotors through year 10 at a rate of up to 200 centrifuges per year for each type.

The administration has repeatedly asserted that even if we destroyed Iran's enrichment facilities with an air strike, we can't turn back time and erase Iran's nuclear enrichment know-how.

While that may be true, we absolutely can and should prevent Iran from increasing its nuclear expertise, but this deal doesn't do that. Instead, it ensures Iran's knowledge will increase by solidifying its ability to develop more advanced centrifuges. Because these IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges are so much more efficient in speeding up the uranium enrichment process, they will make it far easier for Iran to conceal and protect its nuclear program.

Referring once again to the facility at Fordow, when Fordow was first constructed, it was built to contain 3,000 IR-1 centrifuges, which meant that the facility had to be significant in size. IR-8 centrifuges, however, are estimated to be 15 times more efficient than the IR-1 centrifuges used at Fordow, which means that by using IR-8 centrifuges, Iran could replicate the enrichment capability of a facility like Fordow with a building containing not 3,000 centrifuges, but only 200 centrifuges. Such a facility can be the size of a house. By reducing the size of the facilities by this magnitude, Iran could build many Fordows in multiple locations, hiding them more easily and putting them deeper underground. Such facilities could be built within existing mines, making them extremely difficult to find.

As mentioned before, this agreement guarantees Iran will have the manufacturing capacity it needs to build these advanced centrifuges. Even within the parameters of this agreement, Iran could manufacture 200 IR-6 centrifuges and 200 IR-8 centrifuges per year starting around year 8. Since Iran would already have the manufacturing capacity for building IR-8 centrifuges, it would merely need to ramp up the production beyond the terms of the agreement and in a short period of time it could have operating enrichment facilities in multiple locations throughout the country. By the time these violations had been discovered and conformed, the advanced centrifuges would likely be in place, and Iran would have likely enough enriched uranium for a bomb.

But there is much more to it than that. Currently, according to publicly available sources, Iran's air defense capabilities consist of domestically produced, short-range surface-to-air missiles and Russian made, longer range SA-2 and SA-5 surface-to-air missiles, as well as a few Chinese CSA-1s. These systems are vulnerable to electronic countermeasures and pose very little

threat to American or even Israeli aircraft.

However, that is not where Iran's air defenses will be in 10 years. Under this agreement, the ban on conventional weapons sales to Iran will be lifted after 5 years. Russia has already agreed to sell Iran four batteries of S-300 vehicle-launched surface-to-air missiles. Depending upon the sophistication of these S-300 missile systems, they may be able to engage aircraft up to 200 miles away.

As we saw last month with Iran unveiling its new solid-fuel missiles, Iran's domestic military infrastructure will not remain static. Over the next decade, as Iran acquires more and more increasingly advanced weapons systems, its area denial capability will make airstrikes even more difficult. Will a future American President, therefore, have the same military options that we have today, as President Obama and Secretary Kerry claim? The answer is no.

We will still have military options available to us, but the calculus for carrying out a targeted airstrike will be much different down the road. Therefore, it is not realistic for President Obama to claim that future Presidents will have the same military options against Iran we have today. And the more the realistic possibility of a military strike decreases, the more likely Iran will be to violate the terms of the agreement and go after a bomb.

In 10 years' time, under this agreement, our best hope for Iran not attaining a nuclear weapon will be the Iranian Government voluntarily deciding it doesn't want one. That is not something I am willing to bank on.

Madam President, I also want to speak for a moment about Iran's support for terrorism and the idea put forward by President Obama that Iran will spend most of the soon-to-be-acquired economic wealth on its own economy. Even if we assume Iran's military spending remains what it is today as a percentage of Iran's budget, what would that mean going forward?

Well, there are many estimates on how much Iran spends on its military. Some experts put the figure at around \$10 billion per year, while others estimate the figure to be closer to \$15 billion or even higher. In addition, of the amount spent on Iran's military, about 65 percent is spent on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps—the IRGC.

In the first year of this agreement, between unfrozen assets and increased revenue from oil sales, Iran is expected to see an initial influx of around \$140 billion. Now, using conservative numbers, if Iran's military spending stayed the same in this coming year as a percentage of GDP, it would increase to almost \$15 billion, with \$9.5 billion going to the IRGC.

One of the main national security concerns we have regarding the IRGC is that Iran uses it to support terrorist organizations. Iran is the main supporter of Hezbollah in Lebanon and

Hamas in Gaza, both of which have provoked conflicts with Israel in recent years.

In addition, Iran's support of instability in the region is well known, with the Iranian Government providing funding to the Houthis in Yemen and military assistance to Assad in Syria. Many of our own casualties in Iraq were the result of Iranian-made bombs provided to insurgents by the Iranian Quds Force.

Last summer, the missiles being launched at Israel out of Gaza were primarily imported from Iran. It is no wonder Israel has been so opposed to this deal.

Even the Iron Dome system, which proved so successful during the last Israeli-Palestinian conflict, can be overwhelmed if enough missiles are fired at once. And now Iran, a country bent on Israel's destruction, is going to see a huge increase in military spending.

Even the Quds Force commander, Qassem Suleimani, the man responsible for supplying Iraqi insurgents with bombs that killed U.S. soldiers, will see United Nations and European Union sanctions lifted as a result of this deal.

President Obama keeps arguing that the danger of a nuclear-armed Iran far outweighs the short-term impact of Iran's increased support for terrorism. As we have discussed, I don't think this agreement prevents Iran from getting a nuclear bomb. But even if my colleagues disagree with me on that point, are we really willing to trade the lives of our allies in the short term to try to achieve this goal? That is not a risk I am willing to take.

In urging my colleagues to vote against this deal, I would also like to speak for just a moment about what would happen if Congress is able to stop this deal?

The President keeps saying a “no” vote on this deal will lead to war. Well, that is unrealistic and a clear attempt by the President to garner support for the agreement by stoking people's fears.

Iran is very aware of its own military limitations, and it knows what the outcome of such a war would be. For Iran, in the short term, a much more realistic response would be for it to try to keep its side of the agreement in an attempt to gain United Nations and EU sanctions relief. However, despite this attempt, the United States could double down on the U.N. sanctions that were in place prior to the December framework and threaten to use secondary sanctions against foreign businesses who wish to do business with Iran.

Given the size of the U.S. economy compared to Iran, this is a powerful deterrent. Since Iran's economy is already hurting, maintaining sanctions would provide more leverage for the P5+1 to get a better deal.

However, another plausible outcome following congressional rejection of the

deal would be for Iran to try to capitalize on congressional disapproval by seeking to divide Russia and China from the West to undermine the multilateral sanctions regime. Iran could try to achieve this by implementing certain commitments from the agreement but not others.

But even if China and Russia wish to do business with Iran, they both still have an incentive to try to achieve the original goal of the negotiations. It is not in China's interest for a nuclear-armed Iran to cause greater instability with global energy prices, and Russia doesn't want an Islamist regime in its backyard, which is prone to regional conflicts, acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities.

These scenarios I am describing have already been echoed by a chorus of experts who have pointed out the flaws in this agreement and offered alternatives. The vote this week is not—is not—a choice between supporting a bad deal or going to war. The vote this week is an opportunity to reject a bad deal in order to achieve a better outcome.

That is what we ought to be doing, and I hope we get the chance to get on this resolution and that we have the chance to get a full debate here in the Senate where the people's voices can be heard. I hope when it is all said and done, Members here in the Senate will come to the same conclusion I and many of my colleagues have, which is that this is a bad deal for our country, it is a bad deal for our allies in the region, and there is a much better outcome that can be achieved if the Senate will reject this bad deal and get us back to negotiations where we can achieve a better outcome.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Roseann A. Ketchmark, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30

minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today we are going to vote on the nomination of Roseann Ketchmark. She has been nominated to be a Federal district judge in the Western District of Missouri. Now, this is only the sixth judicial nominee that we have voted on since the Senate Republicans took over the majority 8 months ago, so less than 1 a month. In fact, if we continue at this rate the Republican majority has established, the Senate this year will confirm the fewest number of judges in more than a half century—resulting in a judicial vacancy crisis. I am concerned because the Senate Republican leadership has refused to schedule timely confirmation votes for consensus judicial nominees which, I think, demonstrates an astounding neglect of the needs of our independent third branch, which borders on contempt.

I am proud to be a lawyer. I have practiced both in the criminal and civil bars and served as a prosecutor. I have appeared before many different courts. I look at the men and women who have been on our courts, and I say: Here is an example of the way the judicial system should be—something every country in the world wants to emulate. But now, we are treating that third branch almost with contempt—with partisan contempt—and that is going to hurt the whole of the Federal judiciary.

When Senate Democrats were in the majority, we worked hard to reduce the number of judicial vacancies to just 43—the lowest level since this President took office. This was accomplished through the unyielding efforts of then-Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats, who prioritized filling judicial vacancies so that our independent judiciary would be sufficiently staffed. Our success in reducing the number of judicial vacancies to such a level in 2014 was remarkable, given that we had begun the year with over 90 vacancies and the fact that Senate Republicans filibustered every single judicial nominee.

Throughout President Obama's tenure, we have seen Senate Republicans consistently prioritize partisan politics over the Senate's constitutional duty of advice and consent. Their relentless obstruction over the last 6 years has

resulted in an unacceptable number of vacancies—often hovering close to or exceeding 90. By the end of last year, the Senate made progress in reducing judicial vacancies to 43, but now we are seeing those gains reversed due to the Republicans' refusal to even schedule confirmation votes this year. In the 8 months since Republicans have been in the majority, judicial vacancies have increased by more than 50 percent. If Republicans keep on this dangerous course, we are heading to a judicial vacancy crisis. This is made worse by the fact that the number of Federal court vacancies deemed to be "judicial emergencies" by the non-partisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has increased by 158 percent since the beginning of the year. There are now 31 judicial emergency vacancies that are affecting communities across the country.

I am going to show a couple of things. Republicans campaigned last year on the promise they would govern responsibly if they won the majority, but instead they have created divisive issues that play openly to their political base. One needs to look no further than the recent show vote to defund critical health services for women.

I was in Vermont all last month. Everywhere I went—especially rural Vermont, where it is so difficult and so essential to get health care to women—they are asking: Why do the Republicans want to cut off the health care for women in rural parts of our country? Rather than spending 2 days in an unnecessary political exercise, the Senate should have voted to confirm the many judicial nominees pending on the calendar. In fact, rather than pushing bills to strip funding from local law enforcement for obeying the rules on immigration enforcement, we should be confirming judges to ensure our entire criminal justice system works for everyone.

Let's give one example. The last 2 years of President Bush's tenure in office, the Democrats controlled the Senate. By this time, we had confirmed 26 of his judges. Now, with exactly the same situation, with Republicans controlling, they have only allowed five judges. What we did as Democrats for President Bush, we put through five times as many judges as Republicans have for President Obama. What you are seeing actually is we are going to politicize the Federal courts.

Supporting and strengthening our Federal judiciary is not a Democratic or Republican priority; it is a fundamental and constitutional duty of the Senate that we all must share. In fact, the Senate Republican leadership's decision to shirk this body's constitutional duty of advice is doing the most harm to States with at least one Republican Senator. Of the 67 current vacancies that exist, 48 of them—or more than 70 percent—are in States with at least one Republican Senator. Texas, for example, has nine judicial vacancies. Seven of those nine are considered

judicial emergencies. Incredibly, one of those district court positions has been vacant for over 4 years. A Fifth Circuit position in Texas has been vacant for more than 3 years. Pennsylvania and Alabama face similar crises. They have six and five current vacancies, respectively. Federal courts in several other States are grappling with extended vacancies. They desperately need to be filled.

The length of time that some of these vacancies have remained unfilled is staggering. In Texas, none of these vacancies currently have nominees because the Texas Senators have been slow in providing recommendations to the President. A similar pattern can be seen with the Alabama vacancies, where two of the positions have been vacant for over 2 years, and another has remained vacant for over 1½ years.

In Pennsylvania, there are six current vacancies and five nominees pending. Senate Republicans should be trying to move these nominees as expeditiously as possible. Of great concern is the treatment of Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo, who will fill an emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Judge Restrepo was unanimously confirmed 2 years ago by the Senate to serve as a district court judge in Pennsylvania. I have heard no objection to his nomination, yet it took 7 months just to get him a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

Judge Restrepo has strong bipartisan support from both Pennsylvania Senators, and he was voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote. Once confirmed, Judge Restrepo will become the first Hispanic judge from Pennsylvania to serve on this court and only the second Hispanic judge ever to serve on the Third Circuit. No Senate Democrat opposes a vote on his nomination. Senate Republicans are the only thing holding up his nomination. I hope the Republican Senator from Pennsylvania will implore his leadership to bring this highly qualified nominee up for a vote. The continued delay of Judge Restrepo is a poor reflection on this body.

In the Western District of New York, located in Buffalo, there is not a single active Federal district judge, even though it has one of the busiest case-loads in the country. And there are more criminal cases than in Washington, DC, Boston, Cleveland, and they don't have a single active judge because Republicans will not allow a vote, up or down, even though they have the majority. If you don't like the judge, you vote them down. They will not even allow a vote. I should note that the highly qualified nominee to serve in Buffalo was voted unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee. They will not allow them to have a vote on the Senate floor.

