



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 2015

No. 98

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are perfect in wisdom and goodness. Thank You for the great and mysterious opportunities of our lives. Empower our Senators to seize these opportunities, thereby, fulfilling Your purposes for their lives in this generation. May Your Spirit guide them in their thoughts, words, and deeds, providing them with the wisdom they need to navigate through life's turbulent seas. Keep their thoughts pure, their words truthful, and their actions trustworthy, giving them consciences void of offense toward You or humanity. Lord, inspire them to be mindful of their eternal destiny and their accountability to You. Use them today as instruments for Your glory.

And, Lord, comfort the families and loved ones of the victims of the Charleston, SC, church shooting.

We pray in Your merciful 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 MINORITY LEADER

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

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I don't know another way to describe what I

heard this morning in my morning briefing and then the news accounts of this sickening revelation of what took place in South Carolina last night.

Think about this. The sanctity of a house of worship was violated as a gunman opened fire in the historically Black Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC.

We know now at least nine people are dead, and others, of course, are hurt. I don't know how to describe it. This individual was like a wolf in sheep's clothing. He sat among the congregation for a substantial amount of time before he pulled out a weapon and started firing at people. The thought of people who were in a house of worship being gunned down as they gathered to pray is heart-wrenching, devastating, and is the ultimate act of cowardice and hatred.

As our good Chaplain said, our hearts go out to the families and friends of the people who were gunned down in that church. It is hard to even comprehend anything so awful. So, on behalf of the Senate family, we send our support and our sympathy.

We hope Charleston law enforcement are able to capture this murderer, and the perpetrator be swiftly apprehended and brought to justice.

Mr. President, I had some remarks I was going to give, but they could be deemed partisan in nature and I can give them some other time. I don't feel it would be appropriate for me now to talk about these things that are definitely inappropriate today with this pall hanging over our country.

Based upon that, I would ask that the Presiding Officer announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time equally divided, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, typically I would come to the floor and talk about the business at hand before the Senate, but I think that in light of the horrific news we all woke up to this morning, I wish to touch briefly on the tragic events that unfolded overnight in Charleston, SC.

Although we don't know all the facts, by all appearances, the gunman targeted worshippers while they were in church in a way that certainly shocks all of our conscience and sensibilities. I think it is the sort of act that we all find hard to understand, and it is truly unspeakable.

Law enforcement is doing what it does best, which is conducting its investigation, including looking for the suspect.

I think it is appropriate that we all offer our thoughts and perhaps say a private prayer for all of those who were affected by this senseless and horrific tragedy.

Obviously, the Senate has some important business to do, and I will come back later and talk more specifically

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4255

about the Defense authorization bill and the next business we have in line, which is to make sure that our troops get paid and that we provide them the resources they so justly deserve and are entitled to.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRAGEDY IN SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. KING. Mr. President, before beginning my remarks, I want to express my profound sorrow, sympathy, and condolences to the people of South Carolina and the people of Charleston for the tragedy that occurred last night. To my colleagues, Senators SCOTT and GRAHAM, and to all the people of South Carolina, these things are very hard to understand, very hard to fathom, and I think I speak for all of our colleagues when I say our hearts go out to the people of South Carolina this morning concerning this unspeakable tragedy.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion this week, and there will be, I am sure, over the next few days, about Pope Francis's comments in his encyclical issued this morning on the issue of climate change and on the issue of the preservation of the environment. Some of the reaction has been that the Pope should stay away from science and stick to morality and theology. I am here this morning to say I believe that is exactly what he is doing. He is sticking to morality and theology, and that is why he has made the statement that he has.

I have always viewed this issue in fundamentally an ethical and moral context. There has been a lot of talk, discussion, and debate in committees and on this floor about the science, which I think is irrefutable—the science of climate change, the science of the increasing load of CO₂ in the atmosphere, the most we have ever had in some 3 million years, and the impact it will have. I have talked about the practical impact it will have on the lobster population in Maine and on the shellfish, on our forests, on moose in New Hampshire, on water-edged cities and communities all over this country. All of those practical and scientific things we have talked about at great length on this floor. The only thing I would say is that I am convinced the science is irrefutable that, A, something is happening; B, it is detrimental

to the future of the world; and, C, we—people—are largely responsible for it.

Fundamentally, this is a moral and ethical issue. It has always occurred to me in two moral and ethical contexts. One is that I don't understand what right several generations of people on this Earth have to use up a finite resource that was created over millions of years. It took 3 or 4 million years to create the oil and gas that is underneath our Earth. How do we have the right to use it all up in 200 or 300 years? That assumes we are the only people who will ever occupy this planet. Indeed, I don't believe that is the case. Obviously, it is not the case. There are generations that will come after us—6, 7, 8, 10 generations of people who will come after us. Why do we have the right to use resources that the Earth created for all of time?

One of the fundamental premises of the Old Testament is, of course, the Ten Commandments. One of the basic Ten Commandments is "Thou shalt not steal." I believe we are stealing resources from future generations by simply using them up in our lifetimes. That is moral and ethical issue No. 1.

The second ethical issue is the fundamental ethical and moral principle of stewardship. The first line of the Bible says: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." God created—God created—the heaven and the Earth. We have a responsibility to steward, to take care of the creation that God gave us.

There are some very interesting Biblical references early in the Bible, in Leviticus, the third Book of the Bible, about this concept of stewardship. One is in Leviticus 25. The Lord said to Moses: "The land must never be sold on a permanent basis, for the land belongs to me." This is God speaking: The land belongs to me. "You are only foreigners and tenant farmers working for me."

That is the concept of a long-term stewardship—that we don't own the land. Yes, we have deeds and we think we own it, and we can pass it on to our children, but we don't own the planet, and we have a responsibility to pass that resource on to our children in good shape and not destroy it.

Another interesting provision in Leviticus—and I hope it is OK to make notations in the Lord's Book because that is what I did. In Leviticus 25, Moses is told a very interesting thing about how to take care of the land. God talked about a Sabbath for the land, just as He talked about a Sabbath for people—a day of rest. "For six years you may plant your fields and prune your vineyards and harvest your crops, but during the seventh year the land must have a Sabbath year of complete rest."

Very interesting—the land must have a Sabbath. It is the Lord's Sabbath. Do not plant your fields or prune your vineyards during that year.

And then later on in Verse 32, God tells Moses what will happen if you

don't observe that rule. In other words, if you just keep planting and abusing the land, He said—this is again quoting God here in Leviticus 25: "Your land will become desolate." There is an interesting observation. God said:

Your land will become desolate, and your cities will lie in ruins. Then at last the land will enjoy its neglected Sabbath years as it lies desolate while you are in exile in the land of your enemies. Then the land will finally rest and enjoy the Sabbaths it missed.

The concept is we have an obligation to the land, to the Earth that has been given to us.

Then, we skip all the way from the beginning of the Old Testament to the end of the New Testament to the Book of Revelations, and there is a kind of admonition, I think, for all of us in terms of our stewardship of the Earth.

In Revelations 11:18, the Chapter says: "But your wrath came, and the time for the dead to be judged, and for rewarding your servants . . . and for destroying the destroyers of the earth."

That is something we ought to take very seriously; that the time will come for the destroying of the destroyers of the Earth. This is all about morality, theology, and ethics. This is about simply taking care of the asset the Good Lord gave us—whatever Name you give to the Good Lord. It is the Earth we have been given. It is the only Earth we have. It is the only home we have, and we simply can't destroy it. Yet in Genesis it says man is given dominion over the waters, the Earth, and the animals. But that doesn't mean we are entitled to destroy it. It means we have to steward it, we have to conserve it. That is really what this discussion is all about. This is about ethics. This is about morality. It is about theology, as I have demonstrated.

Now, I want to go from the Good Book to another way to state this. In Maine we have what is called the Maine rototiller rule. It is all you need to know about environmental stewardship: If you borrow your neighbor's rototiller to clean up your garden in the spring, the principle is you always return it in as good shape as you got it, with a full tank of gas. That is environmental stewardship. We don't own this planet. We have it on loan. Therefore, we have a responsibility to pass it on to our children and grandchildren and countless generations ahead of us in as good of shape as we got it and maybe with a full tank of gas. And that means we just can't willy-nilly act like there are no consequences for our actions, that we can befoul the air and the land and the water for our convenience, for our aggrandizement, for our material comfort. We have to think about other people. That is of course the fundamental principle of every religion in the world: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." I would submit that "others" includes not only those of us here or those of us in America or those of us around the world but those of us who haven't been born yet.

We have an obligation to “do unto others as we would have them do unto us.”

So I welcome the Pope's words this week as a valuable voice in an important discussion. I realize we will have differences about how to solve this problem. We will have differences about the exact dimensions of it. We will have differences about what the resolution should be and the technology we should use and how we should get there and transitions and all those kinds of things. That is perfectly legitimate. But, fundamentally, we have to think of this as a moral and ethical issue—as a moral and ethical issue—the obligations we owe to other people in this country, to other people in the world who have no voice in the use of the resources that are being taken away from them, and particularly to the people whom we don't yet know who are going to follow us on this wonderful home we have been given to steward, to preserve, to use but to pass on in as good or better shape than we found it.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to begin by extending my deepest condolences and prayers to the families and loved ones of those lost in the heinous church shooting in Charleston, SC. Our hearts break for the people of Charleston and especially for the congregation of this house of God—a place of refuge, a place of peace, a place of love. The perpetrator of this hate crime must be found and swiftly brought to justice.

Tragedies like this remind us that we are all interconnected, in our hometowns, in our country, across the planet. Whether it is our common home of worship or the common home of our planet, we are called every day to care for one another, especially those who are most in need.

PAPAL ENCYCLICAL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, today, Pope Francis released a historic encyclical—a message to the world to preserve the planet from climate change and environmental degradation. In giving us his message to protect what he calls “our common home,” Pope Francis has also given us a common goal—we must act now to stop climate change.

Pope Francis's encyclical calls all people of conscience to examine our own lives, our relationships to people and the planet, and our duty to take action. The Pope's message is clear: Mankind created the problem of climate change and now mankind must solve it.

Pope Francis delivered this message to the world, but the world needs America to lead.

As the wealthiest Nation in the world and one of its largest pollution emitters, it is our economic and moral responsibility to act now. There is time to avoid the worst effects of climate change, but we must act now.

Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, sea levels are rising, extreme downpours and weather events are increasing, the ocean is becoming more acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded, and it is the poorest and the most vulnerable in developing nations who have suffered the most from the developed world's pollution. By reducing U.S. carbon pollution, the United States can be a leader, not a laggard, in answering Pope Francis's call.

Climate change deniers may be the doubting Thomases of the 21st century, but there is no doubting the science anymore when national academies of sciences across the globe, including the Vatican's, all agree that burning fossil fuels is changing the Earth's climate.

So to all of the critics of Pope Francis's message, let's stop denying the science and let's start deploying the solutions. Let's deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for these projects. Let's make our cars and trucks even more fuel efficient. Let's fully implement and defend President Obama's Clean Power Plan that will reduce carbon pollution from America's powerplants.

The United States can be the leader in the clean energy revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling this planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable. The United States has the technological imperative to lead on clean energy. We have the economic imperative to engage in massive job creation that will make it possible to save all of creation. We have the moral responsibility to protect our planet for future generations.

The Pope has given us the guidance—the moral guidance—in his encyclical, and we know, ultimately, science and technology will be the answer to our prayers. But the leadership must begin here. This cannot happen without leadership from the U.S. Senate, from the United States of America. If we want to see more solar and wind deployed in our country, then we must put the tax credits on the books that incentivize the private sector and individuals across the country to deploy it.

Last year, there were 5,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is twice as much as has been deployed in the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. This year, there is going to be 7,500 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is triple the whole history of the United States up until 5 years ago. Next year, there is going to be 10,000 new megawatts of solar installed in the United States. That is four times as much as had ever been deployed in the

whole history of our country cumulatively. So this is a revolution that is absolutely helping to transform the way in which we generate electricity in the United States.

The same thing is true for wind. Wind is expanding at the same exact pace, in terms of generating sources of electricity from a place that has always been there, using God's energy in order to provide electricity for American homes and businesses.

What is happening in both areas? Well, the Republican Senate has allowed the wind tax breaks to already expire. Already they have expired. The solar tax breaks expire at the end of next year. We have no agreement, no signal that this Senate is sending to the investors and solar consumers across the country that solar will be given any incentives past the end of next year.

Similarly, we have seen a dramatic increase in the fuel economy standards of the vehicles which we drive. In fact, much of the problem we have in finding a source of revenues for a robust transportation bill comes from the fact that people are now consuming less gasoline in their much more fuel-efficient cars since President Obama took the authority—by the way, which this Senate gave to him in 2007—to dramatically increase the fuel economy standards for those vehicles. We have to go all the way up to the 54.5 miles per gallon which the President has proposed. That will dramatically reduce greenhouse gases.

And we must ensure that the President's clean power rules, which he is going to promulgate within the next month, stay on the books. There are already those in the Senate who are saying they are going to try to vitiate, to overturn, to make impossible the implementation of those powerplant rules which will keep the greenhouse gases coming out of coal-burning plants—especially across our country—to a minimum, to reduce by 30 percent the amount of greenhouse gases, carbon, that comes out of powerplants generating electricity in our country by the year 2030. We can do this. We are a technological power. The Pope, the world, they look to us.

They say to us: President Kennedy challenged the Nation to put a man on the Moon in 8 years in order to say to the Soviet Union that we would not allow them to dominate outer space, and in 8 years our country invented new metals, invented new propulsion systems, returned that crew from the Moon safely. And we, with our American flag, said we are going to use outer space for peaceful purposes. Well, the flag that flew on the Moon is now in the Capitol. That is the return on investment in science and technology in the United States to help the rest of the world ensure that outer space would be used for peaceful purposes.

The rest of the world expects us to be able to invent new technologies, new batteries, solar, wind, geothermal, energy efficiency, vehicles, metals that

will dramatically reduce the amount of pollution we are sending up into the world but simultaneously spread these technologies across the planet.

In the 1990s, we invented new digital technologies. It was first just a very plain phone, but no one had one in their pocket until 1995 and 1996 because the phone was the size of a brick and it cost 50 cents a minute. No one had one. It was too expensive. But then this Congress moved over 200 megahertz of spectrum. It incentivized the private sector to begin to move. Within 3 years, everyone had one of these phones in their pocket. Within another 8 years, it moved to a smartphone because we had begun the revolution. Where was the smartphone invented? Right here in the United States.

Let's take Africa, for example. Twenty years ago did anyone believe that 700 million people in Africa would have a wireless device in their pocket? No. Why do they? Because the United States invented—the United States put the policies on the books that generated this revolution. They skipped telephone poles. They went right to wireless, right to cell phone towers. We did that. We gave the leadership.

That is leading to a lot of economic development in Africa and in continents around this world. We have to do the same thing in energy technology. They can envision a day where they bypass having to put wires down the street for electricity as well and solar panels could be on their roofs, providing electricity to power their cell phones, their refrigerators, their stoves, their air-conditioning.

We can do this. We have the capacity to do it, but we have to set our mind to doing it because there is an economic incentive for us. Oh, yes, there is a national security incentive for us. Oh, yes, we can tell the Middle East we don't need their oil anymore than we need their sand. We are going to provide our own power, and we are going to give other countries in the world the capacity to produce their own power. But we can do it as well because it is a moral imperative, because God's Earth, his creation is, in fact, now in jeopardy.

We have to be the leaders. We have to answer this moral cause. We cannot say we can't do it. We can't say we can't invent our way out of this potential catastrophe for the entire planet. The Pope is calling upon us to be the world's leader, morally and economically. We can do it.

Today is an important day, I think a watershed moment. I am a Catholic. The Pope is a Jesuit who is trained as a chemist. For those who say the Pope has no business talking about climate, he is a chemist. There are many people who say: Well, I don't have a view on climate because I am not a scientist.

The Pope is a scientist. He has looked at the evidence. He has asked the Vatican academy of arts and sciences to study this issue. They have come back with their conclusions. Man

is creating the problem and mankind now must solve the problem, but it is those who have created the pollution that the greatest responsibility falls.

You cannot preach temperance from a barstool. You cannot tell people to reduce what they are doing—smoking or drinking or engaging in dangerous activities—if you, too, are engaging in them. The leadership must come from this Chamber. The leadership must come from the United States of America. Pope Francis's message must resonate throughout this Chamber in the months and years ahead. If we do it, we will have been doing—as President Kennedy said in his inaugural address—truly God's work here on Earth.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1735) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I hope we are in the final hours of a 2½-week consideration of the Defense authorization bill. Not all amendments were debated and not as many were reported yet. We still have hopes that there could be a managers' package, which is composed of agreed-upon amendments by both sides, equally divided by both sides of the aisle, both Republican and Democratic. There are some important amendments, so I hope we are able to get approval of at least some of them prior to the votes that I believe will be scheduled for this afternoon in order to conclude debate and consideration of the Defense authorization act.

As we enter the final throes—and there are Members on the other side of the aisle and maybe even on this side of the aisle who are deeply concerned about the OCO funding for this authorization—I repeat again to my colleagues, I don't like the use of OCO. I

would like to follow the advice of every one of our military leaders who say that continued sequestration puts the lives of the men and women who are serving in the military in greater danger. I am not sure we have a greater obligation than to do everything possible to prevent the lives of our men and women serving in uniform from being put in greater danger. To get hung up on the method of funding, which many will use as a rationale for opposing this bill, seems to me an upside down set of priorities—badly upside down.

If we don't fund, if we don't authorize, if we don't make possible for us to equip and train and retain the finest military force in the world, why is it a higher priority to object to the method of funding? As I said, in a perfect world, I would argue vigorously—and have continued to—about the harmful effects of sequestration.

I am not talking about a political opinion. I am talking about the view of the uniformed leaders of our Nation who have the respect and admiration of all of us. They are telling us that if we continue sequestration, which would be the effect of not including the additional funding of the overseas contingency operations, then obviously in this world that becomes more and more dangerous as we speak—and I continue to quote probably the most respected man in America, in many respects, Henry Kissinger, who testified before our committee that he has never seen more crises around the world since World War II, as is the case today.

I would entreat my colleagues who may be contemplating voting against this legislation on the grounds that the funding is a disqualifying factor—it is a troubling factor and it is troubling to me—but shouldn't we care more about the men and women who are serving in the military than the problem you might have with a certain process that was followed in order to get there? I would think not.

If you look at the world in 2011, when the unthinkable happened; that is, that sequestration automatically kicked in because both sides were unable to agree on a process that would reduce the deficit and put us on a path to a balanced budget. Everyone said sequestration will not happen because they will come to an agreement. Obviously, sequestration did happen. But if you look at the world in the year of 2011, when sequestration kicked in, and the world today, I think—I think—there is a compelling argument that national security and national defense is far more important than it was then. Because of a series of events that began in 2011—including an incredibly misguided decision by the President of the United States to withdraw all forces from Iraq, which then, inevitably, as some of us predicted, led to the situation as it exists today—the world is now and the Middle East is now literally on fire.