Look at this, how we brought vacancies down when we controlled the Senate, and now look at how they shoot up when the Republicans control the Senate. It makes no sense at all. In fact, as

I said earlier, the Republican-controlled Senate allowed confirmation votes on just five judges—one, two, three, four, five. They have taken vacations, recesses, long weekends, and leave early—but we don't have time to vote on judges, which are normally unanimous votes anyway.

We are going to vote on the sixth today. Whoop-de-i-ay. Good for us. My goodness gracious. It hasn't been this way before. As I said, when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in the last 2 years of President Bush's term, I had put through 26 judges by now. The Republicans have only allowed five judges. This kind of partisanship is really wrong. In fact, it is on pace to be the lowest in recent history.

President Eisenhower had 47 judges confirmed in his last 2 years in office; President Reagan had 85 judges confirmed his last 2 years in office; President Clinton had 73 judges confirmed his last 2 years in office; and President George W. Bush had 68 judges confirmed his last 2 years in office. This is a clear double standard that is being applied to President Obama's nominees.

Republicans can provide some real leadership if the majority leader would go ahead and allow for a vote on all 14 of the judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar. All of these nominees have bipartisan support and were voted out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote. Five of them would fill judicial emergency vacancies, including Judge Restrepo of Pennsylvania. Others would fill judicial emergencies in California, New York, and Tennessee. And the five nominees to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims have now been pending before the full Senate for a year or more.

Today we are voting on the nomination of Roseann Ketchmark to fill a judicial vacancy in the Federal district court in the Western District of Missouri. She has spent her entire 25-year legal career as a prosecutor on both the State and Federal levels. Since 2001, Ms. Ketchmark has served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney with the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Missouri. During her time in the U.S. Attorney's Office, Ms. Ketchmark has served in supervisory and management capacities as both the First Assistant U.S. Attorney and as the Executive Assistant Attorney. She began her legal career as an Assistant Prosecutor in Kansas City, MO, at the Jackson County Prosecutor's Office, and subsequently joined the Platte County Prosecutor's Office in Platte City, MO, as a First Assistant Prosecutor. Ms. Ketchmark has the bipartisan support of her two home State Senators, Senator McCASKILL and Senator BLUNT. She was voted out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote more than 4 months ago. She has a strong background as a criminal prosecutor and I will support her nomination.

The majority leader has spoken recently about his desire to avoid an-

other Republican-led government shut-down. I agree, the American people deserve something better than obstructionist shutdowns. While the focus has been on the threat of Republicans shutting down the government over women's health services, the Senate Republicans have virtually shut down the judicial confirmation process. It is harming our justice system in the short and long term.

I have spoken to a number of Republican Senators who realize this is wrong. These are the same Senators who came to me at the time of President Bush and asked: Can you move these judges, even though you are in charge? And I said, of course, we will. Some have come sheepishly and said: We are sorry we didn't return the favor. What I say is reverse course; I urge Senate Republicans to reverse course and realize the short-term partisan decisions are undermining the ability of the judicial system to serve our communities.

Tonight's vote to confirm a district court nominee from Missouri is long overdue. I urge the Senate Republican leadership to schedule votes for the remaining 13 consensus judicial nominees on the Executive Calendar. They could all be done tomorrow morning in half an hour's time.

I have been in the Senate longer than any Member of this body. I have been here in the majority and the minority, numerous times in both. I have been here with Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents, with the Republican leaders—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. I see nobody else seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent for another 3 minutes.

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

Mr. LEAHY. I have been here with both Republican and Democratic leadership of this body, Republican and Democratic Presidents. I have never, in 41 years, seen the Federal judiciary treated in such a cavalier, mean-spirited and, I would say, irresponsible fashion. I know most Senators want to do the right thing. Let's start doing it. This Third Branch of government should be treated with respect. If you have a person who is not competent who is nominated, then vote them down, but if they are competent, let's have a vote on it. Let's not have this.

You are not going to find good men and women to agree to serve on the Federal bench if they think they are going to be delayed for partisan reasons for a year or more at a time. We can do better. We are all proud of our Federal judiciary. It is the best in the world, but this kind of partisanship could turn it into one of the worst in the world. This Senator does not want to see that happen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roseann A. Ketchmark, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri?

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 263 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Rubio
Markey	Udall

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from South Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

CELEBRATING LABOR DAY AND AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. BROWN. President Lincoln said:

It has so happened in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and it should not continue.

Early in President Obama's term, I printed out that quote and handed it to him because it underscores to me the value of labor and the wealth that labor creates for our country, our society, and for those workers and their families. I gave the President that quote because it is my hope that all of us as elected officials remember how important it is that we stand up for workers, organized and unorganized, labor union and nonlabor union members.

It is important to stand up for the workers who have built this country. They laid down the railroad tracks that move people and products across the country. They work on shop floors. They innovate as they labor. They toil in mines. They dug the coal that would power our trains and our factories. These workers built our strong middle class and they continue to be the backbone of our economy.

Over the past month, as many of us did in our States, I visited factory floors across Ohio. At each stop, I witnessed the ingenuity and dedication of workers. Last Thursday I visited All American Clothing in Arcanum, OH. It is a family business and a classic American success story. In 2002, Lawson Nickol worked for a blue jeans manufacturing company. He watched as his company outsourced more and more of its operations, more and more of its production to other countries. Lawson Nickol was appalled as he saw coworkers and friends losing their jobs all the way down the supply chain of this company. He knew he had to do something.

He left his job and he founded All American Clothing Company in Darke County, a rural county west and north of Dayton, OH. He started making jeans in Arcanum, OH.

The first few years were difficult. The company survived on family savings, taking financial risks, working long hours, and having a little bit of luck. But 13 years later, All American is proof that you should never bet against American workers. The jeans

aren't only made in Ohio; they are made in other places all over this country. The company is growing. The company expanded in 2012 with the help of a \$150,000 low-interest CDBG development loan. Its products are 100 percent American made and support Ohio jobs.

Lawson's business is a family affair. His son, B.J. Nickol, is a co-owner and company president. B.J. told me that "it is not about greed for us. It is about giving people jobs and making a decent living."

Travel across Ohio and across the country, and you will find more companies like All American thriving on the talent, tenacity, and hard work, blood, sweat, toil, and tears of American workers.

I visited an Airstream plant in Shelby County and a Continental ContiTech plant in St. Mary's. I toured the Honda Logistics North America plant in East Liberty and the GE Testing Facility in Peebles. I attended the grand opening of the Hart Schaffner Marx suit facility in Brooklyn, OH, a suburb of Cleveland.

I wear this suit today, made in Cleveland, OH, by union workers in a Hugo Boss plant. Since then that plant has been sold to Hart Schaffner Marx, which is opening its production right now. When I visited that plant in my Hugo Boss suit and talked about the fact that this suit had been made at this plant with 150 unionized workers, a worker walked up to me and said, "Senator," and she touched me on the chest and said, "I made that pocket." All of these operations are flourishing because of Ohio workers.

While our workers support our economy, we are not doing enough to support them. Too often workers have no paid sick leave, no paid family leave, and no overtime pay.

President Obama is taking important steps to help working families. New overtime rules would expand overtime pay so that 40 percent of salaried workers would be eligible. Think of it this way. A worker—an employee who is the shift manager on the second shift at a fast-food restaurant who is classified as management may be making only \$30 or \$35,000 a year. They work that worker more than 40 hours a week. Yet that worker gets no overtime because that worker is classified as supervisory. That is wrong. Under the President's plan, the rule he passed down, 160,000 more Ohioans will earn overtime pay for the work they are already doing at their place of business.

This week the administration announced that Federal contractors will be required to provide up to 7 days of paid sick leave each year. It will mean 300,000 Americans working on Federal contracts will be able to stay home if they get sick or take a day off to care for a sick child. It means they are less likely to show up to work when they might infect somebody else with the illness they have, so everybody is more productive. These are important steps, but there are limits to Executive action.

Too many workers are left without paid sick leave, without maternity leave, without overtime pay, without predictable work schedules. Too many women still earn less than men for the same work. The President, through Executive action, can solve some of this, as he should, as he is given power by Congress to do, but we need legislative action.

Previous generations of workers fought for the protections we take for granted: child labor laws, workplace safety protections, unemployment insurance. They fought in union halls, they organized in union halls and church basements. They demanded a government that respects the dignity of work, that passes laws recognizing the decency and dedication of workers.

After decades of attacks on our unions, laws are often the only protections workers have. Fifty years ago, one in three workers was a member of a union—one-third of workers were members of unions. Now that number is 1 in 10. That is why action from this body is needed more than ever. Workers, when they are organized, when they have a union, are protected so they are paid the overtime they earn. They are protected often with provided sick leave and maternity leave. They are protected because of their union from injury in the workplace.

Because not as many people belong to unions today—that is why we need to pass the Healthy Families Act, we need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, we need to pass the Schedules That Work Act, and we need to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This is action we can take today in celebration of Labor Day that would make a tremendous difference in the lives of American workers who built this economy.

This past weekend, we celebrated Labor Day with picnics and barbecues and time spent with families, we issued statements honoring American workers. Let's not just honor them with words, let's honor them with deeds. Let's move forward in a way that puts labor, that puts the American worker front and center.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'S ACQUISITION OF THOMAS JEFFERSON'S PERSONAL LIBRARY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this year is the 200th anniversary of one of the wisest decisions Congress ever made. In 1815, Congress acquired the entirety of Thomas Jefferson's personal library to

replace Congress's library, which was burnt by the British Army the previous year.

I would like to take a few moments to recognize this anniversary and to focus on the good work one small Library of Congress program does today.

Though the Library of Congress was established in 1800, for the first 15 years of its existence it was mainly a law library. It was not until the acquisition of Jefferson's personal library that the Library became the broad repository of knowledge that it is today. Some Members of Congress opposed the idea of buying Jefferson's entire library, which included books in many languages, and on a variety of topics, including science, math, philosophy, and religion. However, Thomas Jefferson famously replied, "I do not know that it contains any branch of science which Congress would wish to exclude from their collection; there is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer." Fortunately, this view won the day, and today the Library contains an unparalleled number of items from every branch of knowledge, making it the largest library in the world.

Forever growing, the Library of Congress receives 20,000 new items every day. However, only about half are kept for the Library's permanent collection. It is the program designed to bridge that divide which has grown to touch so many Oregonians, as well as regular folks around the country.

The Library of Congress's Surplus Books Program takes the books not needed for the Library's collections and provides them to schools, libraries, and nonprofit institutions around the country. Each week, staff from my office are able to select books, box them up, and send them to Oregon.

One recipient in Oregon has been the new library in Halsey, OR. Halsey is a small town, but the community has come together to build a fantastic new library. I have been able to send them several hundred new books to help them grow and diversify their collection. I expect to be able to send them hundreds more, thanks to the Library of Congress's Surplus Books Program.

I would be remiss if I failed to recognize Joseph Maher, acquisitions specialist and librarian for the Surplus Books Program. Mr. Maher almost singlehandedly runs the program and often goes above and beyond to identify books for particular organizations. Mr. Maher works to find a good home for each of the books, while simultaneously balancing the needs of the many congressional offices, schools, universities, and Federal agencies that select books from the program. He works tirelessly knowing that the books they send around the country are going to make a positive impact on many lives.

Reading sparks creativity, learning, passion, and imagination, and the Library of Congress continues to help ignite it. I could not be more pleased to

see communities in Oregon benefitting from this program.

CONGRATULATING KATIE ROTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to congratulate a constituent and a great friend of mine, Katie Roth of West Des Moines. This summer Katie was named the 2015 Woman Business Owner of the Year, presented by the Business Record.

In the spring of 2005, Katie, who is never shy to take on a challenge, opened her own staffing agency and has built it from the ground up. Ten years later, Portico Staffing has thrived under her exceptional leadership, business savvy, and highly regarded reputation as a people person. Katie knows how to build relationships and find opportunities needed to grow a business. Along the way, she has helped countless Iowa employers and job-seekers find one another. You might say she is a perfect matchmaker. For the last decade, Katie has worked hard to carve out a slice of the American dream by owning and growing her own business. She knows it comes with sacrifice and risk. And she has worked hard to make her dream come true. Katie is a great mentor and role model for the next generation. She shows that perseverance and persistence pay off. Always on the job, whether networking in the community or listening to her clients, Katie makes good connections happen. And that is a good thing for job seekers and employers looking to hire and grow their business.

Katie was nominated by her peers for consideration of this prestigious award. It is no surprise to me that my fellow Iowans would sing her praises. Without hesitation, I endorse Katie's selection as the 2015 Business Owner of the Year. I have had the pleasure of knowing Katie Roth since 1980 when she joined my first campaign for the U.S. Senate. Always a tireless worker, I have enjoyed watching Katie thrive and succeed throughout the years. A loving wife and mother, Katie is fiercely loyal and Barbara and I hold her in our highest regard.

Barbara and I extend our congratulations to Katie Roth for this well-deserved honor. We wish her the very best as she blazes the trail for many years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER KANSAS CITY CRIME STOPPERS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as co-chair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, I call to the attention of my colleagues an effective public-private partnership that was pioneered by the Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers.

This partnership, which empowers citizens to assist law enforcement on behalf of public safety, has been a model for the Nation, and beyond.

Crime Stoppers is separate from the police emergency phone system or other standard methods of contacting police, as it allows a member of the community to provide anonymous information about criminal activity. In 1982, the Kansas City Crime Commission launched a hotline for anonymous tips—Crime Stoppers. That first year, 30 tips came in, clearing 8 cases.

Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers emerged as a top program, earning global recognition. In 1999, Sergeant Craig Sarver of the Kansas City Police Department was named International—Crime Stoppers—Coordinator of the Year.

An innovator, Sergeant Sarver nurtured an idea that has evolved into a common tool for law enforcement.

In the summer of 2002, 19-year-old Ali Kemp was murdered in the pump house at a community swimming pool near Kansas City. Her father, Roger Kemp, suggested to police and the local office of Lamar Advertising Company that billboards could help find the killer.

Eventually, a tip generated by donated billboards helped resolve this case. A suspect was arrested in Connecticut, tried, and convicted.

Since then, "wanted" billboards have led to arrests in more than 20 murder cases in the Kansas City area. Sarver, who retired in 2008 after 33 years on the force, cites two reasons why billboards help generate solid tips for police.

First, he says, is the frequency of the message. Tipsters have said they had seen "wanted" billboards multiple times before they shared tips. Second is the emphasis on anonymity, important to those who fear retribution, according to Sergeant Sarver.

Now this tactic—to feature a tip line number on billboards along with a suspect's photo—is a common tool for law enforcement. In 2007 in Philadelphia, the FBI starting using donated electronic "digital" billboards to help find fugitives. The FBI calls these high-tech signs "force multipliers." Tips generated by digital billboards have resolved 53 FBI cases.

State and local police also rely on billboards to communicate with the public. After two inmates escaped prison in upstate New York in early June, New York State Police activated 50 digital billboards in four states.

Near St. Louis, a motorist opened fire on an Illinois State trooper during a traffic stop on June 23. The trooper was not injured, but the shooter fled. In southern Illinois, the District 11 State Police office is located near Mid America Outdoor Advertising in Collinsville, IL. Shortly after police asked Mid America for help, the suspect's photo appeared on a digital billboard along a high-traffic interstate en route to St. Louis. The suspect was arrested by the end of the week.

In Elyria, OH, the sheriff says 12 fugitives have been arrested thanks to tips prompted by digital billboards. Lorain County Sheriff Phil R. Stammitti describes these long-sought individuals as "very hard to locate."

Neil Mahan, the retired police chief from Janesville, WI, says billboards help police apprehend suspected criminals and deliver other information to the public. "For example," he wrote in *The Police Chief* magazine, "an elderly female suffering from Alzheimer's disease wandered away from family at a local shopping mall and was found by a citizen using the digital billboard information. When spring floods along the Rock River posed significant danger to the public, billboards were used to post warnings about the danger."

In conclusion, we know that public safety is enhanced when citizens are empowered to help law enforcement. I commend the Kansas City Crime Commission and Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers for their contributions in advancing a new communications tool that aides the cause of safety.●

RECOGNIZING THE JOHN R. ELLIOTT HERO CAMPAIGN FOR DESIGNATED DRIVERS

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers on the occasion of their 15th anniversary.

The John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers was created in 2000 following the tragic death of Navy ENS John R. Elliott in a drunk-driving related crash.

The campaign's mission is to prevent drunk driving-related crashes and deaths through the use of designated drivers. That mission has been a significant success across New Jersey, with many drivers citing the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign as a reason why they choose to serve as designated drivers.

Over the last 15 years, the organization has grown from a small group from Southern New Jersey, to an organization nationally recognized by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the National Commission Against Drunk Driving for its efforts.

The effects of the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign have gone beyond the Southern New Jersey region. Seven States across our Nation have adopted the HERO Campaign as their designated driver model in an effort to decrease drunk driving fatalities. The HERO Campaign has also partnered with the New York Giants, the Philadelphia Phillies, and other professional sports franchises in their mission to promote the use of designated drivers. These partnerships do not include the thousands of individuals across our Nation who have also registered as designated drivers at concerts and sporting events as a pledge to the HERO campaign.

The John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers was instrumental in the passage of John's Law, enacted in 2005, which gave States \$145 million in highway grant incentives for establishing car impoundment laws for drivers suspected of drunk driving.

The tragic circumstances surrounding Navy ENS John R. Elliott's crash have turned into a long history of meaningful accomplishments across not only New Jersey, but across our Nation. It is my hope that the legacy of John R. Elliott will live on and expand across our country.

I applaud the efforts of the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers and thank them for their efforts in making our roads safer across our country by promoting the use of designated drivers.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF L. MASON CAPITANI

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 50th Anniversary of L. Mason Capitani CORFAC International. It is a pleasure to commemorate this wonderful milestone in the history of a family-owned Michigan business.

Founded by L. Mason Capitani in 1965, L. Mason Capitani was a one-man operation until his son, Mason E. Capitani, joined the company. Mason displayed an affinity for industry, which helped the company blossom into the full-service brokerage and property management firm it is today. Mason E. still serves as the company's chairman, but a third generation of the Capitani family—Jason Capitani and Mason L. Capitani—are now managing most of the day-to-day operations of L. Mason Capitani.

Mason E. Capitani credits tenacity and careful planning as two of the keys to L. Mason Capitani's success over the past five decades. From its modest beginning, the company has grown into a global organization, with a reach that extends far beyond the State of Michigan. The company has followed a careful path of natural growth, where an honest understanding of its strengths and weaknesses, as well as the dynamics of a global market, have allowed L. Mason Capitani to thrive in a volatile industry.

The success of L. Mason Capitani is rooted in more than diligent planning. It is a reflection of the company's dedication to customer service, as well as its commitment to supporting a knowledgeable and talented workforce. The brokers, agents, and support staff at L. Mason Capitani are encouraged to provide high-quality customer service without jeopardizing their ethics, integrity, or dignity. An emphasis on integrity has allowed L. Mason Capitani to build relationships based on trust and experience. As a family business, its employees understand the company's success and the family's reputation are inseparable.

I applaud the employees of L. Mason Capitani for demonstrating the hard work and dedication to service required for 50 years of success. Family businesses like L. Mason Capitani are the main drivers of the economy in Michigan and across the United States. L. Mason Capitani is well aware of its role

in supporting economic opportunity and quality of life in communities across the State of Michigan, including Detroit, where the company embraces the opportunity for it to grow while contributing to efforts to rebuild one of America's great cities.

Again, I congratulate L. Mason Capitani CORFAC International on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. I appreciate its contributions to quality of life and economic vitality throughout the State of Michigan and wish it and its employees many more decades of success.●

REMEMBERING JOSEPH SCANLON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Island recently lost a good man and dedicated public servant. Joseph Scanlon, from Tiverton, passed away on August 24 with his family at his side. For all of us who knew him, this was very sad news.

Joe wore many hats during the course of his life. He served in the U.S. Army in the Korean war. He represented his hometown of Tiverton in the Rhode Island General Assembly. He worked for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Rhode Island for 10 years and was a member of the board of directors of Home Loan Investment Bank. He was active in local civic and charitable organizations, like the Fogarty Foundation, the Catholic Charity Fund, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, and the Rhode Island Heart Association, just to name a few. These items alone make for quite an impressive résumé.

But Joe will always be remembered for his service as administrative aide to the late U.S. Congressman Fernand St. Germain. For nearly three decades, Joe ran the Congressman's office in Rhode Island. During that time, Joe created an office which focused on helping constituents in their dealings with the Federal Government. Joe's work was and remains the gold standard for congressional offices and reflects Joe's deep-seated commitment to the people of Rhode Island.

In this time of partisanship and rancor, it is good to honor Joe's dedication to a simple goal: helping people. Joe seemed to like everyone he met, and he went out of his way to steer power of government to helping people, one by one, as he learned of their difficulties. He was a master of his craft.

Although it might not get as much attention as other aspects of the job, helping constituents navigate through their government is one of the most important roles we play as Members of Congress. Federal bureaucracy can be difficult, overwhelming, and frustrating. We can't seek special treatment, but we can ask questions and demand accountability, helping to cut the redtape that often stands in a constituent's way.

Joe knew the questions to ask and the people to call. He worked tirelessly with his staff. He returned calls and wrote letters promptly and exhausted

every option available to the constituent. Joe truly cared about Rhode Island and its people. And he got results.

Joe was very helpful to me in my run for Senate in 2006. After my election, I sought Joe's advice as I set up my office in Rhode Island. He gave generously of his time and expertise, and many, if not all, of his words of wisdom are in use in my office today. I will always be grateful to him for that.

I will also be grateful for his friendship through the years, and I will miss him dearly.

I send my condolences to Joe's beloved wife, Jeannine; his children, Deborah, Stephen, and Susan; and the entire Scanlon family. Rhode Island was fortunate to have had such a committed, energetic, and selfless citizen.

Godspeed, my friend.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 6, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 212. An act to amend the Safe Water Drinking Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1531. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

H.R. 2559. An act to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the en-

rolled bills were signed on August 6, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-2533. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-074); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2534. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-028); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2535. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-039); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2536. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-034); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2537. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2538. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2539. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; Correction" (FRL No. 9931-19-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2540. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Definitions of Low Pressure Gas Well and Storage Vessel" (FRL No. 9931-76-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2541. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932-05-Re-

gion 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2542. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM2.5 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932-04-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2543. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead (Pb) and the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)" (FRL No. 9926-72-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2544. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Atlanta; Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9932-20-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2545. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Miscellaneous Changes" (FRL No. 9932-25-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina; Certain Visibility Requirements for the 2008 Ozone Standards" (FRL No. 9932-30-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington" (FRL No. 9932-21-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9926-85-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2572. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives:

Honeywell International Inc. Turboprop Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2006-23706)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2573. A communication from the Management and Program Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2435)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2574. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Limited Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1177)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2575. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Pratt and Whitney Turboprop Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1127)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2576. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc.” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2434)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2577. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1123)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2578. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa ‘PZL-Bielsko’ Sailplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0951)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2579. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Category Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2962)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2580. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turboprop Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2581. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshaft Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0164)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2582. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class B Airspace; New Orleans, LA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2219)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2583. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dyersburg, TN” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0968)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2584. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Campbellsville, KY” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0458)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2585. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, SC” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0044)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2586. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Headland, AL” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0046)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2587. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revocation of Class D and Class E Airspace; Independence, KS” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0565)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2588. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bremerton, WA” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1067)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2589. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0045)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2590. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Revocation of Class E Airspace; Salem, OR” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1069)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2591. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Modification of Restricted Areas R-4501A, R-4501B, R-4501C, R-4501D, R-4501F, and R-4501H; Fort Leonard Wood, MO” ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0640)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2592. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (23); Amdt. No. 3650” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2593. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendment No. 521” ((RIN2120-AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2594. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22); Amdt. No. 3647” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2595. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (54); Amdt. No. 3648” (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2596. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (6); Amdt. No. 3649” (RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2597. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XE064) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2598. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery by Non-Rockfish Program Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western and Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska” (RIN0648-XE064) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2599. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” (RIN0648-XE072) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2600. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries” (RIN0648-BD64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2601. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery” (RIN0648-XE073) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2602. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications” (RIN0648-

XD742) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2603. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels” (RIN0648-XE084) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2604. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XD079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2605. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery” (RIN0648-XE005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2606. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries” (RIN0648-XE007) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2607. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean” (RIN0648-XD972) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2608. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2015” (RIN0648-BF19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2609. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Regional Framework Amendment” (RIN0648-BE40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2610. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries,

Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Recreational Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna” (RIN0648-BE78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2611. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Acetic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance” (FRL No. 9930-20-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2612. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance” (FRL No. 9930-06-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2613. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances” (FRL No. 9931-30-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2614. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, et al.; Revising Determination of Sales History” (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0091; FV15-929-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2615. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Amendment of Asian Longhorned Beetle Quarantine Areas in Massachusetts and New York” (Docket No. APHIS-2015-0016) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2616. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fruit, Vegetable, and Specialty Crops—Import Regulations; Changes to Reporting Requirements to Add Electronic Form Filing Option” (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0093; FV15-944/980/999-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2617. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments” (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0042) received during adjournment of the Senate in

the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2618. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents; Final Rule" (RIN0790-AJ10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2619. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contracts or Delivery Orders Issued by a Non-DoD Agency" (RIN0750-AI63) (DFARS Case 2014-D014) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2620. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Personnel Supporting U.S. Armed Forces Deployed Outside the United States" (RIN0750-AI45) (DFARS Case 2014-D023) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2621. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" (RIN0750-AI52) (DFARS Case 2014-D006) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2622. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisition of the American Flag" (RIN0750-AI51) (DFARS Case 2014-D005) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2623. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Network Penetration Reporting and Contracting for Cloud Services" (RIN0750-AI61) (DFARS Case 2013-D018) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2624. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Item Unique Identification Prescription Correction" (RIN0750-AI65) (DFARS Case 2014-D021) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2625. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine

Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2626. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David R. Hogg, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2627. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2628. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methane Sulfonic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9931-07-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lavanduly Senecioate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930-16-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9930-18-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2632. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2633. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" (RIN3064-AE27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2634. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2635. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program"; to the

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2636. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2637. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2638. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration Process for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants" (RIN3235-AL05) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2639. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporate Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pay Ratio Disclosure" (RIN3235-AL47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2640. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards; Final Rule" (RIN3133-AE40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2641. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chartering and Field of Membership Manual" (RIN3133-AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2642. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Updating Regulations Governing HUD Fees and the Financing of the Purchase and Installation of Fire Safety Equipment in FHA-Insured Healthcare Facilities" (RIN2502-AJ27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2643. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Derivatives" (RIN3133-AD90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2644. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions Addition to the Entity List to Prevent Violations of Russian Industry Sector Sanctions" (RIN0694-AG66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office

of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2645. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015-2017 Enterprise Housing Goals" (RIN2590-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2646. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Freedom of Information Act Regulation" (RIN2501-AD57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2647. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2648. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2649. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions" (RIN0694-AG13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2650. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2651. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Clothes Washers" (RIN1904-AC97) (Docket No. EERE-2013-BT-TP-0009) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2652. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2653. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Definitions and Standards for Grid-Enabled Water Heaters" (RIN1904-AD55)

(Docket No. EERE-2015-BT-STD-0017)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2654. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations" ((RIN1902-0128) (Docket No. RM12-11-003)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2655. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Regulations; Exemption for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board" (RIN1090-AB10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2656. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the final map and boundary for the Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River in Oregon, added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2657. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for External Power Supplies" ((RIN1904-AD36) (Docket No. EERE-2014-BT-TP-0043)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2658. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 5, 2015, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 28, 2015:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment.