What are the results of the misguided policies and the commitment on the

part of the President to get us out of wars? The President ignored one reality; that is, that we may get Americans out of wars, but that doesn't mean the wars are over. What we have seen is the spread of ISIS. We have seen Iran on the move in nations throughout the region, including the latest information we have that Iran is supplying weapons to the Taliban in Afghanistan, not to mention Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon, where they are basically in control. Our Sunni Arab—Middle Eastern Arab nations are now going their own way because they have no confidence in the United States.

What has been the result? All you have to do is pick up this morning's copy of the Washington Post. "Refugee crisis hits tipping point. U.N. ranks 2014 as worst year on record, cites dire need for aid."

London—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—"a nation of the displaced" that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of the displaced.

I urge my colleagues to understand two things: One, a lot of these things didn't have to happen. The absence of American leadership and involvement is largely responsible for a great deal of this. Second of all, it is of vital importance, in my view, given the situation throughout the world, that we pass the Defense authorization bill, reconcile our differences with the legislation with the House and the administration, and take into account that this is probably the greatest piece of reform legislation in recent history, perhaps in the last 30 years, since the then-well-known Goldwater-Nichols Act was passed.

In Reuters today, it says: "World's displaced hits record high of 60 million, half of them children."

Of the 60 million people who are displaced, half of them are children. They are the ones who always suffer the most.

The article says:

... at the end of last year, the highest ever recorded number, the U.N. refugee agency said on Thursday.

More than half the displaced from crises including Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia were children, UNHCR said in its Annual Global Trends Report.

In 2014, an average of 42,500 people became refugees, asylum seekers, or internally dis-

placed every day, representing a four-fold increase in just four years.

In 4 years, there was a fourfold increase in the number of refugees. Again, that is not an accident.

"We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before," said U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees Antonio Guterres in a statement.

UNHCR said Syria, where conflict has raged since 2011, was the world's biggest source of internally displaced people and refugees.

There were 7.6 million displaced people in Syria by the end of last year and almost 4 million Syrian refugees, mainly living in the neighboring countries of Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey.

For the information of my colleagues, there are now more Syrian children in school in Lebanon than there are Lebanese children in school in Lebanon.

UNHCR said there were 38.2 million displaced by conflict within national borders, almost five million more than a year before, with wars in Ukraine, South Sudan, Nigeria, Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo swelling the figures.

It also noted that more than 1.6 million people sought political asylum in a foreign country last year, a jump of more than 50 percent compared to the previous year—largely due to the 270,000 Ukrainians who submitted asylum claims in Russia.

While many conflicts have erupted or reignited in the past five years, few have been conclusively resolved. Just 126,800 refugees were able to return home in 2014, the lowest number in 31 years, UNHCR said.

I say to my colleagues, I have been to refugee camps, and I have seen the suffering and pain and the hopelessness there. I was taken around by a teacher at a refugee camp where there were about 175,000 people, as I recall, in Jordan, and there were a large number of children around in this camp.

The teacher said to me: Senator MCCAIN, do you see all of these children here?

I said: Yes, I do.

She said: They believe you Americans have abandoned them, and when they grow up, they are going to take revenge on you.

My friends, we are sowing the wind, and we will reap the whirlwind. It is time that the United States assumed again a leadership role in the world.

Now many of the critics who call me "Defense Hawk" MCCAIN—I am not sure why the opponents are not called "Defense Doves," fill in the blank—seem to believe I am advocating that a large number of American troops be dispatched to the region. I am not, but I am saying we should listen to the successful military leaders who succeeded in the surge in Iraq and to a large degree succeeded in Afghanistan. I am speaking of General Petraeus, General Keane, and Admiral McRaven. There are a number of people, both military and civilian, we should listen to. Ryan Crocker, to me, is the most respected member of the diplomatic

corps I have ever seen. Those people ought to be brought together and asked for their views to see if we can develop a strategy—a strategy, by the way, which the President of the United States just a few days ago stated is nonexistent. They should be called, and we need to develop a strategy. There is no strategy. If we had a strategy—and these numbers of a record high of the world's displaced of 60 million people, half of them children—perhaps we could turn this situation around.

No one believes we are winning in the struggle against ISIS. We are at the negotiating table in various luxurious hotels and resorts in Europe, negotiating with the Iranians over a nuclear deal while they are moving and controlling four nations, and the latest, of course, is that they are supplying weapons to the Taliban.

We need to have a strategy that is inclusive, and we need to draw on the experience and knowledge from some of the most respected men we have in this country with a military, political, diplomatic, and economic background and come up with a strategy.

I will tell my colleagues there is no good answer. There is the least of bad options. But we have to exercise an option rather than run in place for the next year and a half until we have a new President of the United States.

This legislation is not going to solve those problems. This legislation has certain policy implications. This legislation does not achieve the goals I was just speaking about. But this legislation does do the things we need to do—we, as the people's elected representatives whose first obligation is the defense of this Nation. This legislation addresses many issues that will make our defense establishment more responsive, more responsible, more efficient, and most of all will provide the equipment and the capabilities for the men and women who are serving in the military, many of them still in harm's way, so that they can defend this Nation. Anybody who believes ISIS would be content to remain in the Middle East and not export that terror to the United States of America has not listened to the Director of the CIA, the head of the FBI, and every other military expert. ISIS is bent on harming America.

When Mr. Baghdadi left Camp Bucca, where he spent 4 years—Mr. Baghdadi, obviously, as we know, is the leader of ISIS. He spent 4 years at Camp Bucca in Iraq. When he left, he said: I will see you in New York. Mr. Baghdadi wasn't kidding. ISIS is bent on attacking us. Can they destroy us? No. But the ability of ISIS to be able to launch some attacks on the United States of America grows every time there are thousands of young men and some young women who go to Syria and Iraq and are radicalized even more and return, sooner or later, to the country from which they came.

I ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle put aside the smaller

differences we have. And there are differences with my colleagues on this side of the aisle concerning, for example, the sage-grouse and a number of other provisions in this bill.

I urge my colleagues to put aside those differences—and in the view of many, there are significant differences—and vote in favor of this legislation and send a message that at least on the issue of defending the Nation, we will provide the men and women who are putting their lives on the line on our behalf the best possible capabilities we can possibly provide for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled “Refugee crisis hits tipping point” in the Washington Post this morning be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 18, 2015]

REFUGEE CRISIS HITS TIPPING POINT

(By Griff Witte)

LONDON.—The number of people uprooted from their homes by war and persecution in 2014 was larger than in any year since detailed record-keeping began, according to a comprehensive report released early Thursday by the U.N. refugee agency that will add to the evidence of a global exodus unlike any in modern times.

Just a year after the number of refugees, asylum-seekers and people forced to flee within their own countries surpassed 50 million for the first time since World War II, it surged to nearly 60 million in 2014—“a nation of the displaced” that is roughly equal to the population of the United Kingdom.

The rapidly escalating figures reflect a world of renewed conflict, with wars in the Middle East, Africa, Asia and Europe driving families and individuals from their homes in desperate flights for safety. But the systems for managing those flows are breaking down, with countries and aid agencies unable to handle the strain as an average of nearly 45,000 people a day join the ranks of those either on the move or stranded far from home.

“We are witnessing a paradigm change, an unchecked slide into an era in which the scale of global forced displacement as well as the response required is now clearly dwarfing anything seen before,” U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees António Guterres said in a statement. “It is terrifying that on the one hand there is more and more impunity for those starting conflicts, and on the other there is seeming utter inability of the international community to work together to stop wars and build and preserve peace.”

The annual report on global trends in displacement, issued by the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, or UNHCR, offers perhaps the most authoritative look at who is being uprooted by conflict, where they come from and where they go. The agency, created in 1950 to support Europeans displaced by World War II, said the figures for 2014 were higher than it has ever recorded.

The overall number, which does not include those displaced by natural disasters or economic migrants in search of a better life, had been relatively stable, at around 40 million, since the start of the 21st century.

But it abruptly shot up in 2013, and the pace accelerated last year. Although the report does not cover 2015, there is no indication that the trajectory has changed.

The four-year-old war in Syria has been the single biggest driver of the surging numbers. Last year, 1 in 5 displaced persons worldwide was Syrian. The country in 2014 became the planet’s largest source of refugees, displacing Afghanistan, which had held that dubious distinction for three decades.

The impact of a Syrian population on the move has been felt across the Middle East. Neighboring Turkey now hosts more refugees than any other nation, knocking Pakistan to No. 2. Lebanon has the world’s highest concentration, at nearly a quarter of those living in the tiny Mediterranean nation.

The vast majority of refugees last year were hosted by poor countries that can least afford the added strain. Nearly 9 out of 10 refugees were living in the developing world—a figure that hit a two-decade high.

Meanwhile, with nations across the developing world either at war or in crisis, some of the world’s wealthiest nations have focused on how to beat back the rising tide of those seeking escape.

France and Austria have stepped up police checks at crossings with Italy, leaving migrants to camp out at train stations in Rome and Milan. Hungary on Wednesday announced plans to build a 12-foot fence along its border with Serbia. Nations across Europe have balked at proposals to more equitably share the burden of asylum-seekers while rushing to approve plans to blow up smuggler ships in the Mediterranean.

The tough response has been largely due to political pressure among populations hostile to the influx of migrants. But it prompted Pope Francis on Wednesday to suggest that those “who close the door” to migrants seeking protection should ask forgiveness from God.

The UNHCR and other aid groups have pleaded for more assistance to keep pace with the ever-growing numbers, but to little avail.

“There’s a real risk that we’re seeing the unraveling of the refugee regime that was created in the aftermath of the Second World War on the basis of cooperation and reciprocity,” said Alexander Betts, director of the Refugee Studies Center at Oxford University.

Betts said that unlike during other conflicts, including those in Southeast Asia, the Balkans and Central America, governments are not stepping up to offer assistance commensurate with the scale of a problem that now touches virtually every corner of the globe.

“This isn’t a regional problem,” he said. “It’s a global challenge.”

The UNHCR’s report identifies at least 15 wars across three continents that have either erupted or reignited in the past five years, and that together have forced millions to abandon their homes. A total of 13.9 million people were displaced in 2014 alone.

About a third of those were in sub-Saharan Africa, where wars in the Central African Republic, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria and Congo all flared. Somalia alone is the source of more than a million refugees, the world’s third-highest total.

Europe experienced the biggest proportional increase in displaced persons last year, with a staggering 51 percent increase over 2013.

While much of that was due to Syrian refugees streaming into Turkey, it also reflected the 219,000 people who entered the continent via the perilous journey across the Mediterranean. And as Russian-backed rebels brought war back to European soil, more than 800,000 people were left internally displaced in Ukraine. About 200,000 Ukrainians applied for asylum in Russia.

Worldwide, the number of internally displaced people vastly outstripped the number

of refugees. Once people fled their home countries, they had little hope of returning. Just 126,800 refugees went back to their home countries in 2014 out of a global refugee population of 14.4 million. That marked the lowest level of return since 1983.

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

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

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would note for my colleagues the presence of General Dunford, Commandant of the Marine Corps, a great combat leader and leader of our military and considered to be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a man we all admire a great deal.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, like many have said here today, I would like to express my deepest condolences to the victims of the shooting at Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, last night. This was a senseless act of violence. My thoughts and prayers are with the victims, their families, and all affected by this horrible tragedy.

I know we all hope the perpetrator is swiftly brought to justice. I pray for the safety of the entire Charleston community. This was an act of senseless violence, to be sure. But as I understand it, the perpetrator saved one woman and told her: “I want you to tell everyone what happened here.” That is beyond sinister. That is evil. That evil must be stopped and must be dealt with.

OBAMACARE

What I would like to talk about now is the Supreme Court’s critical ruling on the most recent review of the Affordable Care Act—Obamacare. It is important to highlight many of the ways this law is negatively impacting our health care system as a whole, my constituents in Kansas, the Presiding Officer’s constituents in her neighboring State of Nebraska—all over the country.

Trying to list all of the problems with this law is nearly impossible. Perhaps the best way is to review the promises of the President of the United States. The crafting of this law was supposed to follow his promise of being the most transparent administration in

history. The problem is that there has been a lack of transparency—not to mention the oversight of this law since it was originally being crafted and throughout its implementation.

Despite hearing the contrary from our docs and nurses about practices and hospitals closing and premiums and copays increasing, the administration continues to turn a blind eye. The administration continually moves the goal posts to which they measure success and have claimed victory.

In 2012, the Congressional Budget Office projected there would be 14 million people enrolled in exchange plans this year. Then late last year, the administration back-pedaled on its projections for the second year of enrollment, moving the goal posts. The most recent data out of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, the infamous CMS, shows that when you look at how many individuals had effectual coverage or actually paid their first month's premium and continued to have an active policy, that number is 10 million. Madam President, that is nearly 30 percent below the 2012 enrollment projections—30 percent. That is not transparency. That is not victory.

So why is this number lower? Why aren't folks signing up? First, we had a Web site that crashed and that didn't work. Then Americans tried to shop around and view the policies available to them. But as it turns out, the law didn't lower premiums for the average family by \$2,500—remember that promise—as the President promised. This didn't happen. Premiums are increasing.

The President also promised you could keep your same health care plan and your doctor. We have known for some time that is just not true. It didn't happen.

Yet just last week the President responded to questions regarding his signature law—his legacy law, if you will—at a press conference following the G-7 summit. He said: “The thing is working.” Now, one might add that the “thing” is a pretty good term for the Affordable Care Act.

The President also said: “I mean, part of what's bizarre about this whole thing is we haven't had a lot of conversation about the horrors of ObamaCare because none of them have really come to pass.”

Really?

President Obama concluded: “It hasn't had an adverse effect on people who already had health insurance.”

Well, I am not sure what data has been presented to the President or which American family he has been listening to, but it is certainly not the reality that I have experienced and that Kansans are experiencing. The real-life threats of this law we hear from Kansans back home have not stopped. They are increasing.

A small business owner in Cummings, KS, called my office to inform me his premium this year went up over \$500 a month—more than double last year's.

Eddy, in Spring Hill, says his premium has doubled and his deductible has doubled. He is being forced to choose between running his company and buying health insurance. He says he can't do both.

Let's go back to the President's comments about this “thing” having no adverse effect. Just a couple of weeks ago his own administration published the proposed double-digit—double-digit—premium increases for 2016—next year. The plans on the list affect more than 6 million people across the country and are seeking an average increase of 21 percent.

The Kansas Insurance Department tells us that premiums for some individual and small group health care plans are likely to increase by as much as 38 percent.

According to the administration's list, 14 insurance plans are seeking premium increases above 10 percent for next year. That covers 100,000 Kansans. When you look at just two insurance plans, those two insurance plans have increases of 28 and 38 percent. Perhaps the President does not categorize these 100,000 Kansans as being adversely affected by this “thing.”

Simply put, premiums will continue to spiral upward if we do not act. Facts and reality are really very stubborn things. Even ObamaCare's chief architect, Jonathan Gruber—we all remember Jonathan Gruber—was quoted last year as saying if “you made it explicit that healthy people pay in and sick people get money, it would not have passed. Lack of transparency is a huge political advantage.” So said Mr. Gruber.

Still quoting Mr. Gruber: “And basically, call it the stupidity of the American voter or whatever, but basically that really was really, really critical for the thing to pass.” That is his quote.

Those comments belittle the American people and try to rationalize why, when you have an agenda, the government should not be transparent. The President and proponents of ObamaCare all said publicly this was the first step to nationalized health insurance. That certainly has become transparent.

Now, not only are individuals adversely affected in terms of their own insurance coverage, but also due to the law's mandate on employers, many are seeing the law's negative repercussions at their jobs. The law's employer mandate hinders job creation and growth. Its new definition of full-time employment at 30 hours a week has been a real problem. According to one estimate, 2.6 million workers—2.6 million workers—could potentially have their hours and therefore their paychecks reduced as a result of this provision.

Most concerning is that this new definition of full-time employment hits low-wage earners who work in the service industries. Of the individuals at risk, about half work in retail and half in restaurants. If these folks were pre-

viously working the traditional 40 hours per week, you are not just taking 10 hours from them, but you are reducing their paycheck by 25 percent a week. That is why they work in two different jobs. That is a very noticeable adverse effect.

The concerns I have outlined today are only a few of the many reasons why we need to repeal this law, both the individual and employer mandates. We need to fix health care. Everybody knows that. But we don't need to fix ObamaCare. We need to give peace of mind to the families hurt by ObamaCare.

Now, no one is saying go back to the system we had before. We need reforms to our health care system every day. ObamaCare is costing millions of dollars. But with this law—what the President has called “this thing”—we may have mandated greater coverage for all but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. Let me repeat that. We may have mandated greater coverage for all—if that was the goal of my friends across the aisle—but not access to care and at a cost that is unaffordable. That is not a health care plan.

Perhaps some can afford the rising premiums, but can you actually go see your doctor and receive treatment or is your deductible too high? And is your doctor still available to you? Will your doctor spend at least 5 minutes with you—5 minutes with you—or more time filling out forms or electronic medical records? And are those records secure?

Any day now the Supreme Court will hand down its decision in *King v. Burwell*. This is the case that will determine the legality of the administration's regulation extending health insurance subsidies to people in States that use the Federal insurance exchange. And we will see—we will see—if the Court decides that the law should be implemented as written by this Congress—with all of us on this side of the aisle voting no—or implemented as interpreted by the administration.

This is similarly troubling for Kansas, where we have a federally facilitated exchange. If these tax subsidies go away, 77,000 Kansans and millions of Americans, will be affected. These individuals would be confronted with ObamaCare's true cost—true cost—and would face much higher premiums, with only the administration to blame for recklessly offering tens of billions of dollars in subsidies they had no authority to offer, if the Court rules that way.

A ruling against the administration would also free many of these Kansans from the individual mandate penalty if that coverage is too expensive for them and they, therefore, would qualify for an affordability exemption.

The employer mandate penalties would also be unenforceable. Employers can then add employees above the 50 threshold without fear of penalty and increase workers' hours to more than 30 hours per week.

If the Court invalidates the subsidies, we will be ready. We will be ready on this side of the aisle with our solutions to help mitigate the pain for those individuals harmed by the administration and provide States greater flexibility and build a bridge away from ObamaCare.

However the Court rules, I know that I and everybody on this side of the aisle will continue fighting to repeal this harmful law and replace it with true health care reforms that lower costs, lift the burden on our job creators, and restore the all-important relationship between a doctor and a patient.

The test to fix health care, not ObamaCare, is coming soon. Let's fix health care.