S. 1251. A bill to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted at Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007 (Rept. No. 114-120).

S. 1315. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions (Rept. No. 114-121).

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1493. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-122).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany H.R. 1531, A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-123).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1137. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 36

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 36, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 298

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

S. 417

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 417, a bill to encourage spectrum licensees to make unused spectrum available for use by rural and smaller carriers in order to expand wireless coverage.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of

S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1150

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1375

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1375, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1504

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1504, a bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenants not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for

workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1608

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1608, a bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1812

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1812, a bill to protect public safety by incentivizing State and local law enforcement to cooperate with Federal immigration law enforcement to prevent the release of criminal aliens into communities.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1832

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1832, a bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1836

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1836, a bill to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to ensure State and local compliance with all Federal immigration detainers on aliens in custody and for other purposes.

S. 1844

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1844, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for voluntary country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken.

S. 1852

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1852, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure health insurance coverage continuity for former foster youth.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1878

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program.

S. 1886

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1886, a bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 and for other purposes.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1932

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1932, a bill to provide States with flexibility to use Federal IV-E funding for State child welfare programs to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for all children who need child welfare services.

S. 1944

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1944, a bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans.

S. 1957

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1957, a bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery.

S. 1981

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1981, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. RES. 108

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 108, a resolution commemorating the discovery of the polio vaccine and supporting efforts to eradicate the disease.

S. RES. 237

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 237, a resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance

Army for continuing to perpetrate crimes against humanity, war crimes, and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government, the African Union, and governments and regional organizations in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield and promote protection and recovery of affected communities.

S. RES. 242

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 242, a resolution celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, a resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2642. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2641 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2643. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2644. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike line three and all that follows and insert:

That Congress does not favor the agreement transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, under subsection (a) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e) for purposes of prohibiting the taking of any action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to such agreement under subsection (c)(2)(B) of such section.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2642. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2641 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 2643. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2644. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into ac-

count for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”.

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “6” and insert “7”.

CELEBRATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 243.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 243) celebrating the 35th anniversary of the Small Business Development Centers of the United States.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be

agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 5, 2015, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand appointments were made during the adjournment of the Senate, and I ask they be stated for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, appoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable BEN SASSE of Nebraska.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: David Schiappa of Maryland.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 7 p.m. also be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that the time from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. be controlled by the Democrats and the time from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:25 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CLARE E. CONNORS, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII, VICE SUSAN OKI MOLLWAY, RETIRING.

STEPHANIE A. GALLAGHER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, VICE WILLIAM D. QUARLES, JR., RETIRING.

MARY S. MCELROY, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, VICE MARY M. LISI, RETIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

EDWARD L. GILMORE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DARRYL KEITH MCPHERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL E. FLANAGAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID W. SILVA II

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. PHILIP R. SHERIDAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. LABARGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KRISTAN L. K. HERICKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JODY J. DANIELS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KYLE J. WELD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW P. TARJICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN S. ACKISS
CORNELIUS L. ALLEN, JR.
JONATHAN E. ALLEN
REGAN J. ALLEN
JACQUELINE E. BAIRD
CHRISTOPHER W. BAKER
KAREN A. BAKER
PATRICK J. BAKER
JACKSON L. BALL
THERON P. BALLARD
JEROME K. BARNARD
CHRISTOPHER P. BARTOS
RICHARD T. BASYE
PAUL B. BEDNAR
JASON A. BERDOU
DANIEL J. BIDEITTI
WALTER M. BIELECKI
BOYD R. BINGHAM
CHAD J. BLACKETER
RON L. BLANCH
BRYAN A. BLITCH
DANGELO A. BLOUNT
JAMES E. BLUMAN
THOMAS R. BOLAND
FREEMAN T. BONNETTE
ALFRED S. BOONE
JOSEPH M. BOROVICKA
PETER C. BOYER

HENRY C. BROWN
MIRYAM D. C. BRUNSON
PAUL F. BUSHEY
PETER A. CAGGIANO II
SHAWN M. CALVERT
JOSIEL CARRASQUILLOMORALES
JEFFREY P. CHAMBERLAIN
MARTIN J. CHEMAN
MICHAEL C. CHERRY
JASON C. CHRISTENSON
STEPHEN L. CHRISTIAN
ERIC P. CHRISTIANSEN, JR.
HEATHER J. CLANCY
JAMES G. CLARK
WILLIAM J. CLARK
ERIC S. CLARKE
JOHN D. CLEMONS
JARED L. CLINGER
ANDY R. CLINKSCALES
FRANKIE C. COCHIAOSUE
KIM M. COHEN
ADAM J. COLLINS
JAMES D. COOK
ARMANDO V. CORRAL
CHRISTOPHER COURTLAND
BRIAN M. COZINE
DANA E. CROW
STEPHEN M. CROW
LANCE J. CULVER
SHERMOAN L. DAIYAAN
KENNETH R. DARNALL
PAUL R. DAVIS
LARRY R. DEAN
VICTOR M. DIAZ III
MICHAEL D. DOLGE
BRIAN T. DONAHUE
JOHN C. DOSS
AMY E. DOWNING
GERALD J. D. DUENAS
THERESA L. ELLISON
PATRICK C. EVANS
BRYAN J. FENCL
GREGORY A. FEND
KIMBERLY A. FERGUSON
DAWN M. PICK
ALAIN G. FISHER
MARC J. FLEURANT
CASSANDRA N. FORRESTER
MISTI L. FRODYMA
ALEXANDER GARCIA
OMAR GARCIA
VINCENTE GARCIA
CHAE GAYLES
JAMES J. GEISHAKER
MATTHEW M. GOMEZ
ERIC M. GOULDTHORPE
JOSEPH A. GRANTDE, JR.
JESSIE K. GRIFFITH III
ADAM M. GRIM
STEVEN D. GUTIERREZ
THOMAS W. HAAS
TODD C. HANKS
SCOTT E. HELMORE
BROOK E. HESS
LUCAS S. HIGHTOWER
CHRISTOPHER M. HILL
ROBERT T. HOFFMAN
DAVID L. HOSLER
JOHN A. HOTEK
JAMES E. HOWELL III
CHRISTOPHER S. HOWSER
MICAH R. HUTCHINS
ANGELA B. HYSON
JEFFREY J. IGNATOWSKI
SEAN P. IMBS
JEFFREY J. JABLONSKI
FENICIA L. JACKSON
CHARLES V. JAQUILLARD
SEANA M. JARDIN
BRIAN L. JETER
CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON
LARRY P. JOHNSON
DAVID W. JONES
RONALD M. JONES
VERNON L. JONES, JR.
MICHAEL T. JORDAN
JENNIFER S. KARIM
MICHAEL T. KIM
BRIAN M. KNIERIEM
STEPHEN T. KOEHLER
CODY W. KOERWITZ
ANDREW T. KOSCHNIK
WILLIAM R. KOST
THOMAS D. KRUPP
MATTHEW L. KUHN
WESLEY J. KWASNEY
WILLIAM E. LAASE
HEATHER D. LABRECQUE
JUAN C. LAGO
BARRCARY J. LANE
TYRONNE G. LASTRAPES
JOEL K. LEFLORE
CLAIRE LINDLEY
CARLOS A. LOCK
JAMES T. LOCKLEAR
CHRISTOPHER S. LOWERY
JEFFREY L. LUCOWITZ
THOMAS R. LUTZ
BRIAN W. MACK
CARMELO T. MADERA
STEPHEN MAGNER
MICHAEL R. MAI
PATRICK M. MAJOR
ANTHONY P. MAJORANTE
JESSE R. MARSAIS
RICHARD J. MARSDEN
KATIE E. MATTHEW

ROLAND L. MATTHEWS
JULIE A. MAXWELL
RAMIRO MAYA, JR.
ASUERO N. MAYO, JR.
MARLON MCBRIDE
SHANNON T. MCCORRY
CHRISTOPHER S. MCLEAN
DANIELLE R. MEDAGLIA
JONATHAN W. MEISEL
MICHAEL K. MEUMANN
ANDREW J. MEYERS
JASON L. MILES
MARVIN B. MILLAR
SAMUEL R. MILLER
ZACHARY T. MILLER
JEFF R. MILNE
DAVID A. MITCHELL
KEITH C. MIXON
FAMARLON L. MOBLEY
LATASHA L. MOODYLOVE
CHRISTOPHER L. MOORE
RICHARD B. MOORE
SHANE A. MORRIS
JOHN A. MOTT
JESSICA L. MURNOCK
DEREK S. NEAL
RANDALL W. NEWMAN
MICHELLE D. NHAMBURE
SHAWN M. OBRIEN
ROSENDO PAGAN
PHILBERT J. PALMORE
MATTHEW C. PAUL
ANTHONY J. PETE
KEVIN D. PIERCE
MARTIN P. PLYS, JR.
KEVIN A. POOLE
EUGENE T. PORTER
PHILLIP B. POTEET
STEVEN POWER
MATTHEW A. PRICE
RHEA M. PRITCHETT
ANDRES R. RAMIREZ III
ELDRED K. RAMTAHAL
LUKE RICHARDS
SEAN R. RICHARDSON
MICHAEL K. RILEY
JAMES R. RITCH
DOMINGOS S. ROBINSON
LEON L. ROGERS
ORLANDO R. ROJASBANREY
GEORGE W. ROLLINSON
GILBERTO C. ROLON
ANGEL R. ROSADOPADILLA
JOSEPH L. ROSEN
CHRISTOPHER M. ROZHON
DINA D. RUCK
THOMAS H. RUTH III
JESSICA M. SALGADO
SHAWN D. SANBORN
MICHAEL A. SANSONE
DONALD C. SANTILLO
NATHAN R. SAWYER
JOHN M. SCHMITT
DENNIS L. SHELLEN
ERIC L. SHEPHERD
JASON L. SHICK
JESSICA A. SHUEY
SAMSON T. SIDER
STEPHANIE R. M. SIMMONS
BRUCE A. SKRABANEK
ALLEN M. SLITER
JOHN K. SNYDER
PIERRE A. SPRATT
SHANNON V. STAMBERSKY
RONALD H. STEWART, JR.
JOHN B. STRINGER, JR.
DOMINIC J. TANGLAO
DAVID L. TAYLOR, JR.
FRANYATE D. TAYLOR
MICHAEL J. THIESFELD
DAVID L. THOMPSON
STEPHEN A. THORPE
JOHN S. THYNG
MIGUEL A. TORRES
ANDRE L. TOUSSAINT
ANITA R. TREPANIER
TIMOTHY S. TROYER
THOMAS J. TROYN
DENNIS J. UTT
BERNARD D. VANBROCKLIN
CHRISTOPHER K. VENTERS
WILLIAM H. VICK, JR.
CLAUDE E. WALKER
DAMON K. WALKER
BARRY L. WALSH, JR.
JEREMY H. WEESTRAND
DONNA L. I. WELCH
MATTHEW R. WESTERN
ANTHONY K. WHITFIELD
CARL D. WHITMAN, JR.
DENNIS F. WILLIAMS
TERRENCE A. WILLIAMS
ANTHONY L. WILSON
GORDON L. WILSON
MELVIN E. WRIGHTSIL
MICHAEL D. WROBLEWSKI
JENNIFER R. ZAIS
D011349
D011462
D011538
D011859
D012121
D012472
D012659

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL H. ADORJAN
JOHN M. AGUILAR, JR.
MATTHEW J. ALDEN
JOSEPH E. ANDERSON
JAKUB H. ANDREWS
OKERA G. ANYABWILE
LANCE D. AWBREY
CHARLES R. AYERS
MARK A. G. AYSON
THOMAS A. BABBITT
MICHAEL J. BANCROFT
REBEKAH L. BARNES
PALOMA C. BEAUSOLEIL
CRAIG R. BENDER
WAYNE L. BLAS
THOMAS J. BLOOMFIELD
TODD A. BOOK
CRYSTAL X. BORING
DAVID M. BORN
BRETT J. BOSTON
ANASTASIA BRESLOWKYNASTON
ROBERT E. BREWER
JAMES B. BRINDLE
MICHAEL A. BROCK
BYRON J. BROWN
JEANETTE P. A. BROWN
JOSEPH G. BRUHL
THOMAS E. BURNLEY, JR.
JASON E. BURNS
MALCOLM S. BUSH
STEVEN R. CALDER
SILAS J. CALHOUN
CHARLES H. CANON
KEVIN K. CARLILE
WILLIAM E. CARRUTH
EDWARD M. CERER, SR.
PETER C. J. CHARBONNEAU
SCOTT T. CHILDERS
MELVIN A. CHISOLM
JOSEPH C. CHRISTIEN
ROBERT H. CHUNG
HEATHER A. CLEVENGER
CHRISTOPHER L. CLINE
MARK A. COBOS
JASON R. CODY
CRAIG C. COLUCCI
JENNIFER J. COLVIN
CLAYTON L. COMBS
JOSHUA A. CONNER
STEPHEN F. CORTEZ
RUSSELL M. CORWIN
JAMES A. COVINGTON, JR.
GEORGE W. COWLES III
GEOFFREY B. CRAFTS
THERESA K. E. CROSS
MICHAEL E. CUSHWA
JOHN H. DABOLT IV
RICHARD J. DANIELO
BRIAN L. DAVID
RICHARD A. DAVILA, JR.
BRIAN R. DAVIS
ROBERT A. DEES
RAYMOND G. DELUCIO
ANDREW C. DERMANOSKI
BRENDON K. DEVER
TYPHANIE Y. DIAL
RICHARD M. DIXON, JR.
INDIRA R. DONEGAN
JULIA M. DONLEY
MICHAEL B. DORSCHNER
GABRIEL R. DOWNEY II
JONATHAN T. DRAKE
BRIAN P. DUNN
DAMON J. M. DURALL
DENTON L. DYE
CHRISTOPHER I. EASTBURG
HEINZ EDER
JAMES T. EDWARDS, JR.
ELIAS L. EL ORM
ADAM W. ENNIS
JAMES R. ENOS
DARIUS D. ERVIN
DEVIN H. ESELIUS
CRAIG L. EVANS
LEE A. EVANS
REGINALD K. EVANS
NEIL C. EVERINGHAM
BENJAMIN J. FERNANDES
CHANTAL A. FIELDMAN
JASON C. FINCH
JEREMY J. FINN
JAMES C. FINOCCHIARO
DANIEL R. FITCH
GREGORY B. FITCH
STANLEY FLORKOWSKI
NORA L. FLOTT
ERIC S. FOWLER
BRIAN D. FRULAND
CHAD W. FURNE
SUSAN M. GARLICH
KEVIN W. GARFIELD
BENJAMIN T. GATZKE
HEATH A. GIESECKE
KEITH M. GIESECKE
EVANS L. GILLIARD
MATTHEW D. GIOVANNI
STACY H. GODSHALL
GARY J. GOLUBSKI
JASON A. GONZALES
MIGUEL A. GONZALEZQUINONES
NATHAN K. GOODALL
BENNETT GREEN
CASON S. GREEN
DANIEL S. GREEN
MATTHEW R. GREGORY

JOHN C. GRISWOLD
JOSIAH T. GROVER
PATRICK B. GROW
DOUGLAS B. GUARD
ERIC H. HAAS
JASON B. HAIGHT
DAVID L. HALL
TODD J. HAMEL
ALISON M. HAMILTON
SCOTT P. HANDLER
DAVID B. HANSEN
JENNIFER H. HARLAN
JEREMY D. HARTUNG
BRIAN P. HAYES
DAVID C. HAZELTON
ELIZABETH J. HELLAND
JAMES R. HENRY
ALEXCIE A. HERBERT
JANET L. HERRICK
DOUGLAS C. HESS
DUSTIN G. HEUMPHREUS
CAROL M. HICKEY
ULEKEYA S. HILL
CHRISTOPHER S. HOBGOOD
JAMES M. HOFFMAN II
JARED A. HOFFMAN
CHARLES D. HOOD
TIMOTHY A. HUNT
RICHARD A. HUNTER
PATRICK J. O. HUSTED
DANIEL P. HUYNH
TIMOTHY A. HYDE
ZACHARY P. HYLEMAN
ZACHARY T. IRVINE
CHRISTOPHER J. IWAN
MATTHEW R. JENSEN
CHRISTOPHER L. JOHNSON
CRAIG W. JOHNSON
LONNIE D. JOHNSTON
PAUL D. JOHNSTON
BRYAN G. JUNTUNEN
JEFFREY M. KALHAHL
BRANT E. KANANEN
CHRISTIAN A. KEELS
CURTIS J. KELLLOGG
JULIE A. KELLUM
ROY D. KEMPF
JOEL P. KLEEHAMMER
MATTHEW E. KOPP
ADAM M. KORDISH
ANDREW M. KOVANEN
CHRISTINA J. KRETCHMAN
JUSTINE S. KRUMM
JOSEPH R. KRUPA
KRISTOFER H. KVAM
STEVEN J. LACY
VINCENT C. LAI
JEFFREY J. LAKNER
KYLE W. LANDS
JAMES P. LAWSON
PATRICK Y. K. LEE
MICHAEL D. LOVE
CHRISTOPHER J. LOWRANCE
QUAN H. T. LU
JOSE A. LUGOPEREZ
BRIAN P. LUTI
POLARIS X. LUU
THANG V. LY
CAMILLE L. MACK
JAVIER MADRIGAL
NATHAN M. MANN
PHILLIP G. MANN
KYLE B. MARCRUM
ERIC J. MARON
NATHAN D. MARTIN
ANGELICA R. MARTINEZ
MICHAEL C. MAYS
BRIAN A. MCCALL
CHRISTOPHER S. MCCLURE
KEVIN J. MCCULLAGH
MICHAEL E. MCINERNEY
SHAWN P. MCMAHON
PATRICK B. MCNEACE
TIMOTHY T. MEASNER
THOMAS H. MELTON II
MARC T. MEYLE
ROBERT Y. MIHARA
JANIS C. MIKITS
CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER
ERIC W. MILLER
ANGEL I. MIRANDA
BOUNTYASTH MITTHIVONG
WILLIAM C. MOODY
LOUIS A. MORRIS
TIMOTHY J. MORROW
GREGORY W. NAPPOLI
MICHAEL P. NEEDHAM
SCOTT J. NELSON
DAVID L. NEWELL
HAC D. NGUYEN
JACOB P. NINAS
RYAN C. NOMURA
MARGARET A. NOWICKI
ROBERT A. NOWICKI
DAVID P. OAKLEY
TIMOTHY S. OBRYANT
SHERRY K. OEHLER
BRIAN W. OERTEL
JOSEPH E. OHANLON III
IRVIN W. OLIVER, JR.
ELLIOT H. OLMSTEAD
EDWARD ORTIZVAZQUEZ
JAMON B. OSBORNE
RAMON J. OSORIO
STERLING J. PACKER
ROMEL C. PAJIMULA
RAFAL PANASIUK

PETER A. PATTERSON
GREGORY J. PAVLICHKO
CARLOS PENA, JR.
ROBERT C. PERRY, JR.
FOLDEN L. PETERSON, JR.
ERNEST S. PETROWSKY
MICHAEL A. POE
JOHN F. POPIAK
KARLA J. PORCH
PHILLIP D. PORTER
JEREMIAH K. PRAY
DAVID J. PRICE
JEFFREY A. PROKOPOWICZ
MANUEL F. PULIDO
GABRIEL J. RAMIREZ
ANGELA E. REBER
JOHN M. REEDER
THOMAS R. RENNER
BLANCA E. REYES
ISMAEL REYES
KRISTINA L. RICHARDSON
KEVIN T. RILEY
MELISSA A. RINGHISEN
BART C. RITCHEY
ANDRE G. RIVIER
KILLLAURIN O. ROBERTS
DANIEL H. ROBINSON
THEODORE M. RODILL, JR.
SHANE A. ROPPOLI
MATTHEW R. RUCKMAN
BRADLEY S. RUDDER
ANDREW M. RUIZ
TIMOTHY D. RUSTAD
MICHAEL S. RYAN
JIMMY C. SALAZAR
JESSE L. SANDEFER
BENJAMIN F. SANGSTER
HERIBERTO SANTIAGOACEVEDO
MICHAEL A. SAPP
RACHEL E. SARLES
TIMOTHY M. SAWYER
KENNETH A. SCERBO
TINA M. SCHOENBERGER
PATRICK M. SCHOOF
LLOYD D. SCOTT
MICHAEL B. SHATTAN
RYAN L. SHAW
PAUL E. SHERMAN
JOHN W. SHERMER
JOSEPH J. SHIMERDLA
RYAN C. SHIPLEY
ELDRIDGE R. SINGLETON
DENNIS B. SLATON
DAVID J. SMITH
MATTHEW B. SMITH
SCOTT A. SMITSON
HOWARD M. SMYTH
MELISSA A. SOLSBURY
ISAAC M. SOUTH
JAYSON R. SPANGLER
ROBERT J. SPIVEY
JULIAN P. STAMPS
DANIEL R. STANTON III
ROTUNDA K. STOKES
MICHAEL A. STONE
CECIL A. STRICKLAND
TISSA L. STROUSE
JORDON E. SWAIN
JOHN SYERS
WILLIAM C. TAYLOR
MICHAEL J. TEMKO
JOSHUA W. THIBEAULT
CHRISTOPHER J. THOENDEL
LESLIE W. THOMPSON
ALAN W. THROOP
STANLEY O. THURSTON
ANTHONY L. TINGLE
STEVEN L. TINGLEY
THOMAS E. TOLMAN
CATARINA J. TRAN
PAUL E. TROY
WILLIAM E. TURNER
AUGUSTUS O. TUTU, JR.
JEFFREY B. VANSICKLE
KEITH S. VANYO
ALEXANDER S. VINDMAN
RYAN K. WAINWRIGHT
KEITH W. WALTHALL
MARK E. WARDER
ALAN R. WARMBIER
DENNIS D. WATTERS, JR.
JAMES R. WEARE
KEITH B. WEIDNER
JAMES W. WELCH
BRIAN S. WESTERFIELD
SHAWN E. WHITMORE
JARROLD P. WICKLINE
CHRISTOPHER M. WILKINSON
FREDRICK O. WILLIAMS
PAUL M. WILLIAMS
NORMAN L. WILSON II
LISA L. WINEGAR
CLIFFORD M. WOODBURN
WILLIAM C. WRIGHT
JUN Y. YI
MATTHEW C. YIENGST
WILLIAM T. YOUNG
DOUGLAS W. ZIMMERMAN
D002999
D011942
D012030
D012034
D012047
D012183
D012283
D012292
D012622

G001139
G001378
G010029
G010052
G010108
G010299
G010301
G010310

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW T. ADAMCZYK
DEVON F. ADKINSON, JR.
MATTHEW J. ALBERTUS
GREGORY K. ALEXANDER
NATHAN G. ALLARD
KELLY T. ALLEN
TERRENCE J. ALVAREZ
JUSTIN C. AMBURGEY
RUSSELL J. AMES
BENJAMIN L. ANDERSON
JASON G. ANDERSON
SPENCER M. ANDERSON
JAMES E. ARMSTRONG III
JOHN M. AUTEN II
VICTOR M. BAEZAN III
ANDREW J. BAKER
JOHN L. BAKER, JR.
MICHAEL L. BANDY
JEROME A. BARBOUR
AARON D. BARREDA
JEFFREY J. BARTA
MARK A. BARTON
MARK E. BATTJES
SHAWN M. BAULT
RICHARD E. BAYLIE
DANIEL K. BENSON
MICHAEL R. BERRIMAN
ANTHONY J. BIANCHI
JOHN D. BISHOP
RHETT A. BLACKMON
SCOTT R. BLANCHARD
CHARLES D. BOVEY III
MARTIN J. BOWLING
KEVIN B. BOWMAN
DONALD T. BRAMAN
JESSIE J. BREWSTER
AARON D. BRIGHT
NICOLE A. BROOKS
MATTHEW M. BROWN
JAMES L. BROWNING
MARK A. BRZozowski
TROY C. BUCHER
NICHOLAS T. BUGAJSKI
WILLIAM BURDEN
REED A. BURGORA BE
JEFFERY T. BURROUGHS
CRAIG W. BUTERA
KARL R. BUTLER
CHAD W. CALDWELL
PEDRO A. CAMACHO III
CHRISTOPHER D. CARPENTIER
BARRY S. CARTER
KEITH L. CARTER
JOHANNES E. CASTRO
LARRY D. CASWELL, JR.
DONALD L. CHERY, JR.
MATTHEW B. CHITTY
LAURENCE J. CHRISTIAN
STEPHEN L. CLOWER
CHRISTOPHER H. CLYDE
CLINTON R. CODY
DAVID S. COLLINS
XAVIER COLON
MICHAEL R. CONDON
KATE M. H. CONKEY
DAVID M. CONNER
JOSEPH F. CONNOLLY III
CHRISTINA N. COOK
JAMES P. COOK
WILLIAM F. CORYELL
THOMAS B. CRAIG
JARED A. CRAN
MARK J. CROW
AUSTIN S. CRUZ
BRENDAN J. CULLINAN
AARON J. CULP
JOE D. CURTIS
KRISTEN N. DAHLE
TODD M. DANIELS
DAVID P.T. DAVID
HENRY B. DAVIS IV
JOHN B. DAVIS III
VICTOR D. DEESE
CHRISTOPHER J. DEMURE
KIRBY R. DENNIS
ETHAN P. DIAL
JEFFREY P. DIMARZIO
ETHAN J. DIVEN
AARON B. DIXON
STEPHEN G. DOBBINS
THOMAS P. DONATELLE
WILLIAM J. DOUGHERTY
KENNETH M. DWYER
JONATHAN G. ELIAS
AARON C. ELLIOTT
ROBERT L. ELLIOTT
CHRISTOPHER M. ELLIS
JOSEPH E. ELSNER
DANIEL C. ENRIEN
CHARLES E. ERGENBRIGHT
FRANK J. FAIR
DENNIS W. FAULKNER
WHITNEY O. FEES