I yield the floor.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, on June 4, I was not present to vote on Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2016, amendment No. 1494 to H.R. 1735. I would have voted against this measure.

Madam President, as well, had I been present for the vote on amendment No. 1889, I would have voted no on this amendment. I do not support telegraphing to the enemy what interrogation techniques we will or won't use and denying future Commanders in Chief and intelligence professionals important tools for protecting the American people and the U.S. homeland.

MARITIME PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS IN THE ASIA-PACIFIC REGION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, in the interests of moving the defense bill forward I withdraw my amendments, Nos. 2038 and 2056.

These amendments were intended address a set of issues where I share a concern with the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee that the U.S. needs to make additional concerted effort and provide additional focus to our maritime partner capacity building efforts in the Asia-Pacific region. Indeed, the chairman included a significant provision in this bill for a South China Sea initiative which I support. My efforts were intended to compliment the work of the chairman and assure that we have a fully articulated and whole-of-government approach to this issue, with both the Department of Defense and the Department of State fully and appropriately engaged.

The chairman and I have had some positive discussions on this issue in recent days, and I have received his assurances that my concerns will be addressed as this legislation moves forward. And I also intend to make sure that other aspects of this issue are addressed in legislation that the Foreign Relations Committee will take up, and where I look to the chairman for his partnership and continued leadership on this issue.

With those assurances—and given the deep and shared commitment the

chairman and I have on this issue—I do not see a need to press forward for a vote on my amendments at this time.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Maryland for his consideration. I can assure him that we share a common set of concerns and common set of goals on this issue. We have discussed a pathway forward that addresses the questions raised by his proposed amendments, and I look forward to working with him going forward. And I very much look forward to continuing to work with him on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise today to thank colleagues on both sides of the aisle for the debate and votes we will be casting today on the National Defense Authorization Act. We have come together in a bipartisan fashion, and we have spent significant time in committee and now on the floor to deal with countless provisions. This act is nothing if not detailed with countless provisions that are critical to the defense of the Nation.

We have a long tradition of bipartisanship in this body on the NDAA. The Senate passes an NDAA in one form or another every year, and that can't be said about any other piece of legislation. I want to congratulate the new chairman, Senator MCCAIN, and the new ranking member, Senator REED, and I want to congratulate my colleagues who serve together on the committee, including our Presiding Officer, and also all of our staff, both our personal staff and committee staff—I see some committee staff here—because this is a significant amount of work.

There are many important provisions in the NDAA that affect our national security, and my Commonwealth of Virginia is deeply connected to the American military. In addition to grand items, the NDAA also examines in some excruciating detail some very, very fine points.

Just to give a few examples, the NDAA includes a provision dealing with storage facilities that are needed to help us combat rust on military vehicles, the transmission systems that are used in some army land vehicles, the reflective markings and lights that are used on military air fields, one particular military barracks that has sewage, mold, hot water, and rodent problems, and we even deal in the NDAA with some details of West Point's football program—some of the athletic programs at West Point.

But after all this minute analysis and debate and discussion over the past weeks, both in committee and on the floor, I do notice something a little bit strange. While Congress is very willing to debate and vote on all things great and small concerning our military, there is one thing we don't want to debate or vote on—whether the United States should be at war, whether we should be at war with ISIL. We will vote on shipbuilding, we will vote on military pensions, we will vote on vehi-

cle rust, and we will vote on barracks mold. But we don't want to vote on whether the Nation should be at war.

I proposed an amendment to the NDAA with Senator FLAKE and Senator MANCHIN expressing the sense of the Senate that we should have an authorization debate about whether we should be at war with ISIL, and the amendment that I proposed was ruled nongermane—so barracks mold, yes; vehicle rust, yes; the athletic programs at West Point, yes; whether we should be at war, nongermane to the Defense authorization act.

Interestingly, we even took a vote on the floor of the Senate in the NDAA about whether we should arm the Kurds in a war that Congress has not authorized that we could debate and vote on; but whether we should be at war we have not debated and voted upon.

So I went back and looked at article I of the Constitution. I found that there is no requirement that Congress vote on barracks mold or rust prevention or military airfield lighting. Certainly we can and should take up those matters because each of those matters—even if they just affect one barracks or one airfield—is about the safety of our troops and military personnel. Of course we should take them up. But there is nothing in the Constitution that requires that we take them up and debate and vote on them. But we are required to debate and vote to authorize war. Article I, section 8, clearly declares that Congress shall have the power to declare war—not the President; Congress. Yet, on this item, on this large item, on this largest of items, we are unwilling to debate and vote.

The war against ISIL is now in its 11th month; more than 3,500 U.S. airstrikes, more than 3,000 U.S. forces now in Iraq. U.S. servicemembers and American hostages have lost their lives in the battle against ISIL. The cost of the war to the American taxpayer is now more than \$2.5 billion—an average cost of \$9 million a day. The ISIL threat is spreading, the mission expanding.

In response to ISIL advances in the Anbar Province, the administration recently announced that an additional 450 trainers would be deployed to train and support Iraqi security forces.

So my question as a strong supporter of the NDAA is a simple one: How much longer will we allow war to be waged without Congress even being willing to have a debate about the strategy and scope of the mission? How much longer will we keep asking servicemembers to risk their lives without Congress doing the basic job of authorizing this war?

U.S. airstrikes started on August 8—313 days ago. Let me put this in a historic perspective. The 1-year anniversary of this war is approaching quickly. Congressional inaction on it is already of historic proportions.

World War I: It took President Wilson 33 days to bring an authorization to Congress. Congress acted in 4 days.

World War II: It took President Roosevelt 1 day to bring a request to Congress. Congress acted on the same day.

The Gulf of Tonkin Resolution: President Johnson brought a resolution to Congress within 3 days. Congress acted 5 days thereafter.

The invasion of Kuwait in gulf war 1: It took 160 days for the President to bring an authorization to Congress, but Congress acted within 4 days in approving an authorization.

The 9/11 attacks: President Bush came the same day to Congress. It took 3 days for Congress to act.

In this war against ISIL, it took the President nearly 6 months to bring an authorization to Congress, and it is now more than 4 months since that happened—313 days—and Congress has said virtually nothing.

I appreciate that Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN have made a recent commitment to discuss an ISIL authorization in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction. I understand that. Senator FLAKE and I have introduced a bipartisan proposal to show that there is bipartisan support for this mission, and we have been pushing to have the matter heard.

Yesterday, in a debate on the House floor, the chairman of the HASC committee stated plainly that it is time that we “ought to have a real AUMF debate.”

So I am here to support the NDAA and the good work our chair and ranking member and all the members have done. But I am here to point out that on day 313, if we are willing to deal with important, narrow, small issues, we should be finally willing to address the most important issue we have before us. I challenge my colleagues to do this and to bring the same amount of attention and bipartisanship to debating whether we should send American troops to war as we are willing to apply to barracks mold and vehicle rust.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, with the bill managers' permission, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I know the bill managers are working on a final agreement, and I would defer to them at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1974, AS MODIFIED; 2030; 1472, AS MODIFIED; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, AS MODIFIED; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, AS MODIFIED; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; AND 1916 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1463

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, the ranking member and I have a small package of amendments that have been cleared by both sides.

Notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII and adoption of the McCain substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up and agreed to en bloc: McCain No. 1974, as modified; Murkowski No. 2030; Vitter No. 1472, as modified; Daines No. 1890; Coats No. 1705; Flake No. 1720; Gardner No. 1708; Enzi No. 1908; Paul No. 1678; Hatch No. 1811; Fischer No. 1825; King No. 2020; Menendez No. 2050, as modified; Coons No. 1474; Murphy No. 1901; Warren No. 1902; Blumenthal No. 1563; Durbin No. 1703; Tester No. 1944, as modified; Casey No. 1747; Schatz No. 2006; Leahy No. 1931; Ayotte No. 2011; and Bennet No. 1916.

These have been agreed to by both sides, and I thank all Members for the agreement of this package. I am sorry it is not larger, but it is equally divided between both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments are called up and agreed to en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 1974, as modified; 2030; 1472, as modified; 1890; 1705; 1720; 1708; 1908; 1678; 1811; 1825; 2020; 2050, as modified; 1474; 1901; 1902; 1563; 1703; 1944, as modified; 1747; 2006; 1931; 2011; and 1916) agreed to en bloc are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 1974, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the security and protection of Iranian dissidents living in Camp Liberty, Iraq)

At the end of subtitle B of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1230. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON THE SECURITY AND PROTECTION OF IRANIAN DISSIDENTS LIVING IN CAMP LIBERTY, IRAQ.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The residents of Camp Liberty, Iraq, renounced violence and unilaterally disarmed more than a decade ago.

(2) The United States recognized the residents of the former Camp Ashraf who now reside in Camp Liberty as “protected persons” under the Fourth Geneva Convention and committed itself to protect the residents.

(3) The deterioration in the overall security situation in Iraq has increased the vulnerability of Camp Liberty residents to attacks from proxies of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps and Sunni extremists associated with the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

(4) The increased vulnerability underscores the need for an expedited relocation process and that these Iranian dissidents will neither be safe nor secure in Camp Liberty.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States should—

(1) take prompt and appropriate steps in accordance with international agreements to promote the physical security and protection of Camp Liberty residents;

(2) urge the Government of Iraq to uphold its commitments to the United States to en-

sure the safety and well-being of those living in Camp Liberty;

(3) urge the Government of Iraq to ensure continued and reliable access to food, clean water, medical assistance, electricity and other energy needs, and any other equipment and supplies necessary to sustain the residents during periods of attack or siege by external forces;

(4) oppose the extradition of Camp Liberty residents to Iran;

(5) implement a strategy to provide for the safe, secure, and permanent relocation of Camp Liberty residents that includes a relocation plan, including a detailed outline of the steps that would need to be taken by recipient countries, the United States, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and Camp residents to relocate the residents to other countries;

(6) encourage continued close cooperation between the residents of Camp Liberty and the authorities in the relocation process; and

(7) assist the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in expediting the ongoing resettlement of all residents of Camp Liberty to safe locations outside Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 2030

(Purpose: To express the sense of Congress on the coordination of hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities on military land)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION OF HUNTING, FISHING, AND OTHER RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES ON MILITARY LAND.

It is the sense of Congress that, in situations where military lands are open to public access for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities, the Department of Defense should seek to ensure that coordination with State fish and wildlife managers, tribes, and local governments occurs sufficiently in advance of traditional hunting, fishing, and recreational use seasons to facilitate communication with hunting, fishing, and recreational user groups.

AMENDMENT NO. 1472, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To exclude AbilityOne goods from the authority to acquire goods and services manufactured in Afghanistan, central Asian states, and Djibouti)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. EXCEPTION FOR ABILITYONE GOODS FROM AUTHORITY TO ACQUIRE GOODS AND SERVICES MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN AND CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.

(a) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN AFGHANISTAN.—Section 886 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (d),” after “subsection (b).”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.—The authority under subsection (a) of this section shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 in Afghanistan if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

(b) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN ITEMS NOT MANUFACTURED IN CENTRAL ASIAN STATES.—Section 801 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2010 (Public Law 111–84; 123 Stat. 2399) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting “and except as provided in subsection (h),” after “subsection (b),”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(h) EXCLUSION OF ITEMS ON THE ABILITYONE PROCUREMENT CATALOG.—The authority under subsection (a) shall not be available for the procurement of any good that is contained in the procurement catalog described in section 8503(a) of title 41 if such good can be produced and delivered by a qualified nonprofit agency for the blind or a nonprofit agency for other severely disabled in a timely fashion to support mission requirements.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1890

(Purpose: To modify the immediate applicability of basic allowance for housing for married members assigned for duty within normal commuting distance)

On page 213, between lines 9 and 10, insert the following:

(3) PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BAH FOR CERTAIN OTHER MARRIED MEMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the amount of basic allowance for housing payable to a member of the uniformed services under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, shall not be reduced by reason of the amendment made by subsection (a) unless—

(A) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence;

(B) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing; or

AMENDMENT NO. 1705

(Purpose: To provide for military exchanges between senior officers and officials of the United States and Taiwan)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. MILITARY EXCHANGES BETWEEN SENIOR OFFICERS AND OFFICIALS OF THE UNITED STATES AND TAIWAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense should carry out a program of exchanges of senior military officers and senior officials between the United States and Taiwan designed to improve military to military relations between the United States and Taiwan.

(b) EXCHANGES DESCRIBED.—For the purposes of this section, an exchange is an activity, exercise, event, or observation opportunity between members of the Armed Forces and officials of the Department of Defense, on the one hand, and armed forces personnel and officials of Taiwan, on the other hand.

(c) FOCUS OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include exchanges focused on the following:

- (1) Threat analysis.
- (2) Military doctrine.
- (3) Force planning.
- (4) Logistical support.
- (5) Intelligence collection and analysis.
- (6) Operational tactics, techniques, and procedures.
- (7) Humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

(d) CIVIL-MILITARY AFFAIRS.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall include activities and exercises focused on civil-military relations, including parliamentary relations.

(e) LOCATION OF EXCHANGES.—The exchanges under the program carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall be conducted in both the United States and Taiwan.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “senior military officer”, with respect to the Armed Forces, means a general or flag officer of the Armed Forces on active duty.

(2) The term “senior official”, with respect to the Department of Defense, means a civilian official of the Department of Defense at the level of Assistant Secretary of Defense or above.

AMENDMENT NO. 1720

(Purpose: To authorize transportation to transfer ceremonies for the family and next of kin of members of the Armed Forces who die overseas during humanitarian operations)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. TRANSPORTATION TO TRANSFER CEREMONIES FOR FAMILY AND NEXT OF KIN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO DIE OVERSEAS DURING HUMANITARIAN OPERATIONS.

Section 481(e)(1) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting “(including during a humanitarian relief operation)” after “located or serving overseas”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1708

(Purpose: To require a strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region)

At the end of subtitle E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1264. STRATEGY TO PROMOTE UNITED STATES INTERESTS IN THE INDO-ASIA-PACIFIC REGION.

(a) STRATEGY.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall develop an overall strategy to promote United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Such strategy shall be informed by the following:

(1) The national security strategy of the United States for 2015 set forth in the national security strategy report required under section 108(a)(3) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 5043(a)(3)), as such strategy relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(2) The 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(3) The 2015 Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), as it relates to United States interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region.

(4) The strategy to prioritize United States defense interests in the Asia-Pacific region as contained in the report required by section 1251(a) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3570).

(5) The integrated, multi-year planning and budget strategy for a rebalancing of United States policy in Asia submitted to Congress pursuant to section 7043(a) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2014 (division K of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2014 (Public Law 113-76)).

(b) PRESIDENTIAL POLICY DIRECTIVE.—The President shall issue a Presidential Policy Directive to appropriate departments and agencies of the United States Government that contains the strategy developed under subsection (a) and includes implementing guidance to such departments and agencies.

(c) RELATION TO AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS AND ANNUAL BUDGET.—

(1) AGENCY PRIORITY GOALS.—In identifying agency priority goals under section 1120(b) of title 31, United States Code, for each appropriate department and agency of the United States Government, the head of such department or agency, or as otherwise determined by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall take into consideration the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

(2) ANNUAL BUDGET.—The President shall, acting through the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, ensure that the annual budget submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, includes a separate section that clearly highlights programs and projects that are being funded in the annual budget that relate to the strategy developed under subsection (a) and the Presidential Policy Directive issued under subsection (b).

AMENDMENT NO. 1908

(Purpose: To provide for a small business procurement ombudsman)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. SMALL BUSINESS PROCUREMENT OMBUDSMAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The small business offices in the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the military departments shall serve as intermediaries between small businesses and contracting officials prior to the award of contracts in cases where a small business prospective contractor notifies the small business office that it has reason to believe that the contracting process has been modified to preclude a small business from bidding on the contract or would give another contractor an unfair competitive advantage.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preclude a contractor from exercising the right to initiate a bid protest under a contract.

AMENDMENT NO. 1678

(Purpose: To provide for the more accurate and complete enumeration of members of the Armed Forces in any tabulation of total population by the Secretary of Commerce)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. IMPROVED ENUMERATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN ANY TABULATION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of title 13, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g) Effective beginning with the 2020 decennial census of population, in taking any tabulation of total population by States, the Secretary shall take appropriate measures to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that all members of the Armed Forces deployed abroad on the date of taking such tabulation are—

“(1) fully and accurately counted; and

“(2) properly attributed to the State in which their permanent duty station or homeport is located on such date.”.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the residency status of any member of the Armed Forces under any provision of law other than title 13, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 1811

(Purpose: To provide for sustainment enhancement)

On page 375, line 4, insert “, which includes a sustainment strategy,” after “strategy”.

On page 377, line 13, strike “(d) In this section” and insert the following:

“(9) A sustainment strategy which includes all aspects of the total life cycle management of the weapon system, including product support, logistics, product support engineering, supply chain integration, maintenance, acquisition logistics, and all aspects of software sustainment.

“(d) INDEPENDENT COST ESTIMATE.—The Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation shall perform an evaluation of the

sustainment portion of the acquisition strategy required by subsection (c)(9) prior to the Milestone B decision.

“(e) In this section

On page 410, after line 21, add the following:

SEC. 852. SUSTAINMENT ENHANCEMENT.

(a) **ASSESSMENT EXPANSION OF FUNCTIONS OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR LOGISTICS AND MATERIEL READINESS TO INCLUDE SUSTAINMENT FUNCTIONS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of—

(1) assigning to the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Logistics and Materiel Readiness—

(A) functions relating to the sustainment strategy required under section 2431a(c)(9) of Title 10, United States Code, as added by section 841 of this Act; and

(B) functions relating to manufacturing and industrial base policy currently being carried out within the Office of the Secretary of Defense; and

(2) redesignating such Assistant Secretary (with such functions so assigned and together with the current logistics and materiel readiness functions of such Assistant Secretary) as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Sustainment.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Department of Defense does not place sufficient emphasis on sustainment of a weapon system during the entire acquisition process; and

(2) the Department of Defense should address this deficiency and ensure that all aspect of weapon system sustainment are carefully considered throughout the entire Integrated Defense Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics Life Cycle Management System.

AMENDMENT NO. 1825

(Purpose: To authorize appropriations for national security aspects of the Merchant Marine for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes.)

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of June 8, 2015, under “Text of Amendments.”)

AMENDMENT NO. 2020

(Purpose: To demonstrate the effects of a method to facilitate the disposal of excess Army property and management of underutilized and unutilized property by providing an exemption from certain requirements for off-site use and off-site removal only of non-mobile properties)

At the end of subtitle B of title XXVIII, add the following:

SEC. 2815. EXEMPTION OF ARMY OFF-SITE USE AND OFF-SITE REMOVAL ONLY NON-MOBILE PROPERTIES FROM CERTAIN EXCESS PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUIREMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Excess or unutilized or underutilized non-mobile property of the Army that is situated on non-excess land shall be exempt from the requirements of title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 11411 et seq.) upon a determination by the Secretary of the Army that—

(1) the property is not feasible to relocate; (2) the property is located in an area to which the general public is denied access in the interest of national security; and

(3) the exemption would facilitate the efficient disposal of excess property or result in more efficient real property management.