BRIAN A. FERGUSON
TIMOTHY J. FERGUSON
JOHN V. FERRY
MICHAEL C. FIRMIN
JUDDSON C. FLORIS
MICHAEL J. FOOTE
CHARLES A. FORD
MICHAEL J. FORTENBERRY
THOMAS J. FOURNIER
GREGORY R. FOXX
DAVID C. FREEMAN
REID E. FURMAN
ANTERRIO C. GAINWELL
JOHN D. GARCIA
SEAMUS P. GARRETT
DANIEL A. GATES
TIMOTHY D. GATLIN
ROGER A. GAVRILUK
CASEY T. GEIST
MICHAEL J. GEORGE
JOHN G. GIBSON
ERIC J. GILGE
ANTHONY F. GIORDANO
COREY A. GIVENS
THOMAS A. GOETTKE
JONATHAN P. GRAEBENER
DAVID J. GRAHAM
PAUL M. GRANT
PETER M. GRAY
CHARLES A. GREEN
BRANDON S. GRIFFIN
TERRY D. HAHN
DANIEL S. HALL
LARRY C. HALSEY
BRET M. HAMILTON
JOSEPH R. HAMMOND
CHRISTOPHER C. HAMMONDS
ALAN M. HAMMONS
JODY D. HANSEN
WILLIAM G. HANSEN
RYAN M. HANSON
ELLIOTT R. HARRIS
JAMES J. HART
JONATHAN P. HARVEY
JAMES P. HARWELL
JIMMY L. HATHAWAY
BEAU A. HENDRICKS
JAMES H. HITE IV
MATTHEW B. HOLMES
BRIAN A. HOOKS
MATTHEW D. HOPPER
JOHN P. HORNING
KRISTOPHER H. HOWELL
WILBUR W. HSU
NATHAN M. HUBBARD
TIMOTHY P. HUDSON
DON P. HURSEY
BRANDON J. IKER
BRIAN A. JACOBS
TIMOTHY R. JAEGER
COREY M. JAMES
ERIC M. JANKOWSKI
MATTHEW J. JEMMOTT
EDGAR A. JIMENEZ
CAYTON L. JOHNSON
ERIC B. JOHNSON
RICHARD B. JOHNSON
TRACY D. JOHNSON
BRYAN C. JONES
CULLEN A. JONES
HUGH W. A. JONES
KENNETH R. JONES
KIRK J. JUNKER
JOSEPH A. KATZ
JAMES B. KAVANAUGH
DANIEL F. KEARNEY
COLLIN K. KEENAN
JIM D. KEIRSEY
MATTHEW F. KELLY
RYAN C. KENDALL
DANIEL R. KENT
ADAM R. KEOWN
JEFFREY J. KERSEY
KEVIN J. KEY
BRYAN R. KILBRIDE
NGAN M. KIM
ADISA T. KING
CHRISTOPHER J. KIRKPATRICK
ERIK A. KJONNEROD
CHRISTOPHER D. KLEIN
SAMUEL W. KLINE
JONATHAN S. KLUCK
ANDREW J. KNIGHT
RYAN T. KRANC
ERIC V. KREITZ
JAMES L. KRUEGER
KWENTON K. KUHLMAN
SCOTT A. KUTSCHER
JASON J. LAGEMAN
MATTHEW A. LANDRUM
CONNIE M. LANE
SHOSHANNAH B. LANE
JARRED M. LANG
NEAL J. LAPE
EDWARD B. LAROSA
EDUARDO J. LARUMBE
IAN J. LAUER
JASON C. LAUER
HARRIS T. LAWRENCE III
JOSEPH E. LEACH
ALEXANDER R. LEE
MARK D. LEHENBAUER
ANDREW J. LENNOX
NATHAN L. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER D. LHEUREUX
STEWART C. LINDSAY
CHARLES M. LINGENFELTER

DENNIS O. LOCKHART
MICHAEL T. LOFTUS
JOHN F. LORY
BRADLEY S. LOUDON
HARVEY R. LOWELL
SEAN P. LUCAS
KENT M. MACGREGOR
SIMON A. MACIOCH
AMANDA L. MACWHIRTER
TOD T. MARCHAND
ERIC W. MARHOVER
CHRISTIAN M. MARIANI
WILLIAM J. MARM
BRYAN M. MARTIN
LINDSAY R. C. MATTHEWS
RYAN G. MAYFIELD
SEAN M. MCBRIDE
MARGARET L. MCGUNEGLE
STEVEN B. MCGUNEGLE
GEORGE C. MCINGVALE III
MATTHEW P. MCQUILTON
GLENN C. MCQUOWN III
DAVID O. MCRAE
BRIAN H. MEHAN
NICHOLAS O. MELIN
ERIC G. MELLOH
ANN M. MEREDITH
CHRISTOPHER J. MIDBERRY
STEPHEN P. MIDKIFF
WILLIAM J. MILLER
TRAVIS W. MILLS
TROY A. MILLS
MICHAEL L. MINCE
DANIEL D. MITCHELL
GEORGE A. MITROKA III
JEFFREY D. MIX
CASEY M. MOES
BRYAN M. MOFFATT
NATHAN A. MOLICA
HECTOR A. MONTEMAYOR
TOMAS I. MOORE
BENJAMIN L. MORALES
DAVID W. MORGAN
KENNETH S. MORLEY
JOHN A. MORRIS III
SHELDON A. MORRIS
JAMES M. MOSS
KYLE T. MOULTON
KEVIN J. MOYER
CHRISTOPHER MUGAVERO
JAMES E. MULLIN III
ZACHARY J. MUNDELL
NEIL J. MYRES
BRADLEY S. NELSON
KURT L. NELSON
PATRICK R. NELSON
JOHN T. NEWMAN
PATRIC A. NICHOLS
CECIL C. NIX IV
TOM M. NOBLE
CHRISTOPHER S. NUNN
BRIAN A. OBERG
THERESE L. OBDINSKI
JOHN H. O'BRIEN IV
DAVID J. OHEARN
JEFFREY S. PALLAZZINI
ANDY J. PANNIER
KENT W. PARK
JEROME A. PARKER
KEVIN M. PAYNE
JAMES H. B. PEAY IV
MICHAEL M. PECINA
JASON E. PELLETIER
TIMOTHY N. PETERMAN
JASON A. PIERI
NORMAN L. POLLOCK
MICHAEL A. PORCELLI
AARON M. POULIN
KEVIN R. PUGH
GREGORY G. RALLS
CHAD M. RAMSKUGLER
MATTHEW S. RASMUSSEN
ARIC J. RAUS
TRAVIS J. RAYFIELD
JOHN A. REDFORD
CHRISTOPHER E. REICH
STEPHEN A. RESCH
LISA T. REYES
JOSHUA R. RICHARDSON
RANDY R. RIKER
TYWANA D. ROBINSON
KENNETH P. ROCKWELL
STACY E. RODGERS
EDUARDO D. RODRIGUEZ
TIMMY L. ROSE
DAVID B. ROWLAND
AARON J. SADUSKY
GREGORY SAKIMURA
KEVIN A. SALGE
JASON V. SAMA
DAVID R. SAUDOVAL
BRIAN R. SAUL
BRIAN D. SAWSER
ADAM M. SAWYER
MICHAEL A. SCHAAD
VICTOR H. SCHARSTEIN
NICHOLAS C. SCHENCK
DEREK I. SCHROCK
RYAN L. SCHWAN
DAMON T. SCHWAN
KHIRSTEN T. SCHWENN
JAMES H. SCOTT III
SEANEGAN P. SCULLEY
JUAN C. C. SEGURA
AARON C. SESSOMS
JUSTIN J. SHAFFER
DEVAN J. SHANNON

SHERRI L. SHARPE
 ROBERT M. SHAW
 COURTNEY A. SHORT
 DAVID E. SHORT
 SCOTT F. SIEGFRIED
 DAVID N. SIMMS
 SCOTT C. SINCLAIR
 ANDREW M. SLACK
 ADAM P. SMITH
 DEREK A. SMITH
 RONALD C. SMITH
 SCOTT C. SMITH
 WILLIAM H. SNOOK
 HYOKOOK SONG
 MATTHEW C. STANLEY
 ROBERT C. STANTON, JR.
 ANDREW C. STEADMAN
 PERRY O. STIEMKE
 JOHN C. STROH III
 GREGORY M. STROUD
 RACHEL D. V. SULLIVAN
 SHAWN D. SUMTER
 BRIAN E. SUPKO
 JOHNNY R. SUTTON III
 JEREM G. SWENDDAL
 SCOTT F. SWILLEY
 NATHAN E. SWINDLER
 GABRIEL A. SZODY
 JONATHAN P. TACKABERRY
 BENJAMIN A. TAYLOR
 KEVIN R. TAYLOR
 RICHARD P. TAYLOR
 FRANK TEDESCHI
 JOSHUA P. THIEL
 ISRAEL A. THOMPSON
 MASON D. THOMPSON
 ERIC L. TISLAND
 JASON M. TODD
 WILLIAM J. TOLBERT
 JASON C. TOOLE
 VICTOR J. TORRESFERNANDEZ
 ERIC A. TRESCHL
 GREGORY E. TURNER
 ROBERT E. UNDERWOOD III
 JAMES W. UPTGRAFT II
 JULIAN T. URQUIDEZ
 ALBERT A. VIGILANTE, JR.
 ANDREW K. VISSER
 ROGER P. WALESKI, JR.
 STEPHEN C. WALKER
 RUFUS D. WATSON
 CHRISTOPHER J. WEHRI
 SCOTT D. WENCE
 JOSEPH E. WESTERMAN
 MARCUS C. WHITE
 SONJA L. WHITEHEAD
 BRETT A. WIERSMA
 ANDREW J. WIKER
 JOHN M. R. WILCOX
 JAMES M. WILES
 CHARLES M. WILLIAMS
 ARLIN R. WILSHER III
 CHAD J. WITHERELL
 MARTIN A. WOHLGEMUTH
 BRYAN T. WOODY
 MATTHEW T. WORK
 FREDRICK J. WRIGHT, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER T. YOUNG
 BRION D. YOUTZ
 JAMES A. ZANELLA
 JONATHAN S. ZIMMER
 JAMES E. ZOIZACK
 D003114
 D004286
 D010085
 D010375
 D010646
 D011051
 D012327
 D012380
 D012386
 D012387
 D012593

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

GREGORY I. KELTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

STEPHEN H. COOPER
 DAVID L. JOHNSON
 JOHN P. MAIER
 DOUGLAS P. MARTIN
 JENNIFER R. MITCHELL
 MICHAELLE M. MUNGER
 RYAN T. PACE
 DAVID G. WORTMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LESLEY A. WATTS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ENRIQUE R. ASUNCION
 VERNON D. BIBY
 ROBERT C. CARR
 CAROL Y. CHEEK
 LOWELL C. CORPUZ
 CLINTON FORD
 TIMOTHY J. SAXON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN J. AUGER
 MICHAEL T. AUGUSTYN
 JOHN F. CASILLO
 JONATHAN K. CHARFAUROS
 BRIAN W. CHRISTNER
 PETER J. A. DANCEL
 DANE C. ELLES
 EDWARD A. FOSSON
 DANIEL J. B. GUTIERREZ
 KATHRYN A. GUTIERREZ
 THOMAS D. HALLAM
 CARL A. HANSEN
 HEATHER M. HESS
 MICHAEL R. HIGHTOWER
 WESLEY J. HOWARD
 JOSEPH L. IACOVONE
 MATTHEW J. LENZER
 KIMBERLY I. MAZUR
 SETH T. MCGUIRE
 JAMES B. MCKELVIE
 RONNIE A. MOJZIS
 RACHAEL M. MUSSER
 ROSS A. PENROD
 AUSTIN A. RASBACH
 JASON R. RAY
 CHRISTOPHER A. SANDMEL
 TYLER R. SCHARAR
 JASON A. SCHECHTER
 JAMES O. SHAMBLEY
 RAFAEL E. SUAZO
 ROBERT M. SYRE
 SHAWN E. TALLEY
 RYAN W. THRUN
 RUSSELL B. TORGESEN
 TERRENCE G. WHITE
 BRYAN K. WILSON
 BILLY D. WOODWARD
 CHESTER J. WYCKOFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CARA M. ADDISON
 EMILEE K. BALDINI
 KRISTI H. BAO
 BRYAN C. BARLETTA
 RONISHA T. BEASLEY
 TIMOTHY D. BERGSTROM
 NATASHA T. BODE
 JESSICA J. BURRELL
 CHRISTINA R. CAETANO
 THERESA J. CHAMP
 ANDREW S. CLAYTON
 ROSS S. ERICSON
 KYLE FRALICK
 NICOLAUS C. GRUESEN
 PAUL T. HOCHMUTH, JR.
 LATHAM T. HUDSON
 TODD E. HUTCHINS
 PATRICK O. JACKSON
 MICHAEL E. JONES
 NICHOLAS J. KADLEC
 DANIEL B. LEARY
 JENNIFER L. MYERS
 AUDREY M. NICHOLS
 LEAH A. OBRIEN
 JASON A. PFEIL
 ZACHARY W. PRAGER
 MATTHEW T. RECTOR
 CHRISTOPHER M. REINTJES
 MARK W. RICHARDSON
 BRIAN F. ROACH
 JASPREET K. SAINI
 JULIE SHERMANDUMAIS
 URSULA M. C. SMITH
 JEREMY L. SNELLEN
 MALACHY J. SOLLER
 MATTHEW R. SONN
 BENITA E. STENTIFORD
 LEA E. SUAREZ
 PAUL H. THOMPSON
 AARON D. WALDO
 KEVIN M. WALKER
 ALEXANDER H. WANN
 DAVID W. WARNING
 JOEL A. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