(b) **CONSULTATION.**—Before making an initial determination under the authority provided under subsection (a), and periodically

thereafter, the Secretary of the Army shall consult with the Executive Director of the United States Interagency Council on Homelessness on types of non-mobile properties that may be feasible for relocation and suitable to assist the homeless.

(b) **SUNSET.**—The authority under subsection (a) shall expire on September 30, 2017.

AMENDMENT NO. 2050, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To require a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus)

At the end of subtitle F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1274. REPORT ON THE SECURITY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the security relationship between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A description of ongoing military and security cooperation between the United States and the Republic of Cyprus.

(2) A discussion of potential steps for enhancing the bilateral security relationship between the United States and Cyprus, including steps to enhance the military and security capabilities of the Republic of Cyprus.

(3) An analysis of the effect on the bilateral security relationship of the United States policy to deny applications for licenses and other approvals for the export of defense articles and defense services to the armed forces of Cyprus.

(4) An analysis of the extent to which such United States policy is consistent with overall United States security and policy objectives in the region.

(5) An assessment of the potential impact of lifting such United States policy.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the congressional defense committees; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1474

(Purpose: To propose an alternative to section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

Strike section 1204 and insert the following:

SEC. 1204. PERMANENCE AND MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES RELATING TO NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a)(1) of section 1205 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113–66; 127 Stat. 897; 32 U.S.C. 107 note) is amended by adding at the end before the period the following: “to support the national interests and security cooperation goals and objectives of the United States, including applicable policy and guidelines for United States security sector assistance”.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—Subsection (b) of such section is amended by inserting “that is not” after “an activity that the Secretary of Defense determines is a matter”.

(c) **PROCEDURES.**—Such section, as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) **PROCEDURES.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall—

“(A) establish, maintain, and update as appropriate a list of core competencies to support each program established under subsection (a), collectively and for each State and territory, and shall submit for approval to the Secretary of Defense the list of core competencies and additional information needed to make use of such core competencies; and

“(B) designate a director for each State and territory who shall be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.

“(2) **MILITARY-TO-CIVILIAN CORE COMPETENCIES.**—The Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, may conduct an activity under a program established under subsection (a) relating to military-to-civilian core competencies.”.

(d) **NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.**—Subsection (e) of such section (as redesignated) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM FUND.**—

“(A) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

“(i) **BOOKS OF DOD.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), the Secretary of Defense shall establish on the books of the Department of Defense a National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

“(ii) **BOOKS OF TREASURY.**—If not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees that in the opinion of the Secretary a fund such as the Fund described in clause (i) should be established on the books of the Department of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Treasury shall establish on the books of the Treasury on that date a Fund to be known as the National Guard State Partnership Program Fund.

“(B) **CREDITS.**—In administering the Fund established under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall, to the extent the Secretary determines it to be appropriate, provide for the following amounts to be credited to the Fund:

“(i) Amounts authorized and appropriated to carry out operations under this section.

“(ii) Amounts that the Secretary of Defense transfers, in such amounts as provided in appropriations Acts, to the Fund from amounts authorized and appropriated to the Department of Defense, including amounts authorized to be appropriated for the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard.

“(C) **INCLUSION IN ANNUAL BUDGET.**—The President shall include the Fund established under subparagraph (A) in the budget that the President submits to Congress under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for each fiscal year in which the authority under subsection (a) is in effect.”.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”; and

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).

“(vii) The list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1) and any update to any changes to the list of core competencies required by subsection (c)(1).”.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—Subsection (h) of such section (as redesignated) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) the congressional defense committees; and

“(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as amended) the following:

“(2) CORE COMPETENCIES.—The term ‘core competencies’ means military-to-military and military-to-civilian skills and capabilities of the National Guard, consistent with the roles and missions of the Armed Forces as established by the Secretary of Defense.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) STATE.—The term ‘State’ means each of the several States and the District of Columbia.

“(5) TERRITORY.—The term ‘territory’ means the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.”.

(g) PERMANENT AUTHORITY.—Such section is further amended by striking subsection (i).

AMENDMENT NO. 1901

(Purpose: To require reporting on foreign procurements)

At the end of subtitle E of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 884. ANNUAL REPORT ON FOREIGN PROCUREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§2338. Reporting on foreign purchases

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the end of fiscal year 2016, and each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional defense committees a report listing specific procurements by the Department of Defense in that fiscal year of articles, materials, or supplies valued greater than \$5,000,000, indexed to inflation, using the exception under section 8302(a)(2)(A) of title 41. This report may be submitted as part of the report required under section 8305 of such title.

“(b) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 2337 the following new item:

“2338. Reporting on foreign purchases.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 1902

(Purpose: To require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY ON GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BEHAVIOR AMONG MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on gaming facilities at military installations and problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces.

(b) MATTERS INCLUDED.—The study conducted under subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) With respect to gaming facilities at military installations, disaggregated by each branch of the Armed Forces—

(A) the number, type, and location of such gaming facilities;

(B) the total amount of cash flow through such gaming facilities; and

(C) the amount of revenue generated by such gaming facilities for morale, welfare, and recreation programs of the Department of Defense.

(2) An assessment of the prevalence of and particular risks for problem gambling among members of the Armed Forces, including such recommendations for policies and programs to be carried out by the Department to address problem gambling as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(3) An assessment of the ability and capacity of military health care personnel to adequately diagnose and provide dedicated treatment for problem gambling, including—

(A) a comparison of treatment programs of the Department for alcohol abuse, illegal substance abuse, and tobacco addiction with treatment programs of the Department for problem gambling; and

(B) an assessment of whether additional training for military health care personnel on providing treatment for problem gambling would be beneficial.

(4) An assessment of the financial counseling and related services that are available to members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who are impacted by problem gambling.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a).

(2) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AMENDMENT NO. 1563

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly submit to Congress a report on the implementation of new or updated electronic health records in certain environments)

At the end of subtitle C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 738. REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF DATA SECURITY AND TRANSMISSION STANDARDS FOR ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than June 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the standards for security and transmission of data to be implemented by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs in deploying the new or updated, as the case may be, electronic health record system of each such Department (required to be deployed by each such Department under section 713 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1071 note)) at military installations and in field environments.

(b) TRANSMISSION OF DATA.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include information on standards for transmission of data between the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs and standards for transmission of data between each such Department and private sector entities.

AMENDMENT NO. 1703

(Purpose: To authorize the provision of post-traumatic stress disorder training to military and security forces of the Government of Ukraine)

On page 636, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(10) Training and best practices to identify and treat post-traumatic stress disorder among Ukrainian Armed Forces and National Guard personnel.

AMENDMENT NO. 1944, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To reform and improve personnel security, insider threat detection and prevention, and physical security)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. REFORM AND IMPROVEMENT OF PERSONNEL SECURITY, INSIDER THREAT DETECTION AND PREVENTION, AND PHYSICAL SECURITY.

(a) PERSONNEL SECURITY AND INSIDER THREAT PROTECTION IN DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

(1) PLANS AND SCHEDULES.—Consistent with the Memorandum of the Secretary of Defense dated March 18, 2014, regarding the recommendations of the reviews of the Washington Navy Yard shooting, the Secretary of Defense shall develop plans and schedules—

(A) to implement a continuous evaluation capability for the national security population for which clearance adjudications are conducted by the Department of Defense Central Adjudication Facility, in coordination with the Suitability Executive Agent, the Security Executive Agent, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(B) to produce a Department-wide insider threat strategy and implementation plan, which includes—

(i) resourcing for the Defense Insider Threat Management and Analysis Center (DITMAC) and component insider threat programs, and

(ii) alignment of insider threat protection programs with continuous evaluation capabilities and processes for personnel security;

(C) to centralize the authority, accountability, and programmatic integration responsibilities, including fiscal control, for personnel security and insider threat protection under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(D) to align the Department's consolidated Central Adjudication Facility under the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence;

(E) to develop a defense security enterprise reform investment strategy to ensure a consistent, long-term focus on funding to strengthen all of the Department's security and insider threat programs, policies, functions, and information technology capabilities, including detecting threat behaviors conveyed in the cyber domain, in a manner that keeps pace with evolving threats and risks;

(F) to resource and expedite deployment of the Identity Management Enterprise Services Architecture (IMESA); and

(G) to implement the recommendations contained in the study conducted by the Director of Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation required by section 907 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2014 (Public Law 113-66; 10 U.S.C. 1564 note), including, specifically, the recommendations to centrally manage and regulate Department of Defense requests for personnel security background investigations.

(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report describing the plans and schedules required under paragraph (1).

(b) PHYSICAL AND LOGICAL ACCESS.—Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Secretary of Defense shall define physical and logical access standards, capabilities, and processes applicable to all personnel with access to Department of Defense installations and information technology systems, including—

(A) periodic or regularized background or records checks appropriate to the type of physical or logical access involved, the security level, the category of individuals authorized, and the level of access to be granted;

(B) standards and methods for verifying the identity of individuals seeking access; and

(C) electronic attribute-based access controls that are appropriate for the type of access and facility or information technology system involved;

(2) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall design a capability to share and apply electronic identity information across the Government to enable real-time, risk-managed physical and logical access decisions; and

(3) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in conjunction with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management and in consultation with representatives from stakeholder organizations, shall establish investigative and adjudicative standards for the periodic or regularized reevaluation of the eligibility of an individual to retain credentials issued pursuant to Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004), as appropriate, but not less frequently than the authorization period of the issued credentials.

(c) SECURITY ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall—

(1) formalize the Security, Suitability, and Credentialing Line of Business;

(2) submit a report to the appropriate congressional committee that describes plans—

(A) for oversight by the Office of Management and Budget of activities of the executive branch of the Government for personnel security, suitability, and credentialing;

(B) to designate enterprise shared services to optimize investments;

(C) to define and implement data standards to support common electronic access to critical Government records; and

(D) to reduce the burden placed on Government data providers by centralizing requests for records access and ensuring proper sharing of the data with appropriate investigative and adjudicative elements.

(d) RECIPROCITY MANAGEMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council shall ensure that—

(1) a centralized system is available to serve as the reciprocity management system for the Federal Government; and

(2) the centralized system described in paragraph (1) is aligned with, and incorporates results from, continuous evaluation and other enterprise reform initiatives.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Performance Accountability Council, in coordination with the Security Executive Agent, the Suitability Executive Agent, and the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly develop a plan to—

(1) implement the Security Executive Agent Directive on common, standardized employee and contractor security reporting requirements;

(2) establish and implement uniform reporting requirements for employees and Federal contractors, according to risk, relative to the safety of the workforce and protection of the most sensitive information of the Government; and

(3) ensure that reported information is shared appropriately.

(f) ACCESS TO CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND OTHER PURPOSES.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(7) The terms ‘Security Executive Agent’ and ‘Suitability Executive Agent’ mean the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent, respectively, established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.”.

(2) COVERED AGENCIES.—Section 9101(a)(6) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The Department of Homeland Security.

“(H) The Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

“(I) An Executive agency that—

“(i) is authorized to conduct background investigations under a Federal statute; or

“(ii) is delegated authority to conduct background investigations in accordance with procedures established by the Security Executive Agent or the Suitability Executive Agent under subsection (b) or (c)(iv) of section 2.3 of Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

“(J) A contractor that conducts a background investigation on behalf of an agency described in subparagraphs (A) through (I).”.

(3) APPLICABLE PURPOSES OF INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (D) as clauses (i) through (iv), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(B) in the matter preceding clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “the head of”;

(ii) by inserting “all” before “criminal history record information”; and

(iii) by striking “for the purpose of determining eligibility for any of the following:” and inserting “, in accordance with Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Suitability Executive Agent and Security Executive Agent, for the purpose of—

“(A) determining eligibility for—”;

(C) in clause (i), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Access” and inserting “access”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon;

(D) in clause (ii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Assignment” and inserting “assignment”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “or positions”;;

(E) in clause (iii), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Acceptance” and inserting “acceptance”; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”;

(F) in clause (iv), as redesignated—

(i) by striking “Appointment” and inserting “appointment”;;

(ii) by striking “or a critical or sensitive position”; and

(iii) by striking the period and inserting “; or”; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) conducting a basic suitability or fitness assessment for Federal or contractor

employees, using Federal Investigative Standards jointly promulgated by the Security Executive Agent and the Suitability Executive Agent in accordance with—

“(i) Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto; and

“(ii) the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum ‘Assignment of Functions Relating to Coverage of Contractor Employee Fitness in the Federal Investigative Standards’, dated December 6, 2012;

“(C) credentialing under the Homeland Security Presidential Directive 12 (dated August 27, 2004); and

“(D) Federal Aviation Administration checks required under—

“(i) the Federal Aviation Administration Drug Enforcement Assistance Act of 1988 (subtitle E of title VII of Public Law 100-690; 102 Stat. 4424) and the amendments made by that Act; or

“(ii) section 44710 of title 49.”.

(4) BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC SEARCHES.—Section 9101(b)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(2)(A) A State central criminal history record depository shall allow a covered agency to conduct both biometric and biographic searches of criminal history record information.

“(B) Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to prohibit the Federal Bureau of Investigation from requiring a request for criminal history record information to be accompanied by the fingerprints of the individual who is the subject of the request.”.

(5) USE OF MOST COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEM.—Section 9101(e) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) If a criminal justice agency is able to provide the same information through more than 1 system described in paragraph (1), a covered agency may request information under subsection (b) from the criminal justice agency, and require the criminal justice agency to provide the information, using the system that is most cost-effective for the Federal Government.”.

(6) SEALED OR EXPUNGED RECORDS; JUVENILE RECORDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(i) in the first sentence, by inserting before the period the following: “, and includes any analogous juvenile records”; and

(ii) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “The term includes those records of a State or locality sealed pursuant to law if such records are accessible by State and local criminal justice agencies for the purpose of conducting background checks.”.

(B) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Federal Government should not uniformly reject applicants for employment with the Federal Government or Federal contractors based on—

(i) sealed or expunged criminal records; or

(ii) juvenile records.

(7) INTERACTION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT AND INTELLIGENCE AGENCIES ABROAD.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) Upon request by a covered agency and in accordance with the applicable provisions of this section, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Overseas Citizens Services shall make available criminal history record information collected by the Deputy Assistant Secretary with respect to an individual who is under investigation by the covered agency regarding any interaction of the individual with a law enforcement agency or intelligence agency of a foreign country.”.

(8) CLARIFICATION OF SECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS CONDUCTING BACKGROUND INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 9101 of

title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) If a contractor described in subsection (a)(6)(J) uses an automated information delivery system to request criminal history record information, the contractor shall comply with any necessary security requirements for access to that system.”.

(9) CLARIFICATION REGARDING ADVERSE ACTIONS.—Section 7512 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (D), by striking “or”;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period and inserting “, or”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(F) a suitability action taken by the Office under regulations prescribed by the Office, subject to the rules prescribed by the President under this title for the administration of the competitive service.”.

(10) ANNUAL REPORT BY SUITABILITY AND SECURITY CLEARANCE PERFORMANCE ACCOUNTABILITY COUNCIL.—Section 9101 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this subsection, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) The Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto, shall submit to the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, an annual report that—

“(1) describes efforts of the Council to integrate Federal, State, and local systems for sharing criminal history record information;

“(2) analyzes the extent and effectiveness of Federal education programs regarding criminal history record information;

“(3) provides an update on the implementation of best practices for sharing criminal history record information, including ongoing limitations experienced by investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency with respect to access to State and local criminal history record information; and

“(4) provides a description of limitations on the sharing of information relevant to a background investigation, other than criminal history record information, between—

“(A) investigators working for or on behalf of a covered agency; and

“(B) State and local law enforcement agencies.”.

(11) GAO REPORT ON ENHANCING INTEROPERABILITY AND REDUCING REDUNDANCY IN FEDERAL CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE PROTECTION ACCESS CONTROL, BACKGROUND CHECK, AND CREDENTIALING STANDARDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on the background check, access control, and credentialing requirements of Federal programs for the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources.

(B) CONTENTS.—The Comptroller General shall include in the report required under subparagraph (A)—

(i) a summary of the major characteristics of each such Federal program, including the types of infrastructure and resources covered;

(ii) a comparison of the requirements, whether mandatory or voluntary in nature, for regulated entities under each such program to—

(I) conduct background checks on employees, contractors, and other individuals;

(II) adjudicate the results of a background check, including the utilization of a standardized set of disqualifying offenses or the consideration of minor, non-violent, or juvenile offenses; and

(III) establish access control systems to deter unauthorized access, or provide a security credential for any level of access to a covered facility or resource;

(iii) a review of any efforts that the Screening Coordination Office of the Department of Homeland Security has undertaken or plans to undertake to harmonize or standardize background check, access control, or credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs overseen by the Department; and

(iv) recommendations, developed in consultation with appropriate stakeholders, regarding—

(I) enhancing the interoperability of security credentials across critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(II) eliminating the need for redundant background checks or credentials across existing critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs;

(III) harmonizing, where appropriate, the standards for identifying potentially disqualifying criminal offenses and the weight assigned to minor, nonviolent, or juvenile offenses in adjudicating the results of a completed background check; and

(IV) the development of common, risk-based standards with respect to the background check, access control, and security credentialing requirements for critical infrastructure and key resource protection programs.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the congressional defense committees;

(B) the Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(C) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the term “Performance Accountability Council” means the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), or any successor thereto.

AMENDMENT NO. 1747

(Purpose: To require the Department of Defense to support the security of Afghan women and girls during and after 2015)

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1209. SUPPORT FOR SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN AND GIRLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Through the sacrifice and dedication of members of the Armed Forces, civilian personnel, and our Afghan partners as well as the American people's generous investment, oppressive Taliban rule has given way to a nascent democracy in Afghanistan. It is in our national security interest to help prevent Afghanistan from ever again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism and to solidify and preserve the gains our men and women in uniform fought so hard to establish.

(2) The United States through its National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security

has made firm commitments to support the human rights of the women and girls of Afghanistan. The National Action Plan states that “the engagement and protection of women as agents of peace and stability will be central to United States efforts to promote security, prevent, respond to, and resolve conflict, and rebuild societies”.

(3) As stated in the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the Department of Defense and the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) “maintain a robust program dedicated to improving the recruitment, retention, and treatment of women in the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF), and to improving the status of Afghan women in general”.