OLUWAFADEKEMI N. ADEWETAN
 RICHARD D. BARTOL III
 JARED C. BECK
 ERIC L. BISCHOFF
 STEPHEN R. BLACK
 ROBERT J. BLOCK
 MICHAEL A. BOHMAN
 JOSEPH G. R. BOICE
 BRANDON K. CALLAWAY

KARL M. CHANDLER
 ALAN H. S. CHEN
 ANTHONY Y. S. CHIA
 JAMES C. COMINSKY
 THOMAS G. COOPER
 PRESTON M. CRIDDLE
 TRACY A. DANTONIO
 CAITLIN D. DARCEY
 ROHIT K. DAVE
 HAI A. M. DOAN
 KRISTEN M. ESTRADA
 BRIAN D. EVANS
 KENNETH K. H. FAN
 AMANDA A. FIX
 STUART C. FRY
 WILLIAM H. GALLAGHER
 JOHN M. GREEN III
 KARSTEN J. HAIN
 JAMES M. HAWKINS
 TAWFIQ N. HAZBOUN
 BRENT M. HIEBERT
 ANDREW J. HOPPE
 PATRICK A. HUNTER
 STEPHEN B. HUTTON
 SHIN J. KIM
 JIMMY H. KU
 YALE A. LEE
 ERIK J. LIGAS
 JAMES C. M. LISH
 LANDON E. LUDWICK
 CHRISTOPHER P. MALY
 RICHARD A. MCKINNEY, JR.
 KRISTINA B. MENDOZA
 EVAN P. MOODY
 ALEXANDER D. PAUL
 DAVID G. QUINTERO
 MONICA L. RANCOURT
 NICOLE M. REDDOUT
 JENNA M. REDGATE
 OSCAR A. RODRIGUEZRAMOS
 NICHOLAS K. RORICK
 BLAKE M. ROSACKER
 GRANT R. RUTHERFORD
 JAMES A. SHAUL
 KELLY B. SLICHTER
 VINCENT J. SLOVAN
 JEFFREY T. SMITH
 DOUGLAS D. STEFFY
 WALTER D. THAMES
 JUSTIN I. WATSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FREDERIC ALBESA
 CHRISTOPHER L. ALLEN
 ALEX F. G. AMPER
 IAN E. BARR
 JENNIFER M. BIBY
 HEATHER M. BOWMAN
 CHRISTOPHER M. BUCHANAN
 JASON P. BUONVINO
 REYNALDO R. CABANA III
 DON C. CADE
 LUPEI CHOU
 MICHAEL J. COLLINS
 SHELLEY CONYERS
 VAUGHN B. COOPER
 MARK A. COWANS, JR.
 SHANNON M. DANIELS
 HEIDI M. DAVIS
 JAMES A. DAVIS
 CHARLES M. DEIBLER
 JUSTIN T. DEVOE
 RYAN P. DIPIROLO
 MICHAEL B. DIPROSPERO
 REBECCA R. DREMAN
 CRAIG T. DZIEWIATKOWSKI
 DAVID C. EGGERS
 MALCOLM L. ELLIOTT
 MELISSA S. FLYNN
 JARON Z. GOLDSTEIN
 MELISSA A. GONZALES
 JEREMY A. GRENNAN
 DEANN K. GUNNELLS
 MARK A. GUNTER
 ADAM L. HAMILTON
 BRIAN H. HAYS
 NATHAN T. HAYWARD
 EDWARD W. HERBERT IV
 LUKE J. HODGES
 ALEJANDRA HOLCH
 STEVEN A. HOLLAND
 RYAN Z. HUGHES
 MICHAEL D. KEY
 JONATHAN M. KRENZ
 MICHAEL D. LABBE
 RAYMOND J. LANCLOS III
 QUENTIN E. LEASE
 SOHNHWA LEE
 JEFFREY D. LEGG
 JASON P. MARKS
 CATHERINE L. MCCLURE
 ANDREW S. MIKESSELL
 HOWARD A. MILLIGAN
 JOSHUA M. MILLNER
 STEPHANIE C. MONTANO
 JASON A. MONTS
 BENJAMIN G. MUNIZ III
 BRENT E. NIVEN
 RAYMOND D. OBRIEN
 JOHN A. OLABODE
 ROEL K. OROZCO
 ISAAC J. ORTMAN
 STEAVE W. PHANN

MATTHEW C. POSS
 RENAE J. RENKEN
 JOHN J. RENQUIST
 LEANNE R. RILEY
 PETER J. RIVERA
 WILLIAM D. M. ROMPS
 MANUEL ROSAS
 FADI J. SACRE
 CHRISTOPHER M. SANDS
 NARCISO M. SANGLE III
 MATTHEW J. SCHAEFER
 JAN D. SCHOTMAN
 JOHN R. SECRIST
 SARAH S. SIRKIN
 GINA M. SLABY
 CINDY SUAREZVILLAFANE
 JOHN R. SUMNER
 PURIPHAT SURARUJIOJ
 SEAN M. TETER
 MICHAEL B. VALLE
 TROY R. WEIDENMILLER
 KURT A. WELDAY, JR.
 JACOB T. WHITELEY
 JAMES R. WHITWORTH, JR.
 DANTE E. WILLIAMSON
 EDWARD P. WINDAS
 TIMOTHY J. WINN
 FRANZ J. YU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MARICAR S. ABERIN
 CHERIE T. AYALA
 JOHN B. AYLSWORTH
 KENNETH D. BARBER
 KATHLEEN K. BAUTISTA
 SHERI M. BENJAMIN
 CARLTON W. BENNETT III
 NICHOLE D. BENSON
 TOMMIE R. BIRGE
 ANGELINA D. BRANNON
 ELYSE M. BRAXTON
 TRACEY L. BURNIEY
 JASON R. CARMICHAEL
 SARAH K. CERTANO
 RAQUEL CHAMBERS
 JOHN P. CHIONG
 ESTHER M. COLBERT
 TANYA M. COPPA
 GRACIANA E. CRAWFORD
 ANNISIA L. CROMER
 NICOLE CUTHBERTSON
 ANGELA R. DAVENPORT
 KAREN E. DOWNER
 ANTHONY P. DURAN, JR.
 SARA R. EDMONDSON
 JESSICA R. FAHL
 MICHELLE L. FINLEY
 ROBERT D. GIBSON
 APRIL A. GILBRECH
 DANIELLE M. GRADY
 KEVIN T. GUTIERREZ
 SAMUEL I. HARRIS
 EMILY S. HESS
 RANDA P. HEYWOOD
 CHRISTINE D. HIGGINS
 JAMES P. HINES
 ANTONY N. HOPSON
 MIRANDA R. HORNE
 KAYLA R. HORTON
 SARAH C. HULEY
 DOUGLAS T. JOHNSON
 SONDRA L. JOLLY
 THOMAS J. KANNON
 ERIN L. KERR
 MEGAN L. KING
 CANDICE N. KLINE
 KATHLEEN E. KOSTKA
 AMY D. KRAMER
 LANI A. KUHLOW
 SHANE I. LATIMER
 NATHAN J. LEE
 TAIKO LESTER
 ANDY G. LUM
 JENNIFER R. LYND
 CHRISTOPHER A. LYNN
 KONSTANCE C. MACKIE
 CHARLIE O. MANALANSAN
 CAMERON P. MATHIE
 RICKY R. MCCALLISTER
 SHELLY K. MCCARTER
 DAVID R. MCDONALD
 MATTHEW M. MOORE
 RACHEL M. NADOLSKY
 DEREK L. OWENS
 JENNY L. K. PAUL
 JESSIE N. PERALTA
 SHEILA PHILLIPS
 DESIRAE N. PIERCE
 JACKIE L. PONCE
 JACQUELINE E. PRICE
 CHASITY Y. REID
 JASON A. REID
 AUTUMN J. RIDDELL
 REBECA S. RODRIGUEZ
 LUIS A. RODRIGUEZFONSECA
 FRANCISCO J. RODRIGUEZSOSA
 MELISSA J. ROSLONIEC
 SHEREE A. SCOTT
 BETSY M. SEITZ
 DOMENIQUE K. SELBY
 KRISTEN M. SKINNER
 SASHA Y. SMITH
 CHRISTOPHER E. STEADMAN

REBECCA L. STRONG
 LAUREN T. SUSZAN
 RIE H. TAMAYO
 LAURA A. TATE
 BEVERLY J. TORRES
 SCHADAQ TORRES
 WILLIAM C. WESTBROOK
 MALINDA V. WILFORD
 CARDIA M. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES P. ADWELL
 MOLLY A. AVERY
 TANYA N. BATES
 JEREMY O. BIEHN
 HENRY L. BIRD
 GREGORY W. BOGGS
 MICHAEL P. BOWERS
 CLIFTON D. BUTLER
 KIRSTEN M. CARLSON
 MARY E. CAVA
 STEPHANIE C. CLAPPER
 ASHLEY N. CLARK
 DOUGLAS E. COLE, JR.
 WALTER J. COLIN, JR.
 RACHEL W. P. CONDON
 TRAVIS W. COOK
 BRENNAN D. COX
 TARA J. DARIANO
 RICHARD J. DELINSKY
 SONJA M. DIAZDEVILLA
 RYAN K. DIPARISI
 PATRICK J. DOUGHERTY
 STEPHEN M. EGGAN
 MATTHEW R. ENGLISH
 MICHAEL L. FISHER
 JASON S. GALLUS
 LINDA C. GALLUS
 GREGORY D. GENTRY
 MARISSA L. GEENE
 KAYREEN K. GUCCIARDO
 MARC D. HAINES
 FRANCIS J. HARAN III
 LINDA D. HAVENS
 HEATHER C. HENDRIXHOLMES
 MACEDONIO M. HERRERA
 CHRISTINE HOBBS
 DEREK B. HOFFMAN
 DARCI E. HOOK
 MEGAN I. HORVATH
 BRIAN A. HOWARD
 ALAN D. HUBER
 BRITTANY J. JANSEN
 AMANDA L. JIMENEZ
 JOSHUA I. KEIL
 BRENNAN S. KELLY
 MICHAEL R. KIMBRELL
 CHRISTOPHER R. KUNTZ
 CARLOS A. LINOMONTES
 ERIC S. LITZENBERG
 STEPHANIE M. LONG
 WILLIAM P. MARTIN, JR.
 BETH M. MATTESON
 AMY E. MCARTHUR
 JENNIFER J. MCCLAUGHLIN
 GREG F. R. MENDOZA
 CASSANDRA G. MONTALVO
 SHAWN M. MORRIS
 ADELEKE O. MOWOBI
 FRANKLIN E. J. MUHAMMAD
 ANNE R. MURRAY
 KEITH D. NEMEROFF
 HEATHER M. NEUMEYER
 ROBERT P. B. NEVINS
 DAVID NORIEGA
 JACOB N. J. NORRIS
 DONALD T. ORDINARIO
 MICHAEL D. OWEN
 JOHN D. PAVLICA, JR.
 KATHERINE E. PIERCE
 BRIAN L. PIKE
 BRETTSON W. PLATTE
 ERICA L. POOLE
 LUKE P. QUEBEDEAUX
 DAVID W. QUEEN
 CHRISTOPHER T. RAGSDALE
 ROXANNE M. RAU
 HEATHER A. REDDING
 KALA T. ROBINSON
 STEPHEN E. ROGERS
 KATHLEEN C. ROONEY
 GARY M. ROSONET
 ANDREW C. RUTLEDGE
 JILL M. SALLIS
 NICHOLAS C. SCHAAL
 SCOTTIE E. SMITH
 KVAJA G. SNAPE
 KRISTIN L. SOMAR
 MICHAEL W. TERRENZI
 DAWN M. TORRUSIO
 CHRISTOPHER J. UDELL
 JOEL P. VALDEZ
 DAVID P. VARNNEY
 WILLIAM J. WALDERS
 ROBERT C. WARD
 THOMAS G. WARNER, JR.
 DAVID L. WHEELER, JR.
 KEVIN R. WHITMYER
 JANNIFER L. WICK
 JESSICA N. WOOD
 JASON E. WRIGHT
 MARTIN R. WRIGHT
 HAO XIE