(4) According to the Department of Defense's October 2014 Report on Progress Toward Security and Stability in Afghanistan, the “Afghan MoI showed significant support for women in the MoI and is taking steps to protect and empower female police and female MoI staff”. Although some positive steps have been made, progress remains slow to reach the MoI's goal of recruiting 10,000 women in the Afghan National Police (ANP) in the next 10 years.

(5) According to Inclusive Security, women only make up approximately 1 percent of the Afghan National Police. There are about 2,200 women serving in the police force, fewer than the goal of 5,000 women set by the Government of Afghanistan.

(6) According to the International Crisis Group, there are not enough female police officers to staff all provincial Family Response Units (FRUs). United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan and the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees found that “in the absence of Family Response Units or visible women police officers, women victims almost never approach police stations willingly, fearing they will be arrested, their reputations stained or worse”.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON PROMOTION OF SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to prevent Afghanistan from again becoming a safe haven and training ground for international terrorism;

(2) as an important part of a strategy to achieve this objective and to help Afghanistan achieve its full potential, the United States Government should continue to regularly press the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan to commit to the meaningful inclusion of women in the political, economic, and security transition process and to ensure that women's concerns are fully reflected in relevant negotiations;

(3) the United States Government and the Government of Afghanistan should reaffirm their commitment to supporting Afghan civil society, including women's organizations, as agreed to during the meeting between the International Community and the Government of Afghanistan on the Tokyo Mutual Accountability Framework (TMAF) in July 2013;

(4) the United States Government should continue to support and encourage efforts to recruit and retain women in the Afghan National Security Forces, who are critical to the success of NATO's Resolute Support Mission and future Enduring Partnership mission; and

(5) the United States should bid on no less than one gender advisor billet within the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit and continue to work with other countries to ensure that the Resolute Support Mission Gender Advisory Unit billets are fully staffed.

(c) PLAN TO PROMOTE SECURITY OF AFGHAN WOMEN.—

(1) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, in conjunction with the Secretary of State, shall include in the report required under section 1225 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291; 128 Stat. 3550)—

(A) an assessment of the security of Afghan women and girls, including information regarding efforts to increase the recruitment and retention of women in the ANSF; and

(B) an assessment of the implementation of the plans for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, treatment, and provision of appropriate facilities and transportation for women in the ANSF, including the challenges associated with such implementation and the steps being taken to address those challenges.

(2) **PLAN REQUIRED.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall, in coordination with the Secretary of State, to the extent practicable, support the efforts of the Government of Afghanistan to promote the security of Afghan women and girls during and after the security transition process through the development and implementation by the Government of Afghanistan of an Afghan-led plan that should include the elements described in this paragraph.

(B) **TRAINING.**—The Secretary of Defense, working with the NATO-led Resolute Support mission should encourage the Government of Afghanistan to develop—

(i) measures for the evaluation of the effectiveness of existing training for Afghan National Security Forces on this issue;

(ii) a plan to increase the number of female security officers specifically trained to address cases of gender-based violence, including ensuring the Afghan National Police's Family Response Units (FRUs) have the necessary resources and are available to women across Afghanistan;

(iii) mechanisms to enhance the capacity for units of National Police's Family Response Units to fulfill their mandate as well as indicators measuring the operational effectiveness of these units;

(iv) a plan to address the development of accountability mechanisms for ANA and ANP personnel who violate codes of conduct related to the human rights of women and girls, including female members of the ANSF; and

(v) a plan to develop training for the ANA and the ANP to increase awareness and responsiveness among ANA and ANP personnel regarding the unique security challenges women confront when serving in those forces.

(C) **ENROLLMENT AND TREATMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense, in cooperation with the Afghan Ministries of Defense and Interior, shall seek to assist the Government of Afghanistan in including as part of the plan developed under subparagraph (A) the development and implementation of a plan to increase the number of female members of the ANA and ANP and to promote their equal treatment, including through such steps as providing appropriate equipment, modifying facilities, and ensuring literacy and gender awareness training for recruits.

(D) **ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Of the funds available to the Department of Defense for the Afghan Security Forces Fund for Fiscal Year 2016, no less than \$10,000,000 should be used for the recruitment, integration, retention, training, and treatment of women in the ANSF as well as the recruitment, training, and contracting of female security personnel for future elections.

(ii) **TYPES OF PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES.**—Such programs and activities may include—

(I) efforts to recruit women into the ANSF, including the special operations forces;

(II) programs and activities of the Afghan Ministry of Defense Directorate of Human Rights and Gender Integration and the Afghan Ministry of Interior Office of Human Rights, Gender and Child Rights;

(III) development and dissemination of gender and human rights educational and training materials and programs within the Afghan Ministry of Defense and the Afghan Ministry of Interior;

(IV) efforts to address harassment and violence against women within the ANSF;

(V) improvements to infrastructure that address the requirements of women serving in the ANSF, including appropriate equipment for female security and police forces, and transportation for policewomen to their station

(VI) support for ANP Family Response Units; and

(VII) security provisions for high-profile female police and army officers.

AMENDMENT NO. 2006

(Purpose: Relating to the policies of the Department of Defense on the travel of next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas)

At the end of subtitle C of title VI, add the following:

SEC. 622. POLICIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON TRAVEL OF NEXT OF KIN TO PARTICIPATE IN THE DIGNIFIED TRANSFER OF REMAINS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE WHO DIE OVERSEAS.

(a) **REVIEW OF POLICIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense shall carry out a review of the current policies of the Department of Defense on the travel for next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The review required by this subsection shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the changes to Department instructions and Federal regulations necessary to provide Government funded travel to the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurred in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(B) An action plan and timeline for making the changes described in subparagraph (A).

(b) **MODIFICATION OF POLICIES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than February 1, 2016, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate actions to modify the policies of the Department in order to provide Government funded travel for the next of kin to participate in the dignified transfer of remains of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department of Defense who die overseas, regardless whether the death occurs in a combat area or a non-combat area.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Secretary is not required to modify the policies of the Department as described in paragraph (1) if, by not later than March 1, 2016, the Secretary certifies, in writing, to the congressional defense committees that such action is not in the best interest of the United States. The certification shall include the following:

(A) An assessment and reevaluation by the Secretary of the rational for excluding the next of kin from Government funded travel if the death of a member of the Armed Forces

or civilian employee of the Department overseas occurs in a non-combat area.

(B) Recommendations for alternative plans to ensure that the next of kin of members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees of the Department who die overseas in a non-combat area may participate in the dignified transfer of the remains of the deceased at Dover Port Mortuary, including through the actions of appropriate non-governmental organizations.

AMENDMENT NO. 1931

(Purpose: To improve the annual reports of the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the ability of the National Guard to meet its mission)

At the end of subtitle F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1065. ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE CHIEF OF THE NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU ON THE ABILITY OF THE NATIONAL GUARD TO MEET ITS MISSIONS.

Section 10504(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Chief of the National Guard Bureau”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking “, through the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force,”;

(3) by striking the second sentence; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

“(2) Each report shall include the following:

“(A) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out its Federal missions.

“(B) An assessment, prepared in conjunction with the chief executive officers of the States and territories, of the ability of the National Guard to carry out emergency support functions of the National Response Framework.

“(3) Each report may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2011

(Purpose: To provide for cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel capabilities)

Strike section 1272 and insert the following:

SEC. 1272. UNITED STATES-ISRAEL ANTI-TUNNEL COOPERATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Tunnels can be used for criminal purposes, such as smuggling drugs, weapons, or humans, or for terrorist or military purposes, such as launching surprise attacks or detonating explosives underneath civilian or military infrastructure.

(2) Tunnels have been a growing threat on the southern border of the United States for years.

(3) In the conflict in Gaza in 2014, terrorists used tunnels to conduct attacks against Israel.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) it is in the national security interests of the United States to develop technology to detect and counter tunnels, and the best way to do this is to partner with other affected countries;

(2) the Administration should, on a joint basis with Israel, carry out research, development, test, and evaluation of anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel; and

(3) the Administration should use developed anti-tunnel capabilities to better protect the United States and deployed United States military personnel.

(c) **AUTHORITY TO ESTABLISH ANTI-TUNNEL CAPABILITIES PROGRAM WITH ISRAEL.**—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Director of National Intelligence, is authorized to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish anti-tunnel capabilities to detect, map, and neutralize underground tunnels that threaten the United States or Israel. Such authority includes authority to construct facilities and install equipment necessary to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation so authorized. Any activities carried out pursuant to such authority shall be conducted in a manner that appropriately protects sensitive information and United States and Israel national security interests.

(2) REPORT.—The activities described in paragraph (1) and subsection (d) may be carried out after the Secretary of Defense submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth the following:

(A) A memorandum of agreement between the United States and Israel regarding sharing of research and development costs for the capabilities described in paragraph (1), and any supporting documents.

(B) A certification that the memorandum of agreement—

(i) requires sharing of costs of projects, including in-kind support, between the United States and Israel;

(ii) establishes a framework to negotiate the rights to any intellectual property developed under the memorandum of agreement; and

(iii) requires the United States Government to receive quarterly reports on expenditure of funds, if any, by the Government of Israel, including a description of what the funds have been used for, when funds were expended, and an identification of entities that expended the funds.

(d) ASSISTANCE IN CONNECTION WITH PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide procurement, maintenance, and sustainment assistance to Israel in support of the anti-tunnel capabilities research, development, test, and evaluation activities authorized in subsection (c)(1).

(2) REPORT.—Assistance may not be provided under paragraph (1) until 15 days after the Secretary submits to the appropriate committees of Congress a report setting forth a detailed description of the assistance to be provided.

(3) MATCHING CONTRIBUTION.—Assistance may not be provided under this subsection unless the Government of Israel contributes an amount not less than the amount of assistance to be so provided to the program, project, or activity for which the assistance is to be so provided.

(e) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress on a quarterly basis a report that contains a copy of the most recent quarterly report provided by the Government of Israel to the Department of Defense pursuant to subsection (c)(2)(B)(iii).

(f) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(g) SUNSET.—The authority in this section to carry out activities described in subsection (c), and to provide assistance de-

scribed in subsection (d), shall expire on the date that is three years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 1916

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to designate a construction agent for certain construction projects by the Department of Veterans Affairs)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1085. DESIGNATION OF CONSTRUCTION AGENT FOR CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall seek to enter into an agreement subject to subsections (b), (c), and (e) of section 1535 of title 31, United States Code, with the Army Corps of Engineers or another entity of the Federal Government to serve, on a reimbursable basis, as the construction agent on all construction projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs specifically authorized by Congress after the date of the enactment of this Act that involve a total expenditure of more than \$100,000,000, excluding any acquisition by exchange.

(b) AGREEMENT.—Under the agreement entered into under subsection (a), the construction agent shall provide design, procurement, and construction management services for the construction, alteration, and acquisition of facilities of the Department.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all postclosure time on H.R. 1735 expire at 1:45 p.m. today, with the time equally divided between the managers or their designees for debate only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I have asked the members of the committee to convene in the President's Room at 1:30 p.m., if they would, because there is a portion of the bill, the annex, that needs to be approved. We need a quorum for that so that we can move forward with the final vote on the bill.

I also wish to thank all Members on both sides of the aisle for the conduct of this debate in consideration of a very large and very complex piece of legislation.

I especially thank my friend from Rhode Island, who has worked diligently, along with his staff, to see that we arrive at this point. We have a lot of other hurdles to go through, but without getting through this one, we couldn't have been prepared for those that are laid before us before the President puts his signature on this most important piece of legislation.

I yield to my friend from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I, too, want to commend the chairman and his staff for extraordinarily diligent, cooperative, and careful work. I am pleased to be here to support this block of amendments. As the chairman noted, we are on the verge of passage of the legislation. Then we will be able to move forward and address other issues.

I thank the chairman for his cooperation and his great leadership.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I congratulate the chairman and ranking member of the Armed Services Committee for this heroic effort, doing, as the chairman said, the most important business we can do as part of the Federal Government; that is, keeping America safe and making sure we keep our commitments to those who volunteer to serve, many in harm's way, to protect our liberties.

In a couple hours, we will vote to pass the Defense authorization bill, and that is an important bipartisan accomplishment. It is just another step in a new Congress which has acted in a bipartisan way to deal with a number of challenges confronting the country.

I am more optimistic today than I have been in a long time that the Senate is finally back to work and Congress is doing what the American people who elected us sent us here to do, and that is to do their work and to represent them to the best of our ability, which is one reason why I have come to the floor to express some of my concerns at what we have heard from the Democratic leadership about their intentions with regard to the next piece of legislation we turn to—the Defense appropriations bill. As we all know, the Democratic leader and some Democrats in his caucus have threatened not to move forward on this Defense appropriations bill.

I want to talk about the consequences in the real world of holding up this Defense appropriations bill and particularly how it will affect my home State of Texas.

Obviously, the Defense appropriations bill will provide the military with resources necessary to meet the significant demands they face and we face as a country around the world but most basically to defend our country and to keep us safe.

This bill provides for training and readiness funds and makes sure our troops are well prepared to carry out any mission that might be assigned to them anywhere in the world.

The appropriations bill provides the money for critical modernization of our aircraft, ships, ground vehicles, and other equipment so that our troops can fight with the best cutting-edge weapons systems at our disposal so they can accomplish their objective.

Perhaps most importantly, this legislation helps make sure our troops and military families enjoy a good quality of life. We have an all-volunteer military, and the family members of those who wear the uniform serve no less than the ones who wear the uniform. So making sure the families of our military members enjoy a good quality of life is very important. We will never be able to repay our troops for all they

have given us, but we can at least provide appropriate benefits to their families to help make their lives a little easier.

This bill also includes funding to actually pay our troops their salary and provides them a modest, well-deserved raise.

Like the Presiding Officer, I am proud of those who serve our Nation and our military and our home States. Nearly 120,000 Texans are serving on Active Duty today, as well as more than 55,000 Guardsmen and Reservists. We have 15 major military installations in Texas, which have more than 168,000 Active and Reserve component servicemembers assigned to them. These world-class bases, posts, air stations, and depots are critical facilities where our troops train for combat and learn the skills they need in order to accomplish their mission and where we maintain essential military equipment. So when I consider the possibility that for a cynical political reason some might decide to block this appropriations bill that actually literally pays the salary of the troops, I am very disappointed. I hope they will reconsider.

These resources we will vote on—starting this afternoon, we will start that process—go to places such as Fort Bliss and Fort Hood, TX, homes to the finest heavy ground combat units in the world.

Fort Bliss in El Paso sits on more than 1 million acres. It is an irreplaceable training range for our troops, and it is the Army's second largest installation by size. It is the proud home of the Army's famed 1st Armored Division. And Fort Hood, which serves as home to both III Corps and the storied 1st Cavalry Division, has more Army brigades than any Army installation in the country.

When I think about Members of the Senate actually considering the possibility of blocking pay for our troops and support for our military, I also think about bases such as Dyess Air Force Base in Abilene, TX. This key base is home to units that have deployed time and time again in recent years in support of combat missions in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere, including the 317th Airlift Group. Dyess is also home to the 7th Bomb Wing, one of only two B-1 strategic bomber wings in the U.S. Air Force. The 7th has been the tip of the spear in the fight against ISIL, conducting airstrikes against the terrorist army in Iraq and in Syria.

We are also proud in my State to boast the Corpus Christi Army Depot, the largest rotary wing repair facility in the world. When our Army helicopters come back from battle, many of them are pretty beat up and barely operable. They typically make a pit stop in Corpus Christi to make sure our battle-tested warfighting equipment is ready for the next challenge.

Between our naval air stations at Corpus Christi and Kingsville, Texas provides the proving ground and crucible for more than 1,000 new Navy and

Marine aviators each year. Shortly after they leave Texas, they find themselves in skies over Iraq or Syria or landing in rough seas, in near-zero visibility, on aircraft carriers bordering hostile shores around the globe. But these bases represent only a fraction of the U.S. military presence in Texas. All of our military installations are integral to making sure our military is prepared, trained, healthy, and ready for action.

The Defense appropriations bill that some have threatened to filibuster in order to extract a negotiation about more government spending makes sure that the servicemembers assigned to those bases and countless others across our Nation have what they need.

We ask a lot of our men and women in uniform. The very least we can do is pass legislation that provides for the training and equipment they need in order to accomplish their mission and to ensure them the quality of life they and their families have so richly earned.

I find it very troubling and, indeed, dumbfounding that some of our colleagues from across the aisle who have already voted overwhelmingly to move forward on the Defense authorization bill would today talk about blocking the necessary appropriations bill to actually carry out that policy that we will pass shortly in the Defense authorization bill.

I believe that to be consistent after such a big vote, as I anticipate we will have on the Defense authorization bill, any notion of blocking the appropriations bill that would actually pay for those policies to be carried out should simply evaporate.

So I hope our colleagues across the aisle—many of whom have said they actually support the policies behind this legislation—will defy their party's leadership and their misguided advice about blocking this legislation in order to extract a negotiation on more government spending and will decide instead to move this legislation forward. The brave men and women in Texas and throughout the country who are fighting on our behalf deserve nothing less. And I hope our colleagues who are even considering for a moment the idea of blocking the funding that would actually help pay our troops will reconsider and cast their vote in support of the troops and not cast their vote in favor of some cynical political strategy which will undermine our support for our troops.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, 3 years ago, President Obama announced

that DREAMers—young people who were brought to the United States as children—would have the opportunity to apply for temporary protection from deportation through the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program or what has become known as DACA.

Today, more than 660,000 young people across this Nation have benefitted from DACA, including more than 7,000 in my home State of New Mexico. These are some of our brightest students and veterans who no longer have to fear deportation. Not only do DREAMers want to earn an education and work, they want to give back to their communities and their country. In fact, I would suggest that DREAMers don't know how to be anything but American.

We hear again and again of the remarkable stories of immigrants overcoming very difficult challenges in the genuine pursuit of a better life. Across the country, there are DREAMers working to become doctors, scientists, lawyers, and engineers. They want to start businesses or teach in classrooms. They want to contribute to America's success.

I had the privilege of meeting these twin sisters who are pictured here, Jazmin and Yazmin, earlier this year. They immigrated to the United States with their mother from Mexico when they were just 3 years old.

As students at Del Norte High School in Albuquerque, Jazmin and Yazmin worked hard to earn good grades, and as juniors and seniors, they took dual credit courses at Central New Mexico Community College.

Jazmin will graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of business administration, concentrating in finance. She earned an interdisciplinary studies distinction from the University of New Mexico Honors College, and her sister Yazmin would go on to graduate magna cum laude from the University of New Mexico with a bachelor of science in biology and Spanish, a minor in chemistry, and completed the University Honors Program. She received departmental summa cum laude honors.

These two young women are working tirelessly to ensure they have a better future for themselves and their mother.

In August, Jazmin will begin her second year at the University of New Mexico School of Law, and Yazmin will begin her first year at the University of New Mexico School of Medicine.