ADAM L. ZEILER
 MARESA C. J. ZENNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RICHARD R. ABITRIA
 CHANTAL N. AFUHFLORE
 HAYDAR M. ALFID
 DANIEL B. ALBERT
 LESLEY P. ALBERT
 WILLIAM C. ANDERSON
 CODY C. ARMSTRONG
 KESTUTIS A. AUKSTUOLIS
 DAVID F. AURIGEMMA
 KRISTEN D. AURIGEMMA
 MARY M. BAILEY
 NEAL J. BAKER
 ANGELO B. BAQUIR
 MATTHEW P. F. BAUER
 TERENCE D. BAYLY
 JEREMY E. BENJAMINSON
 DANIELA J. BERMUDEZ
 MICHELLE C. BILBAO
 BENJAMIN D. BONI
 JEROMY T. BOUCHER
 ELISE C. BRANDON
 MARIE E. BROCK
 TAYLOR A. BROWN
 TIMOTHY P. BRUCE
 KERRY L. BUCKLEY
 RYAN T. BUCKLEY
 SARAH B. BUCKLEY
 SUSAN A. BULLARD
 PATRICK J. BURBANODELARA
 MATTHEW D. BURGESS
 NATHAN H. BUTLER
 WILLIAM J. BUTLER
 AMELIA H. BUTTOLPH
 WILLIAM E. BYLUND
 KRISTOPHER E. CARTER
 KRISTI L. CASSELMAN
 ALLEN C. CHANG
 BENJAMIN B. CHI
 GRANT K. COCHRAN
 GEOFFREY J. COLE
 RICHELLE L. CORRADO
 PAUL CRIFE
 CHRIS A. CRUZ
 NICHOLAS A. DARLING
 CHRISTOPHER A. DAVIS
 DANIEL J. DEAN, JR.
 DEREK L. DEBOER
 JOHN B. DEGEUS
 ANDREA F. DELACRUZ
 VICTORIA M. DERREVIANKO
 NICHOLAS W. DIGEORGE
 BRIGHAM L. DOUGLAS
 STEVEN E. ELEG IV
 JENNIFER K. ENCKULAWY
 JOHN K. EVANS II
 SARA K. FAUGHT
 KAYCEE R. FIASEU
 RADU FILIPESCU
 LYNN M. FLOWERS
 STEPHANIE M. FOPI
 SAMUEL D. FRASIER
 MICHELE M. GAGE
 KAREN G. GANACIAS
 ALEJANDRO J. GARCIASALAS
 BETHANY K. GAYLORD
 JUDITH C. GENEROSO
 JOHN W. GILLESPIE
 LUKE A. GILMAN
 JONATHAN R. GOWER
 JENNIFER N. GRAHAM
 TATIANA M. GRENE
 ALEX A. GUTWEILER
 SEAN P. HAIGHT
 KENT M. HALL
 ERIN R. S. HAMERSLEY
 TODD G. HASTINGS
 HEATHER N. HAUCK
 NIELS M. HAUFF
 MAE W. HEALY
 NATHAN J. HEMERLY
 ANDREW D. HENEBRY
 SADIE M. HENRY
 EVAN M. HOELL
 MARSHALL M. HOFFMAN
 PATRICIA E. HOGAN
 KEVIN T. HOLLEMAN
 JAMON A. HOLZHOUER
 ANKUSH K. JAIN
 MICHELLE D. JARDONAITES
 JENNIFER L. JASKIEWICZ
 LING JING
 MICHAEL W. JOHNS
 BIANCA C. KARRIS
 DI KHOO
 IULIANA KILIMENTMIHAILEANU
 DANIEL P. KUCKEL
 SCOTT A. KUNKEL
 CASEY E. LAFFERTY
 JOSEPH E. LAGREW II
 ERIC C. LARSEN
 SCOTT M. LAWSON
 JOSEPH A. LE
 TUVIEN LE
 BLAIR C. LEE
 BENJAMIN J. LEHMANN
 WILLIAM A. LEWIS
 KATHRYN A. LIPSCOMB
 MATTHEW C. LOMELI
 LANCE A. LOPEZ

JOSEPH O. LOPREIATO
CHRISTOPHER S. LOVE
HEATHER K. MAK
PAUL G. MALIAKEL
ANDREW E. MANCUSIUNGARO
RODOLFO E. MANOSALVA
JOSEPH P. MARQUARDT
MICHAEL T. MARSHALL
MARY B. MARUSZAK
MANOJ MATHIEW
JEAN G. MATHURIN
JOHN C. MATTINGLY
ROBERT I. MCCLURE
JEREMY D. MCCULLOUGH
JOHN C. MCDONNELL IV
LESLEY A. MCPEAK
JONATHAN M. MELZER
NICOLE J. MEUNIER
ERIC B. MICHEL
SHANNON S. MICHEL
MICHAEL J. E. MONSON
BEAU J. MUNOZ
DAVID E. MYLES
JESSICA L. NAFF
CARLOS A. NAVARRO
MIKAL J. NELSON
MARIA L. NIEVES
BRENDAN S. OBRIEN
OLAMIDE J. OLADIPO
ERIK J. OLSON
TODD G. OSBORNE
JAMIE K. OVERBEY
STEFFANIE M. OWENS
AARON G. PANNIER
CHRISTOPHER R. PARTOVI
PHILLIP R. PERRINEZ
ALEXANDRA V. PERRY
BRANDON R. PETERSON
MICHAEL F. POWERS
MICHAEL A. PROKOP
WILLIAM J. REYNDERS
NOLEN F. ROBERSON
CHRISTOPHER D. RODEN
WARREN L. ROSS
MATTHEW C. RUSSELL
TODD M. RUTTENBERG
GABRIEL F. SANTIAGO
JONATHAN M. SARDINA
SCOTT J. SASOVETZ
JESSE T. SCHONAU
STEPHENIE A. SCULLY
DANIEL B. SEEGER
ERIK E. SHANAHAN
JOSEPH F. SIEBENALER
JOSEPH A. SIEGEL
BRETT P. SIMMONS
JACOB E. SINGER
CHRISTOPHER D. SKEEHAN
JENNIFER L. SMITH
RYAN W. SNOW
ANA L. SOLIS
PETER L. SONE
ADAM G. SONGER
MATTHEW V. SPEICHER
GREGORY R. STAEHELI
CHRISTOPHER J. STANGE
VLAD V. STANILA
ROBERT E. STAPLETON
LEITH J. STATES
HELEN M. STEELE
LORETTA L. STEIN
KRISTI K. STONEGARZA
MICHAEL S. STRATTON
INES H. STROMBERG
PAUL C. TALISE
JACOB M. TAYLOR
BRIAN TOUPIN
RUTH A. TREVINO
IAN C. UBER
JASON M. VALADAO
KARI L. WAGNER
SCOTT C. WAGNER
KENNETH B. WAITE, JR.
JAMES D. WALLACE
JOHN C. WALSH
ADAM T. WATERMAN

JAMES W. WESTBROOK
ANN V. WHEELAN
JONATHAN D. WILDI
JESSICA A. WILSON
KEVIN F. WILSON
MICHAEL E. WOLF
BRYAN E. WOOLDRIDGE, JR.
DAVID J. ZELINSKAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHELLE D. CARTER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KRESHNIK ALIKAJ, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHELLE ANGULO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KATIE WILTROUT APPELEGATE, OF VIRGINIA
ALICIA M. ARENDT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIEGO A. ARIAS, OF NEW JERSEY
CHRISTOPHER N. ASHCRAFT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZACHARY SAMUEL AUERBACH, OF VIRGINIA
MADELEINE THERESA BEARD, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH MARY ANN BENNION, OF UTAH
JULIA ANNE BENSON, OF WISCONSIN
CLARETHA BILLINGSLEA, OF VIRGINIA
XAVIER JONATHAN BILLINGSLEY, OF TEXAS
ROBERT R. BLAKELY III, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN A. BLEAKNEY, OF DELAWARE
JASON Z. BRAINER, OF MICHIGAN
JEREMY K. BRANSON, OF VIRGINIA
CASEY M. BRASWELL, OF VIRGINIA
DIANA G. BRAUN, OF NEW YORK
RYAN MARIE CALDWELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DANIEL MICHAEL CAPONE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KATHRYN R. CARNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JESSICA NICOLE CARRILLO, OF TEXAS
MORGAN E. CASSELL, OF WASHINGTON
CHRISTOPHER JONATHAN CHENG, OF VIRGINIA
JOEL WILLIAM CHRISTENSEN, OF UTAH
CARLY L. COHEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
OSVALDO VIDALY COLON-TORRES, OF VIRGINIA
KHATIJAH SUZANNA COREY, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIE ANN CURRY, OF VIRGINIA
SHARON MICHELLE CYR, OF ILLINOIS
KEITH THOMAS DEVEREAUX, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY MARIE RAIN DODGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMES HARRIS FINDLEY, OF ILLINOIS
LINNETTE D. FRANCO, OF GEORGIA
MICHELE L. GAMMARIELLO, OF VIRGINIA
MELINDA GATTO, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL TEKA GETAHUN, OF MINNESOTA
RAJANI MARY GHOSH, OF MARYLAND
JUDITH DIANE GLASS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DANIEL ALLAN GRIFFITHS, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN JOHN GROB-FITZGIBBON, OF VIRGINIA
HERMES RAFAEL GRULLON, OF NEW YORK
JUSTIN RANDALL HALPERN, OF NEW JERSEY
ADAM R. HENNINGS, OF MINNESOTA
DONNA MELYZA HERNANDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
BENJAMIN P. HINES, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN ISAAC HOUSTON, OF NEW JERSEY
AARON AKIRA ISAKI, OF HAWAII
KENYA JORDANA JAMES, OF NEW YORK
BRITTNEY NICOLLE JOHNSON, OF MARYLAND
SAMANTHA A. JORDAN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH E. KAHNT, OF TEXAS
TARYN NOHEA KAILI, OF HAWAII
BRIAN C. KELLY, OF CALIFORNIA
MADELINE LOUISE KOCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHRISTINE LAHENS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CANDICE MELINDA LAPLANTE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY HOWARD LARSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH A. LEIGHTON-BRADLEY, OF VIRGINIA

ROBYN NICOLE LUFFMAN, OF MISSOURI
ETHAN DONOVAN LYNCH, OF KENTUCKY
MARCOS A. MADRID, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER MAITNER, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN C. MALLETT, OF VIRGINIA
CRISTIAN NOEMI MARTINEZ-LUSANE, OF CALIFORNIA
NOLAN PATRICK MASTERSON, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT WILLIAM MCGHEE, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL JOSEPH MCGUIRE, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM L. MCILWAIN IV, OF OHIO
MICHAEL JOHN MCMULLAN, OF VIRGINIA
MEGAN ELIZABETH MCPHEE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
DAVID ALEJANDRO MENDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN MARK MILLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NAAKOSHIE A. MILLS, OF NEW YORK
JAKE THOMAS MINER, OF CONNECTICUT
MENAL GAURISHANKER MODHA, OF VIRGINIA
JACQUELINE MAE MOORE, OF TEXAS
SARAH KYLER MOORE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
UMAR MOULTA-ALI, OF MARYLAND
AMAURY MUNOZ, OF NEW YORK
DARLENE M. NOBLE-ZINZER, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN MOODY O'GRADY, OF OREGON
JAMES ROBERT O'LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
AUTUMN KELLY PATTERSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PATRICK J. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL PAYAN, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH ALAN PEARCE, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE R. PATTERSON PEREZ, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK J. PRATT, OF TENNESSEE
EVAN ROBERTS PRICE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER D. PRITCHETT, OF GEORGIA
JESSE N. RAMIREZ, OF VIRGINIA
STEFAN H. REISINGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAI VAY RETTENMAYER, OF CALIFORNIA
CYRUS FARROKH REVAND, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA MARISSE ROACH, OF NEW JERSEY
ASHTON E. ROBISON, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM D. ROWE, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA M. SANDOVAL, OF NEW YORK
THOMAS HAMILTON SANTORO, OF NEW YORK
MONICA LORRAINE SAWYER, OF COLORADO
DANIEL R. SINGER, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA A. SPERLONGANO, OF VIRGINIA
TODD E. STRUMKE, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD B. SWANN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LARA R. TALVERDIAN, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER F. TATUM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MEGAN SIMONE TAYLOR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MIMI WIN THEIN, OF VIRGINIA
CLAIRE GRONEMEYER THOMAS, OF CALIFORNIA
JONATHAN NIKOLAS TSCHETTER, OF VIRGINIA
DMITRIY UPART, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN JAMES VACCARO, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN RICHARD VELASCO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GREGORY JAMES VIOLA, OF NEW YORK
JAMES A. WATERMAN, OF WISCONSIN
TRAE R. WATSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID MCKAY WEILER, OF OREGON
DEBORAH ARIN WHANG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIANA MARIE WICK-PALDANO, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB ANDREW WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL LEE WILSON, OF FLORIDA
EMA DIANE WOODWARD, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ONEJIN WU, OF CALIFORNIA
MARK D. WYDRA, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA YANG, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT DAVID ZISKIE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 8, 2015:

THE JUDICIARY

ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.