Given their immigration status, the journey for Jazmin and Yazmin to get to where they are today was anything but easy. They have overcome many hardships, including homelessness and hunger.

After their mother—who is a single mom—suffered a stroke, it was up to them to find work to support their family, cover her medical costs, and pay for their education. To this day, there is another heavy burden these young women carry with them; it is

living with the fear that at any moment their mother, whom they love dearly, will be deported because of her immigration status. Under these circumstances, you have to ask what drives these two bright young women and what keeps them going, and it is simple: They want to give back to their communities.

Jazmin, who is currently a summer law clerk at New Mexico's Center on Law and Poverty, wants to be a lawyer to ensure that every person has equal access to the law.

Yazmin, who is currently a medical assistant at the Casa de Salud Medical Office in the South Valley, wants to be a primary care physician so she can help families gain access to quality health care.

This is who DREAMers are, and I think their stories are absolutely inspiring.

This young man's name is Cesar. He is 26 years old and a DACA recipient.

Cesar and his family moved from Ciudad Juarez to Las Cruces, NM, when he was in the fifth grade.

As a middle and high school student, he earned great grades, and through local scholarships he enrolled at New Mexico State University. He earned a bachelor degree in biology, microbiology, and Spanish, not to mention minors in chemistry and biochemistry.

When he graduated from college in 2011, Cesar couldn't put his degrees to work because of his immigration status. So instead of working in the laboratory, he went to work as a landscaper.

When the President made his DACA announcement, Cesar immediately applied and was approved for deferred action. Because of DACA, Cesar was able to work and earn an income to help pay for graduate school.

This year, Cesar earned his master's degree in biology and a minor in molecular biology from New Mexico State University, where he focused his research on bioinformatics.

Cesar makes it a point to get involved in the local community. He has volunteered at La Casa and helped with the biology graduate organization. He said:

Once you start volunteering, you wish you had more time because you love it so much. It can improve your outlook on everything you're doing.

Cesar's dream is to become a doctor so he can work to help prevent disease. Soon he will take a major step toward that goal. This coming school year, Cesar will be a medical and Ph.D. student at Loyola University in Chicago. "DACA has changed my life," he said. "Within two to three years, I went from working in landscaping to becoming a medical student."

The stories of Cesar, Jazmin, and Yazmin represent what makes this country great. They are inspiring, and there are hundreds of thousands of DREAMers like them across this country.

Immigrants make the United States a more prosperous nation. In New Mex-

ico, our State's remarkable history is rooted in our diversity, our history, and our culture, which has always been enriched by our immigrant communities and their family members.

My own father is an immigrant who came to America from Nazi Germany in the 1930s, and I am sure many of us in this Chamber have immigrant roots in our own families which have contributed to America's success story. We are not a country that kicks out our best and brightest students, and we are not a nation that tears families apart.

The current DACA Program is only a temporary solution. DACA recipients have to renew every 2 years in order to maintain their deferred status, but that is no way to live. It is unfair for these DREAMers to live their lives 2 years at a time. We desperately need robust immigration reform.

Now, let's step back for a moment and remember that the Senate passed a comprehensive, bipartisan immigration bill almost 2 years ago now. That bill would have modernized our immigration system to meet the needs of our economy, provided an accountable pathway to earned citizenship for the undocumented workers currently living in the shadows, including making the DREAM Act the law of the land, and it would have dramatically strengthened security at our borders. Accountable immigration reform received 68 votes in this body and demonstrated the kind of legislation we can pass when we work together.

As a nation, we value the twin promises of freedom and opportunity. Those ideals are important no matter where you were born. However, too many of my Republican colleagues don't see it that way. Several of them want to rescind or even defund DACA and roll back the progress we have made over the past 3 years.

Why would we end such a successful program? What I would say to those who do this is come back to the table and work with us to pass immigration reform. We need pragmatic solutions to fix our broken immigration laws, and we need them now. Let's make the dream a reality after all.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate be waived with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685.

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

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to speak about the

terrible news out of Charleston, which is a true tragedy. That an event such as this could occur at a house of worship makes it even worse.

It is always awful when one of these events takes place, but to have it happen at a house of worship makes it even worse. Churches should be a place of refuge, a place where people feel safe and secure, a place of mercy, a place of compassion. The depth of loss these families must be feeling is simply awful.

I want the American people to know the Senate is thinking of the families today and the victims they loved. We are also thinking of the entire congregation at this historic church. We will continue to do so as more about this tragedy is learned in the hours and days to come.

Our hearts go out to the families who have been affected by this awful tragedy.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, after almost 3 weeks, we are completing consideration of the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. Again, I want to thank Senator McCain for what has largely been a bipartisan, serious consideration of issues important to the Department of Defense and to the national security of the United States. He has led the way, initially with a series of very thoughtful hearings with foreign policy experts setting the context for our debate.

Then we listened to our uniformed military leaders and our Defense Department officials. In the process of drafting the legislation, before it went to the subcommittees, there was a collaboration that was inspired by his commitment—which he has always demonstrated—to do what he thought was in the best interest of the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. His presence and his leadership, has, I think, brought us to this point where we are getting ready to consider a major piece of legislation on behalf of the men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States and of the country.

We have considered many issues. We were briefly sidetracked by the cyber amendment. We all understand that the cyber bill is absolutely critical. In fact, I think it has to be addressed as soon as possible. That is probably the next piece of business we should take up in this Senate. But it was brought up in a procedure—in an unexpected way, in a way in which we could not give it the full consideration it deserves. So, once again, I think we should commit ourselves as a Senate to

bringing up this bill as rapidly as possible—in fact, I would suggest it as the next major piece of legislation.

In the process of considering this National Defense Authorization Act, we brought a bill to the floor which had some very thoughtful and important provisions. Six hundred amendments were filed. We were able to consider many of them, both Republican and Democratic, either through votes on the floor in a very open process or through managers' packages which we put together and approved. We debated on very important issues—interrogation techniques, sexual assault in our military, and U.S. policies in Iraq and elsewhere. I think these debates and votes ensured that this authorization bill is better than it was when it left the committee.

There is, however, one overarching problem that remains with this bill, and it is one that I have persistently pointed to and persistently argued has to be corrected, and it is the fact that the bill is funded through the OCO accounts in a significant way, using an escape valve from the Budget Control Act, which OCO provides exclusively for defense, with some minor deviations for other some national security programs and other agencies, but essentially this is the defense funding mechanism. As a result, what we are confronted with is a bill that is over-reliant upon the overseas contingency account. Ironically, it provides the same level of resources that the President asked for, but instead of putting it in the base budget, it grows OCO from roughly \$50 billion to \$90 billion, and that is all deficit spending. So this is not a way in which we are improving our fiscal situation; we are just adding \$40 billion of deficit spending.

The other aspect of this that is so critical is that if we adhere to the Budget Control Act, we will not adequately fund other agencies, and many of these other agencies are as vital to our national security as the Department of Defense—the FBI, Homeland Security, and the State Department.

We have had speakers on floor talk about—rightfully so—this huge refugee crisis we are seeing all through the Middle East because of the instability in Iraq and Syria. Those refugees—when we try to help them, that help is typically sent through the State Department, through USAID, through those agencies, and they are still within the sequester caps.

As a result, I was very pleased to offer both in the committee and on the floor an amendment that would essentially say: Let's stop for a second. We have this \$39 billion of additional OCO spending that we are giving to the Department of Defense because it is not subject to BCA. Before we do that, let's put a fence around it, to put it in colloquial terminology, let's just say that money is there because we recognize that the needs of the Department of Defense are critical and they have to be fulfilled, but it is going to stay

there until we fix the underlying issue, in my view, and that is the BCA, the sequestration issues that affect the State Department and every other Department in the government.

We had a very good debate. I am thankful to the chairman for encouraging that debate, allowing it to take place, and for it coming to a vote. We lost, 54 to 46. It had strong support on our side of the aisle, but it was a fair and full debate and we lost. The result, though, is that the problem remains. We are in a situation where, if we continue down this pathway, we will see the OCO account as an escape valve for defense while everyone else is subject to sequestration. I don't think that is good. I don't think it is good for defense. I certainly don't think it is good for these other agencies, and it is not good for our overall national security.

There are many who say: Don't worry about that. This is just an authorization bill. The appropriations bill is where we will have the appropriate discussion and debate.

I think that is going to happen, but my view is that authorizations and appropriations are so closely related that we couldn't ignore one and we couldn't ignore this authorization.

So, again, I think we have to recognize that underpinning this authorization, with all of its worthy programs, is this very difficult issue of overreliance on OCO funding.

Then there are some who say: Well, even so, it is a 1-year fix.

Well, I don't think that is the case at all. I think if we use these types of gimmicks—as some have called them—and accounting tricks once, our tendency to use them again will be there. In fact, once we use it once, it is easier to use it two, three, four, five times.

We have had this discussion on the floor, for example, interestingly enough, about how medical research in the Department of Defense went from \$25 million or so in 1992 to \$13 billion today. Well, the answer is easy. Back then, because we had similar—not identical—arrangements where we capped discretionary domestic spending but uncapped defense spending, people went to where—the chairman referred to the Willie Sutton approach—the money was. It was defense. And it has grown and it has grown. I think that is what is going to happen again if we take this trajectory, this pathway, using OCO.

I sense that if we make tough decisions today, it will benefit us in the long run. One of those tough decisions—and one I make very reluctantly—is to oppose this legislation. It is worthy legislation in many respects. I think we have to fix this problem, and I think we have to fix it now. I have tried in my efforts to focus the attention on the need to correct the BCA, the need to get us on a sustainable pathway where we do include within the base of the Department of Defense those funds they need to operate and then OCO really is for overseas contingency operations.

Let me conclude my comments by saying there has been tremendous cooperation and support. It starts with the chairman. I particularly want to thank his staff director, Chris Brose, for his great work.

I thank my colleagues on the Democratic side: Liz King, Gary Leeling, Creighton Greene, Kirk McConnell, Bill Monahan, Mike Kuiken, John Quirk, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Arun Seraphin, Carolyn Chuhta, Mike Noblet, Ozge Guzelsu, Maggie McNamara, Jody Bennett, and, once again, my staff director, Liz King.

I would like to thank the floor staff. I have come to appreciate more than I ever knew how vital a role they play on both sides of the aisle, and I thank them for what they have done.

Finally, this bill has some extraordinarily good provisions in it. Many of them are tough, hard, path-breaking provisions that are there because the chairman decided he was going to go all in on many different aspects, from acquisition, to troop support efforts, to incorporating provisions of the commission on pay and retirement, all of those things, and I commend him for that. It is just that I think I have to stand and say we have to fix this issue with respect to the underpinning fundamental budget approach which says: We will let BCA stand for every other agency, but we will be able to exploit, in a way, this OCO exception, and we will use it. And I think that is not the path we want to pursue.

With that, and again with my thanks to the chairman, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCain. Mr. President, as we approach a final vote on the National Defense Authorization Act, I take this opportunity to thank my friend and colleague from Rhode Island, Senator REED. Despite his lack of substantive education somewhere on the Hudson River, he has been thoughtful, bipartisan, and he has maintained that throughout the consideration of this legislation.

We worked together through hundreds of amendments in markup and hundreds more during the past 2 weeks, and obviously we have some differences from time to time. Senator REED has never stopped searching for common ground and consensus, and so this legislation would not be what it is without his leadership and his cooperation.

I would just remind my friend, however, that the title of this legislation is “to authorize appropriations”—not to appropriate but to authorize appropriations. That is the task of the Appropriations Committee. So the OCO issue, which he and I are largely in agreement on, should have been repeal of sequestration. That is an issue which should be addressed where the authority lies—in appropriations, not in authorization. We can't increase or decrease a single penny of authorization except what was given to us through the Budget Committee process, which

was votes and decisions made on this floor on the budget.

So I say with respect and friendship, if there is a problem here, it is not with the authorization. We don't spend a penny. We authorize the expenditure of money. And that is an issue that my friend from Rhode Island and I disagree on, but it did not prohibit him, me, our staffs, and members of the committee on both sides of the aisle from working on a piece of legislation that, in my view, which is clearly subjective, is a reform bill—a reform bill, working together, that is almost unprecedented, at least in the last 30 years when you look at the extent and the nature of the reforms in this legislation.

I thank the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, for his commitment to resuming regular order. Under Senator MCCONNELL's leadership, the Senate has been able to take up this critical national security legislation on time, allowing for thoughtful consideration of amendments. This is how the Senate should operate—regular order, on time, giving our military the certainty they need to plan and execute their missions.

For 53 consecutive years, Congress has passed a National Defense Authorization Act. That is testimony to the vital importance of this legislation, which provides the necessary funding and authorities for our military to defend the Nation.

But perhaps at no time in the last half century has this legislation ever been so critical. Over the past few months, the Senate Armed Services Committee has received testimony from many of America's most respected statesmen, thinkers, and former military commanders. These leaders had a common warning, and that warning is clear: America is facing the most diverse and complex array of crises since the Second World War.

I won't go into all the different events that have taken place that authenticate that assertion by the most respected leaders who served under both Republican and Democratic administrations.

We have faced challenges before. We marshalled our power—both soft and hard power—to defend the rules-based national order that is the foundation of our prosperity and security. We have deterred aggression, defended allies, defeated adversaries, and built peace through strength. As we look at our challenges today, the question being asked all over the world by both friend and foe alike and the question we must answer now is, Are we equal to those challenges again?

There is only so much one piece of legislation can do to answer that question, but the National Defense Authorization Act before the Senate today is a strong first step toward rising to the challenge of an increasingly dangerous world. This is an ambitious piece of legislation, but in the times we live, we cannot afford business as usual in the Department of Defense. To prepare our

military to confront our present and future national security challenges, we must champion the cause of defense reform, rigorously root out Pentagon waste, and invest in modernization and next-generation technologies to maintain our military technological advantage. That is what this legislation is all about. It is a reform bill. It tackles acquisition reform, headquarters and management reform, military retirement reform, and personnel reform.

The bill authorizes every dollar of the President's budget request of \$612 billion but focuses these resources more directly on our warfighters. The Committee on Armed Services identified \$10 billion of excess and unnecessary spending in the budget request, and we reinvested those savings in the military capabilities our troops need to succeed. We did all of this while upholding our commitments to our servicemembers, retirees, and their families.

My friends, America's military technological advantage is eroding—and eroding fast. One of the primary causes of this is a broken Defense Acquisition System that takes too long, costs too much, and wastes billions of dollars—often on weapons programs that never become operational and with no one ever being held responsible. That is why this legislation includes the most sweeping acquisition reforms in a generation. We put the services back into the acquisition process, create new mechanisms to ensure accountability for results, streamline regulation, and open the defense acquisition process to our Nation's innovators.

This bill advances unprecedented reforms to our military retirement system. Under the current 70-year-old system, 83 percent of servicemembers leave the service without any retirement assets. This system excludes the vast majority of current servicemembers who will not complete 20 years of uniformed service, including many veterans of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. The NDAA creates a modernized retirement system and extends retirement benefits to the vast majority of servicemembers through a new plan, offering more value and choice. Under this new plan, 75 percent of servicemembers would get retirement benefits. This reform is estimated to save \$15 billion a year in the out years.

In addition to retirement reform, the NDAA focuses on improving the quality of life of our military servicemembers, retirees, and their families. It authorizes a 1.3-percent pay raise for members of the uniformed services at the grade of O-6 and below. The bill authorizes \$30 million in support for schools serving military dependent children, including those with severe disabilities. It includes many provisions to improve the military health system and TRICARE. The NDAA allows a TRICARE beneficiary up to four urgent care visits without making them get a preauthorization and requires the Department of Defense to

focus more on health care quality, patient safety, and beneficiary satisfaction by making them publish health outcome measures on their Web sites.

The NDAA builds on military justice reforms of the past few years to prevent and respond to military sexual assault. It contains a number of provisions aimed at strengthening the authorities of Special Victims' Counsel to provide services to victims of sexual assault. The legislation also enhances confidential reporting options for victims of sexual assault and increases access to timely disclosure of certain materials and information in connection with the prosecution of offenses.

On management reform, the NDAA ensures the Department of Defense and the military services are using precious defense dollars to fulfill their missions and defend the Nation, not expand their bloated staffs. While staff at Army Headquarters increased 60 percent over the past decade, the Army is now cutting brigade combat teams. The Air Force evaded mandated cuts to Headquarters personnel by creating two new Headquarters entities, while at the same time complaining it had insufficient personnel to maintain combat aircraft. The NDAA directs targeted reductions in Headquarters and administrative staff that would generate \$1.7 billion in savings in just the next fiscal year.

With these savings and billions more identified, this bill invests in providing critical military capabilities for our warfighters and meeting the unfunded priorities of our service chiefs and combatant commanders.

Even as challenges to maritime security increase in the Middle East and the Western Pacific and pressures on our shipbuilding budget increase, the Navy remains well below its fleet size requirement of 306 ships. The NDAA directs savings identified in the budget request to accelerate Navy modernization and shipbuilding, to mitigate impacts of the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine replacement, and to grow the Navy to meet rising threats.

As adversaries seek to counter and thwart American military power, the NDAA looks to the future and invests in the technologies that will maintain America's military technological superiority. It provides \$400 million in additional funding to support the so-called third offset strategy to outpace our emerging adversaries.

The NDAA details robust assistance to our allies and partners as they confront urgent challenges. The legislation authorizes nearly \$3.8 billion in support of the Afghan National Security Forces.

After an overwhelming bipartisan vote on an amendment offered by Senator FEINSTEIN and myself, the NDAA reaffirms the prohibition on torture and ensures that every U.S. Government agency always applies the same effective, humane interrogation standards as the U.S. military. Past interrogation policies compromised our values, stained our national honor, and

did little practical good. This legislation provides greater assurances that never again will the United States follow that dark path of sacrificing our values for our short-term security needs. I thank Senator FEINSTEIN for her hard work on this vitally important issue.

Finally, this legislation contains a bipartisan compromise on how to address the challenge of the detention facility of Guantanamo Bay. President Obama has said from day one of his Presidency that he wants to close Guantanamo. But 6½ years into his Presidency, the administration has never provided a plan to do so. This legislation requires the administration to submit that plan. We are simply asking the executive branch to explain where it will hold those set for trial, how it will continue to detain dangerous terrorists pursuant to the laws of war, and how it will mitigate the risks of moving this population.

If the administration can provide answers to these basic questions to the satisfaction of the American people and their elected representatives, then congressional restrictions on the movement of these detainees will be lifted and the plan can be implemented. If the Congress does not approve the plan, nothing would change. The ban on domestic transfers would stay in force, and the certification standards for foreign transfers included in the NDAA would remain.

My friends, America has reached a key inflection point. The rules-based international order, which has been anchored by U.S. hard power for seven decades, is being seriously stressed, and with it the foundation of our security and prosperity. It does not have to be this way. We can choose a better future for ourselves, make the right decisions now, and set our Nation on a better course.

That is what this legislation is all about—living up to our constitutional duty to provide for the common defense, increasing the effectiveness of our military, and restoring America's global leadership. This legislation is a small step towards accomplishing these goals, but it is an important step we can take right now, together. We owe the brave men and women in uniform nothing less.

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

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

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

Mr. DURBIN. 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 South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 215 Leg.]

YEAS—71

Alexander	Ernst	Murray
Ayotte	Feinstein	Perdue
Barrasso	Fischer	Peters
Bennet	Flake	Portman
Blumenthal	Gardner	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hatch	Rounds
Burr	Heinrich	Rubio
Cantwell	Heitkamp	Sasse
Capito	Heller	Schatz
Carper	Hoeven	Sessions
Casey	Inhofe	Shaheen
Cassidy	Isakson	Shelby
Coats	Johnson	Stabenow
Cochran	Kaine	Sullivan
Collins	King	Tester
Cooms	Kirk	Thune
Corker	Klobuchar	Tillis
Cornyn	Lankford	Toomey
Cotton	McCain	Udall
Crapo	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Moran	Warner
Donnelly	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	

NAYS—25

Baldwin	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Leahy	Reid
Boxer	Manchin	Sanders
Brown	Markey	Schumer
Cardin	Menendez	Warren
Cruz	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Mikulski	Wyden
Franken	Nelson	
Gillibrand	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Graham	McCaskill
Lee	Scott

The bill (H.R. 1735), as amended, was passed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Democratic leader would like to make some remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. To respond to the majority leader, I have nothing to say until I hear what he has to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, America asks a lot of the men and women of its voluntary military force: to undertake dangerous missions in far-off lands, to spend months and

years away from their families, and always to sacrifice so that we might live in freedom.

These brave men and women do it all without reservation. They ask precious little in return, save for the resources they need to do the job and the support they need to look after their families. It is the least we can do, to provide for them. We just voted 71 to 25 for a bill that promises a lot of things for our men and women.

It would be very cruel indeed for any Senator who just made that promise to turn around now and block the rest of us from fulfilling the pledge to our troops. Passing the legislation before us is a way to fulfill the promise we just made, 71 to 25. That is why nearly every Democrat voted to pass it in committee, 27 to 3. That is why Democrats have hailed this bill as a win-win-win and a victory for each of their States.

They know it gives President Obama the same level of funding he asked for. They know it adheres to a bipartisan spending level that both parties agreed to, that President Obama signed into law, and that President Obama campaigned on in the last Presidential election.

Now our friends face a choice.

Option 1: Allow the promise just made to our troops to be fulfilled by voting for a bill they can't stop praising.

Option 2: Break the promise they just made by killing a bill they claim to love, all in the service of some unrelated and completely incomprehensible partisan plan.

It is the road of bipartisanship and support for our troops that brought us this far. We shouldn't let partisan politics trip us up now. We don't have to—not if commonsense Democrats continue to prioritize pay raises and medical care for our troops over some unrelated gambit to funnel more cash to bureaucracies such as the IRS and the EPA.

I will just leave my colleagues with something one of our Democratic friends said of men and women in the military. Here is what he had to say: "Just as we called on them to protect us, they are calling on us to provide them with the resources they need."

They are. Senators just promised they would, 71 to 25. They just made the promise. So now they shouldn't block us from fulfilling that promise by preventing us from getting on the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill that just passed the Senate, the Defense authorization bill, has 52 Republicans voting to fix sequestration. Only 2 voted against it. We are all in favor of fixing the sequester.

My friend, the Republican leader, is talking in a dreamland.

Ash Carter, the Secretary of Defense, is a very good man. We are so fortunate

that he has dedicated his life to public service. He is a scientist and has worked for the defense establishment for a while in public service. He, the Secretary of Defense, says this bill my friend talks about is a bad bill. It doesn't help the military. This funny funding that is in this bill is not good. The chairman of the Armed Services Committee was on the floor this morning talking about that.

It is important that we solve the sequester problem. It is not good, but we cannot, and we should not, fix one part of our government and not the other part.

We support the Pentagon. We support the troops. Of course we do. But as the Secretary of Defense has so implored us, don't do this to the military. To have a secure nation involves more than the people in the armed services. The people in the armed services, while their families are at home, want them to be protected as they travel to an airport. The TSA needs to be funded, the FBI needs to be funded, the Drug Enforcement Administration needs to be funded, Homeland Security needs to be funded, and in the process, we need to fund education properly. We need to fund research for health. We need to make sure the National Institutes of Health are not whacked again with sequestration the way they were the first time. They lost \$1.6 billion. They have never recovered from that. They have never gotten their money back. Do we want to give them another sequestration? Of course we don't.

We have until this fiscal year ends in the fall to work this out, and that is what we should do. We are legislators. I agree with the 52 Republicans who said we should fix sequestration, but this bill only fixes sequestration for the Department of Defense.

Let's sit down and do what we, as legislators, are supposed to do. Legislation is the art of compromise. We are not going to get everything we want, but the Republicans shouldn't get everything they want, and we should not fund this government by using funny money for defense and using the really unfunny money on the rest of the government. It is unfair, and above all the Republican Party, which used to stand for fiscal responsibility, should get fiscally responsible and help us work this out.

We are ready and willing at any time to sit down and work through this, and we need to start that now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Democratic leader reminded me, on a virtually daily basis for 8 years, the majority leader always gets the last word.

Here is the issue, I say to my friends on the other side: You just voted for the troops. And now you are going to vote against them? Are you going to vote against the troops right after you voted for the troops? That is the fundamental question before us in deciding

whether to go to the Defense appropriations measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend gets the last word, and I am looking forward to his last word. However, the logic of my friend is illogical. We stand on our record, and we will continue in that fashion.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Lindsey Graham, John McCain, John Thune, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Leg.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Cochran
Collins
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly

Enzi
Ernst
Fischer
Flake
Gardner
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Kirk
Lankford
McCain
Moran
Murkowski

Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—45

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Boxer
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Manchin
Markey
McConnell
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy
Murray

Nelson
Peters
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warner
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Coats
Graham

Lee
McCaskill

Scott

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, the yeas are 50, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The Senator from Maryland.

(The remarks of Mr. CARDIN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 204 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CARDIN. 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.

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

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

3RD ANNIVERSARY OF DACA PROGRAM

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about a constituent of mine. Ilse is a 23-year-old graduate of the University of Washington who works at the Seattle Children's Hospital and is studying to become a nurse. She has faced a lot of challenges in her 23 years, not the least of which was being diagnosed with cancer when she was a teenager, going through treatment, and working to put herself through college.

And if the outstanding costs of cancer treatment weren't difficult enough for her, Ilse was brought to the United States by her mother when she was 6 months old as an undocumented immigrant, which makes navigating our health care system even harder.

Ilse persevered through her cancer treatment. She worked her way through high school with an impressive list of extracurriculars and went on to earn a scholarship that eventually got her to the front steps of her dream school, the University of Washington.

When I met Ilse in 2013, she told me that after 15 years of waiting for her petition to obtain a visa, she lost the opportunity to obtain legal residency when she turned 21 years old. But thanks to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, or DACA, she had a second chance. She said she doesn't know where she would be now without that second chance. She told me that DACA opened doors that were previously closed to her. And thanks to the increased certainty DACA brought and the amazing work ethic she has, Ilse was able to find jobs that helped pave her way through school.

Today she is able to continue to pursue her dream of helping others as a nurse and building a life in Washington State, her home.

I am pleased to report that Ilse has now been cancer free for over 14 years. So while I rise to talk about Ilse, I also wish to celebrate DACA.

Three years ago this week, Americans celebrated a historic step forward in protecting young, undocumented immigrants known as DREAMers, people such as Ilse. When DACA was enacted, the national dialogue on immigration policy forever changed. The administration announced that America is not a place that will deport someone who plays by the rules but through no fault of their own is an undocumented immigrant, someone who has known no other home than the United States, someone who is an American in all but name. This was a major step toward changing the lives of so many immigrant families.

During the past 3 years, more than 600,000 young immigrants have benefited from deferred action. In my home State of Washington, almost 15,000 DREAMers have been able to receive the stability and peace of mind that DACA brought.

Too often in this debate, it is difficult for some people to understand that millions of undocumented families in our country are already an important part of our community. Immigrants—documented or not—work hard. They send their children to schools throughout this country. They pay their taxes, and they help weave the fabric of our society. In all but name, they are Americans, and America would not be the same without them.

Despite the steps this administration has taken, only legislation from Congress can solve the underlying problem of a very broken immigration system.

So I am here today to say I stand ready to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to achieve that. Until Congress truly passes comprehensive immigration reform, I am going to continue working each day to help the

families and businesses—people such as Ilse—that are trapped by a broken system.

We must never forget the past and the fact that our Nation has long offered generations of immigrants a chance to achieve their dreams. Ilse is no different.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to speak today about the National Defense Authorization Act, which was just passed on the floor after almost 3 weeks of debate on the Senate floor. Today, a very strong bipartisan majority passed this legislation. It is a very important bill.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I wish to start by offering prayers and thoughts—I think of every Member of the Senate—to the families of those who were killed in last night's horrific, horrific shooting in South Carolina. No words can undo the incredible pain that they are going through, but I think knowing that Members of this body and the entire Congress are thinking and praying for these families is something that I just wish to state on the Senate floor before I begin to talk about this very important bill.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as I mentioned, we passed the NDAA this afternoon after almost 3 weeks of debate, and I do wish to extend congratulations to the leadership, particularly to the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator MCCAIN, and the ranking member, Senator REED, who did such an outstanding job of working in a bipartisan fashion on this bill.

In many ways, this bill is about something that is so critical to American foreign policy and national security interests. What is that? It is credibility, the credibility of the United States. In many ways it is the coin of the realm in international security—how our friends, how our allies, and how our adversaries view American credibility, particularly in the realm of national security, international affairs, and foreign policy. They pay close attention to what we are doing on this floor, in the White House, and overseas—credibility.

Unfortunately, as many are aware, both at home and certainly overseas, we are rapidly losing credibility around the world. In fact, much of the world is puzzled. What is happening to American credibility in terms of foreign pol-

icy? We used to be the shining city on the hill, a beacon of strength, a beacon of freedom. Countries that wanted to do us harm didn't because they feared us. Our allies respected and trusted us. But, unfortunately, that is starting to change. It is changing. Red lines have been crossed with no consequences in places such as Syria, Ukraine, Russia, and in the Iranian negotiations. Many say American credibility has declined. Some say American credibility overseas is in shambles. Nations that once counted on us as friends, as allies, are having a harder time trusting the United States and in some ways are even suspicious of our motives and our policies.

So it is a critical, critical issue. How do we, as a country, regain credibility in the world. It is something that everybody in this body and everybody in the Federal Government should be focused on.

The NDAA bill that we just passed, the National Defense Authorization Act, is a way to start regaining credibility for our country, and we did that this afternoon. A very strong bipartisan majority in the Senate, 71 Senators, voted to pass this very important bill. It is one of the most important bills that we are going to vote on all year.

This is an important signal. U.S. foreign policy—our national security is strongest when we act in a bipartisan manner, as we did on the Senate floor today, and when the executive and legislative branches are working together on foreign policy and national security issues. That is what this bill does.

In many ways, this bill does pretty much exactly what the President has asked in a whole host of areas regarding the military. For example, it funds the Department of Defense at the levels requested by the President. And again I congratulate Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for many of the key programs, many of the key reforms, and such a powerful bill that got through this body.

This bill also strongly endorses one of the President's signature foreign policy issues—the rebalance of our military focus to the Asia Pacific. There are many provisions in the NDAA that support this rebalanced strategy. Most Members—Republicans and Democrats—of this body are supportive of the President's rebalance strategy.

There is even a directive in the bill from the Congress to the Department of Defense and our military leaders that states: "In order to properly implement the U.S. rebalance policy, United States forces under operational control of the U.S. Pacific Command should be increased"—increased, not decreased. That is strong language. That is supporting the President's rebalance. The Department of Defense needs to heed this language from Congress, and of course we will be keeping a close eye on whether they do.

So the NDAA just passed on the floor helps—it can help and it will help restore America's credibility in the world. But it would be another blow to our credibility—to U.S. credibility globally—if, after all the hard work that has gone into this bill, after the strong bipartisan support this bill achieved, the President would then decide to veto the NDAA. What would the world think of that? What would the world think of our commitment to our troops with a bill that strongly passed in the House and Senate to fund the U.S. military, to set policies that support the President's policies, if the President then vetoed the bill? This would further undermine U.S. credibility in the world right at a moment when the Congress is trying to be supportive and rebuild this credibility.

After today's vote, after passing the NDAA, it is not clear that Members of this body are going to move forward to actually appropriate the money to fund the military. Think about that. The NDAA passes with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Armed Services and strong bipartisan support on the Senate floor this afternoon and the President of the United States vetoes it. That is not going to help America's credibility.

Now we are moving to Defense appropriations, again with strong bipartisan support out of the Committee on Appropriations. Yet we are hearing rumors that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not going to fund the military, that they are going to filibuster this bill.

Playing politics with the funding of our defense, the funding of our men and women in uniform, is not going to help enhance America's credibility anywhere. I think Members are going to have a hard time explaining votes that don't look to fund the men and women who so courageously defend us day in and day out here and abroad. It just doesn't make sense. We have to recognize that these actions that are being taken on the floor and in the White House are not only being watched by Americans, they are being watched by our allies and our adversaries overseas.

Another way to start to restore America's credibility in the world and to support the President and the White House's rebalance strategy in the Asia Pacific is to pass trade promotion authority next week. We have all talked about that. We debated that here on the floor for many weeks. It will help increase jobs. It will make sure that we, the United States, are setting the rules of the road for international trade in the Asia Pacific and not China. But it also goes to America's credibility.

I had the honor of traveling a couple of weeks ago with Chairman MCCAIN, Ranking Member REED, and the Senator from Iowa, Mrs. ERNST, to Vietnam and Singapore. We met with the Prime Minister of Singapore. All the discussion was on American engagement in the Asia Pacific. They want us

there. They want us leading. But the consensus was that if we can't move forward on TPA, it would be disastrous for our credibility.

So, again, the world is watching. We cannot afford to lose U.S. credibility in another region of the world. I am hopeful that next week, as this bill comes to the floor of the Senate, we will once again vote to pass trade promotion authority because that goes to not only helping spur economic growth and greater job growth in our own country, but it goes to America's leadership and credibility in the world.

Finally, I want to talk about another area of the world where U.S. credibility is at stake, and that is the Arctic. Fortunately, Congress has begun to recognize this fact. In the bill we just debated and passed on the floor today, the NDAA, there is an important provision about the national security of the United States in the Arctic. It is now up to the administration and the Department of Defense to start to focus on this very important area of the United States but also the world.

Nobody spoke more eloquently and compellingly about peace through strength and about our country's credibility in the world than former President Ronald Reagan. President Reagan's philosophy to win the Cold War was simple. As he put it, "We maintain the peace through our strength; weakness only invites aggression."

The important thing President Reagan did was he matched his rhetoric with credible actions. Under President Reagan, we strengthened our NATO allies, strengthened our military, provided strong funding for the men and women who defend us, modernized our strategic defense systems, and countered potential Soviet threats throughout the world.

As a result of this credible policy that people and countries around the world believed whether they were our allies or adversaries, the efforts of the Soviet Union to build an empire based on aggression were thwarted and the Soviet Union itself ended up collapsing.

Today, the Soviet Union no longer exists, but make no mistake—the imperialist dreams of expansion that have dominated much of Russian history since the days of the czars is still alive. Today's Russia is again a threat to its neighbors and to the peace of the world. Think about Russia's unlawful military aggression in the Ukraine. But that is not all. There are other vital areas of the world in which Russia is now taking new actions that should concern us. One of these areas is the Arctic.

We don't hear much about the Arctic from the mainstream media. That is largely because it is hard to get reporters and television cameras out to the Arctic. But America is an Arctic nation. We are an Arctic nation because of my State, the great State of Alaska. And there is much at stake in the Arctic—new transportation routes, huge

opportunities for energy. As a recent column in the Wall Street Journal pointed out, "No wonder Moscow has been racing to reopen old Soviet bases on its territory across the Arctic and develop new ones."

The signs are everywhere that Russia is making a new push into the Arctic. Let me provide a few examples. Earlier this year, the Russian military held 5 days of Arctic war exercises that included close to 40,000 troops, 50 surface ships, 13 submarines, and 110 aircraft. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, said recently that the Russians are increasing their military forces by six combat brigades, four of which will be stationed in the Arctic. President Putin has said he wants to build at least 13 new airfields, and they are starting in the Arctic. They are establishing a new Arctic command, with several new icebreakers to add to their robust fleet.

In the paper just today, there was another report of the Russians planning yet another large-scale exercise in the Arctic involving two Arctic brigades.

Just last week, in a study called "America in the Arctic," CSIS talked about what the Russians are doing. The article said:

Recent actions taken by Russia do not instill confidence that the Arctic will be exempt from recent geopolitical tensions. The Kremlin continues to hold unannounced military exercises in the Arctic, which engage significant numbers of forces . . . and simulate the use of nuclear weapons. Moscow's authorization of the use of military force to protect Russian interests in the Arctic . . . the planned reopening of over 50 Soviet-era bases along Russia's Arctic coastline, and Russia's recently Unified Arctic Command, as well as Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin's pronouncement that "the Arctic is Russia's Mecca," have all raised serious questions regarding Russia's intent in the Arctic.

I want to put this in perspective with a map. This shows the new push by the Russians into the Arctic. It shows the new airfields, the new bases. If we look at the map here, we see red on these different spots. These red spots are the new or existing Russian bases and airfields in the Arctic. The three blue spots on this map are the U.S. presence—a small airfield and radar station in Greenland and Alaska. America's Arctic. Two combat brigades in the great State of Alaska.

Our U.S. military commanders are starting to wake up to the fact that the red is clearly expanding on this map, and it is concerning them. Even Secretary of Defense Ash Carter said just 2 months ago:

The Arctic is going to be a major area of importance to the United States, both strategically and economically in the future—it's fair to say that we're late to the recognition of that.

We are late. So what are we doing? The Russians have Arctic exercises, new airfields, a new Arctic command, and four new Arctic combat brigades, according to our own Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. What are we doing? The Department of Defense has

a 13-page Arctic strategy. That is it—13 pages. That is what the United States of America has—the greatest military force in the world right now—as this is happening. We have this.

I want to talk about credibility. This is not credible. This is not credible. Worse—much worse—the Department of Defense is thinking about removing one or maybe two brigade combat teams from America's Arctic.

Let me repeat that. As the Russians are building up everywhere, we are looking at possibly removing the BCs right here—these two blue dots—one or two, gone. That is not credible. These are the only U.S. soldiers in the Arctic. They are Arctic-tough soldiers, cold-weather trained. This is the only Arctic airborne brigade in the United States. This is the only airborne brigade in the entire Asia-Pacific, right here, Fort Richardson, Alaska. These soldiers, thousands of them, are capable, well-trained, tough U.S. soldiers, and they are the only ones capable of protecting our country's interests in the Arctic, as that part of the world becomes more and more an area that Russia becomes interested in.

So we have this, 13 pages. We have announced we are seriously contemplating removing these forces from the Arctic. Let me just say, Vladimir Putin must surely be smiling somewhere in Moscow as he makes these moves and he hears that the Department of Defense is thinking about removing our only Arctic forces out of the Arctic. This is not credible.

We are not only showing a lack of credibility, removing Army troops from the Arctic, removing them from Alaska, will show the world weakness. As President Reagan noted, weakness is provocative. We can be assured of that.

This strategy defies logic. Importantly, it also defies the direction of the U.S. Senate and the NDAA, which we just passed by large bipartisan numbers. As I mentioned at the outset, the bill we just passed states that the Department of Defense should increase troops in the Asia-Pacific region—increase troops—under the command of the PACOM commander, which includes these troops right here.

Fortunately, as I said, there are also provisions in the NDAA to start making sure our country wakes up to the security interests we have in the Arctic. The bill we just passed on the floor provides an important first step toward ensuring that the Arctic remains a peaceful, stable, and prosperous place.

The NDAA requires our military to lay out a specific strategy—not just 13 pages—in the Arctic region that protects our interests there. It requires the Secretary of Defense to update the Congress on the U.S. military strategy in the Arctic region, and, importantly, requires a military operations plan for the protection of our security interests in this important region of the world.

The Department of Defense, the U.S. Army, should not even contemplate

moving one single soldier out of America's Arctic until all of this has been completed, and they should look hard at this bill—that we hope the President will not veto—with regard to the direction of the Congress on the importance of increasing U.S. military forces in the Asia-Pacific to add credibility to our rebalanced strategy. That means keeping appropriate troop levels in appropriate places—like the Asia-Pacific, like the Arctic, and like Alaska—as required by the bill that we just passed by an overwhelming majority.

Alaska is the northern anchor of the Pacific rebalance. It is the gateway to the Arctic. It is what makes America an Arctic nation. It is our only Arctic State, and it probably is the single greatest repository of untapped energy resources that will power our Nation's future. That is why, in the words of Gen. Billy Mitchell—the father of the U.S. Air Force—it is the most strategic place in the world.

We need a strong rebalanced strategy that is credible.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

TRAGEDY IN CHARLESTON

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, let me say, before turning to the topic at hand, those of us from Connecticut—especially those of us in and around Sandy Hook, CT—our hearts go out to the community in Charleston. The grief and tragedy they are working and sifting through today is hard for anyone to imagine. All I can say is I hope they will find, as we did in Newtown, CT, that an internal strength over time comes from unlikely spots; that friends arrive from far-off places; that there is a community that is much bigger than one church or one city that is going to wrap its arms around families and friends of the victims during this terrible time.

KING V. BURWELL DECISION

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I was so glad to see Senator STABENOW down on the floor a week ago talking about a pretty simple issue, which is the tax increase that is going to occur to 6.4 million Americans if the Supreme Court rules this week, next week, for the plaintiffs in the case of King v. Burwell. We wanted to come down to the floor and accentuate this message so people all around this country know what is at stake.

What is at stake is 6.5 million people losing their health insurance. That maybe gets the headlines. But the way in which people get affordable health insurance under the Affordable Care Act is by tax credits. So the immediate effect of a reversal of subsidies for Federal exchange States is that 6.5 million Americans are going to have their taxes dramatically increased by thousands of dollars if this body refuses to act in the face of a Supreme Court finding for the plaintiffs.

So we wanted to come down to the floor just to talk a little bit about what the stakes are for people's tax bills and how this is going to be a gut punch for millions of American families if the Supreme Court rules the way we hope they don't.

I think it is, first of all, important to say at the outset that most of us who have followed the Affordable Care Act and its legal interpretation think this is a sham of a case. This is a political attack on the Affordable Care Act masked as a legal case.

There is absolutely no question that the Affordable Care Act is built in a way to deliver subsidies to both State exchanges and Federal exchanges. I will not go into all the details as to why that is the clear case. But though we are talking about what might happen if King v. Burwell comes down for the plaintiffs, many of us think that would be an absolutely ludicrous legal result, one that would be a stunning act of judicial overreach, essentially a political substitution of the Court for the legislature. But I want to talk about a couple case studies and then turn the floor over to my colleagues.

I have come down and talked about people from Connecticut. I talked about Christina, a small business owner from Stratford; Susie, a two-time breast cancer survivor from North Canaan, CT; and Sean and Emilie, two freelancers from Weston. All of these people have gotten tax credits through the Affordable Care Act, and it has allowed them to have a lower tax bill but also get insurance. Many of them, it was the first time in their lives or in recent history that they have been able to afford insurance. But there are stories all over the country that are parallel to the stories from Connecticut I have been telling on the floor of the Senate over the course of the last year.

For instance, there are 832,000 Texans who are receiving an average tax credit of \$247 a month. If the Supreme Court strips away these tax credits, those 800,000 people in Texas are going to see a tax increase of around \$3,000. People like Aurora, a 26-year-old from Houston, got health insurance coverage through Texas's Federal marketplace. She works at a small nonprofit where she helps her LGBT peers get the coverage they need. She is saving \$1,500 a year getting insurance she would have never been able to afford. She says, quite simply:

I wouldn't be able to afford my policy otherwise. It has really helped me be able to get my well person exam and other preventions screenings that I'd not had in years.

She is one of 832,000 people in Texas who are going to have their taxes increased, their insurance stolen away.

I am a big New York Giants fan, so I get to watch a lot of games in which the Giants are playing in this stadium, which is, as Cowboy fans know it, AT&T Stadium. You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 different times. This is a huge stadium. People see the giant jumbotron on the roof of this stadium.

You could fill AT&T Stadium 10 times with the number of people in Texas alone who could lose their health care and lose their tax cut—\$3,000, on average, per person a year in Texas—if King v. Burwell is decided in favor of the plaintiffs.

But I will tell another story of a young woman named Celia. She is a self-employed Pilates instructor in Florida. Since 2005, she hasn't been able to find health care coverage. Since 2005, she has been uninsured. Now, she has been lucky because she didn't get really sick during that time, but she only had a \$900-a-month plan that she could find. That was the cheapest. With the Affordable Care Act, Celia finally has insurance. Celia is able to finally sign up for a health insurance plan that has meant something to her because last year she had a minor accident in her home. She had to go to the emergency room. With her insurance, she received a bill of \$57. She said, "I couldn't have even imagined what that would have cost me out-of-pocket—more than I could ever afford." This year, Celia has reenrolled in another silver plan, and for around \$200 a month she knows that she is going to be covered if she gets sick or if she has another minor accident.

In Florida—we think this is a lot of people, 832,000. In Florida, there are 1.3 million people who are receiving health care tax credits right now. Now, I root for the University of Connecticut Huskies, and so we don't necessarily get to play in stadiums this big when you are playing out of the American Athletic Conference. But everybody in Florida knows The Swamp, and you could fill The Swamp 15 times over with the 1.3 million people who could lose their health care tax credit. Those are more people than attend Gator football games on an annual basis. Those are more people than attend Gator football games over a 2-year period of time. So 1.3 million people are going to lose their coverage in Florida alone.

So let's call a spade a spade. This is about health care. It is about our belief that for people who are working hard and playing by the rules, they should have a shot at being healthy, but it is also about keeping people's tax bills low. If we ever contemplated a bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate that raised 1.3 million people's taxes in Florida by an average of \$3,500, my friends from the Republican side of the aisle—our friends would be screaming bloody murder that this was an unjustifiable, unconscionable, unworkable tax increase on the American people. But there is largely silence or temporary fixes and patches that are proposed.

So I am glad to join my colleagues to talk about what this means.

Now, I am from Connecticut and we have a State exchange. We have a State exchange. Conventional wisdom is that those of us who have State exchanges are going to be protected because we will continue to get subsidies.

But this is going to be a death spiral nationally. We have no idea how this will actually play out. When you have all of these subsidies ripped away with the insurance reforms still baked in, even in States such as Connecticut, where you have a State exchange, we are not immune. Nobody is immune. The primary victims here are going to be the people in States such as Florida and Texas, as I mentioned. But this is going to be a national catastrophe.

We hope we don't ever have to have a conversation on the floor of the Senate as to how to fix this. But we better be clear ahead of time as to what the implications are.

I yield the floor.

I know my colleague will seek recognition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first I want to thank my friend from Connecticut, not only for those very powerful words but for his ongoing advocacy and leadership in the whole realm of health care and the importance of something as basic as being able to take the kids to the doctor, to make sure that you have the health care and the affordable health insurance that you need. I want to thank Senator MURPHY, and I also want to thank Senator BALDWIN as well, my partner and neighbor from Wisconsin. Senator BALDWIN is also a champion as it relates to quality, affordable health care for every American. Both of them are very important voices and leaders on what we call the HELP Committee. I am their partner on the other committee that does the financing of health care, which is, in fact, the Finance Committee.

As the ranking Democrat—the lead Democrat—on the Health Care Subcommittee and someone deeply involved through the Finance Committee as we were putting together the Affordable Care Act, I think it is appropriate for me to be able to talk about legislative intent. That is what I want to do for a moment. We knew that in putting together a way for everyone to be able to purchase affordable health insurance and indicating the expectation that we would, it had to be affordable.

I worked very hard to make sure that we had a tax credit system that would essentially lower people's taxes so they could take those funds and be able to use those to be able to afford health insurance. In fact, at the time, Senator Baucus, the chairman of the committee, would razz me and call me "Senator Affordability" in all the meetings.

We spent a lot of time focusing on how to make sure health insurance was affordable. What is happening, as Senator MURPHY said, is that if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position, 6.4 million Americans are going to see tax credits go away and their taxes go up. The worst part is that their taxes are going to go up and their health care is going to go down. It is not a good deal for anybody.

Unfortunately, one of those States is my State of Michigan.

But let me talk a little bit more, first, about the broad picture, because we are looking at \$1.7 billion in tax increases to people all over America if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position. Basically, somehow we would have to say it is rational that Members from all of these States actually voted for a system that didn't help their own people, which makes absolutely no sense.

I can't believe anybody would do that. People wouldn't do that. Basically, we are saying that Members of Congress said that people in Massachusetts, where there is a State exchange, can have a tax cut, but if you live in Oklahoma you can't. Or if you live in the District of Columbia, right here, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Louisiana, you can't. Or if you live in New York, you can have a tax cut, but if you live in Texas, you can't.

We can go right around looking at some of the numbers. I will not go through all of the charts that I did last week. I am very grateful for Senator MURPHY for pointing out two very important States.

Let me talk about my State of Michigan. I happen to be a baseball fan. I am a big Detroit Tigers fan. When we look at Comerica Park in Detroit, it is a beautiful stadium. Mr. President, we welcome you to come and watch a game and get our folks engaged in what they do best at winning games. The fact of the matter is that you would have to fill up Comerica Park five times—that is what it would take—to get the number of people who are going to lose their health care tax credits if the Supreme Court sides with the Republican position—228,388 people.

A couple of other States: In Illinois, 232,371 people will see their taxes go up. In New Jersey, 172,000-plus will see their taxes go up. In Ohio, another State right down from the great State of Michigan, 161,011 people will see their taxes go up. Finally, in Pennsylvania, it is 348,823 people.

When we look at all of this, all of the States together, 6.4 million people are going to see tax increases. It makes no sense that people who represent these States would have voted for a system that raises taxes on their people and doesn't give them the health care they need while other people, in fact, see lower taxes—tax credits that allow them to pay for their health care and get affordable health care. It makes absolutely no sense.

Let me also say this. When we look at the Chairman of the Finance Committee in the Senate, the former distinguished chairman, Senator Max Baucus from Montana, all the time we were debating the Affordable Care Act, it was clear that Montana had absolutely no plan to set up their own exchange. They indicated that. In order for the Court to side with Republicans, we would have to somehow believe that Senator Baucus would write a health

care bill with tax cuts for other States and not his own State of Montana, which I can assure you he did not do. The same can be said for myself.

The legislative intent is absolutely clear on this. What the Court is deciding, in my opinion, is something that I can't believe they are even bringing in front of the U.S. Supreme Court because on the face of it, it makes no sense. Unfortunately, depending on how they rule, millions of Americans—millions of Americans—will see their taxes go up and their health care go away.

The intent is very real. It is very clear in the Affordable Care Act. Title I, page 1: Quality, affordable health care for all Americans. What was true 5 years ago when we wrote this bill is true today: The right to get the tax cuts has nothing to do with the State in which you live. If you are in America, then you deserve the opportunity to receive tax cuts that will make your health care affordable, whether you get your plan on an exchange run by the State or through healthcare.gov.

This is about moms and dads in Michigan and across the country being able to go to bed at night without having to say a prayer that says: Please, God, don't let the kids get sick because what am I going to do? The Affordable Care Act has provided an answer and the peace of mind for millions of Americans. We certainly hope that the Supreme Court will not take that away.

I would now like to yield the floor to the great Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

TRAGEDY AT EMANUEL AME CHURCH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, before I begin my focus on the Affordable Care Act, I want to simply state that my heart goes out to the victims of last night's shooting in Charleston, SC, as they participated in a prayer service at Emanuel AME Church. The victims and their families and the entire community are in my thoughts and prayers in the wake of this unspeakable hate crime.

AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. My colleagues and I gathered here on the floor today to share some good news—something we unfortunately don't get to hear quite enough on the Senate floor. I am here today with Senators MURPHY and STABENOW to talk about how the Affordable Care Act is working to strengthen and improve the economic security and the health security of our families all across the United States.

Before the Affordable Care Act, over 50 million Americans were uninsured, and seniors paid higher out-of-pocket costs for their prescription drugs. Insurance companies wrote their own rules and jacked up premiums. They denied coverage to people with pre-

existing health conditions. And in too many cases they dropped your coverage because you got sick, got older or had a baby.

Making the Affordable Care Act the law of the land marked a critical turning point that was essential to stopping these predatory practices and to giving our families the quality, affordable health care they deserve and they need. Now the story has changed.

As my colleagues have noted, we have seen a historic reduction in the number of uninsured since Congress passed the Affordable Care Act in 2010. Thanks to the law, over 16 million previously uninsured Americans have received health coverage. This year more than 10 million individuals have an affordable, quality health plan through the law's new health care marketplaces. Nearly 8.7 million people are benefiting from the health insurance cost assistance provided under the new law.

I want to make it clear that the law's important benefits are making a real difference in my home State of Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, over 180,000 people have a quality insurance plan through our Federally facilitated Affordable Care Act marketplace.

More than 90 percent of these Wisconsinites are receiving support to make their coverage more affordable. More importantly, the insurance companies don't get to make their own rules anymore.

Because of the Affordable Care Act, insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to the more than 2 million Wisconsinites who have some type of preexisting health condition. Insurance companies can no longer charge copays or deductibles for critical preventative services such as contraception or cancer screenings for over 1 million Wisconsin women. Thanks to the new law, 89,000 Wisconsin seniors on Medicare will see their prescription drug doughnut hole closed by 2022. In the meantime, these same seniors on average have saved \$913 each on prescription drugs.

I could continue on to share more numbers that prove that the ACA is working for our families in Wisconsin and in States across the country. But the real proof, the real story is about the faces and the people behind these numbers. It is about real people, real Wisconsinites, who are realizing the benefits of this law every day—real Wisconsinites such as Doug from Colgate, WI. At age 62, Doug was worried about becoming uninsured. He and his wife had been insured through her employer, but she was about to apply for Medicare. Fortunately, Doug was able to find an affordable health plan on the Affordable Care Act marketplace. He did not have to lie awake at night worrying about being denied coverage due to his recent heart surgery or another preexisting condition.

There are real Wisconsinites such as Kim of West Allis. Kim runs a small costume shop. She lost Medicaid cov-

erage when her son turned 18 years old. She went without medical care because she could not afford it, even though Kim's doctor had found an indication of cancer during a hysterectomy. But then she signed up for the affordable coverage on the Affordable Care Act's marketplace that costs only \$79 a month. And when she renewed her coverage this year, her premium dropped to \$20 a month. Without this coverage and the premium tax credits, she wouldn't have been able to afford the extra checkups she needed to keep track of the possibility of the cancer emerging.

Joelisa is a real Wisconsinite. She is a community health worker. Joelisa lost her health insurance when she switched jobs but was able to quickly find a new plan through the ACA marketplace. The plan cost only \$87 per month with premium tax credits—a tremendous tax savings from her \$500 monthly premiums through her previous job. Joelisa's health care coverage helps her manage several chronic conditions, including a metabolic syndrome that carries a high risk of progressing to diabetes, and it also makes sure that her daughter gets immunizations and stays as healthy as possible.

One part of this story has not changed, and that part is that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't want the Affordable Care Act to work. In fact, they continue to root for its failure. They don't want you to know about Joelisa's lower health insurance premiums or about Kim's affordable plan that is helping her prevent cancer.

Regrettably, what they do want is crystal clear. They want to repeal the law and turn back the clock to the days when only the healthy and wealthy could afford the luxury of quality health insurance. Since its passage, Republicans have spent countless days trying to repeal the Affordable Care Act by any and all means. They have tried to repeal the law in Congress by voting over 50 times—that is 5-0—to repeal all or parts of the Affordable Care Act. They have also tried to repeal the law by advancing politically motivated lawsuits, including the most recent one that would rob millions of Americans of the health insurance they have today. In Wisconsin alone, this would mean that over 160,000 hard-working Americans would see their taxes increase if they were stripped of their health insurance subsidies. That is enough to fill historic Lambeau Field twice. It is one thing to say the numbers, it is another thing to imagine the number of Wisconsinites that affects.

It is not only Wisconsin families who would be impacted by this devastation but also families in our neighboring States—neighboring States with Federal exchanges—such as Michigan, Illinois, and Iowa.

Republicans have tried to say they have an answer, but their answer is really nothing more than another tired

attempt to dismantle and repeal the Affordable Care Act. One of these proposals was put forth by a Republican colleague from my home State of Wisconsin. It would eliminate the health insurance subsidies in all States, including the federally facilitated and State-run marketplaces. His proposal would rob over 166,000 Wisconsin constituents of their premium support. His plan would attack the health care security of Kim and Joelisa. According to the American Academy of Actuaries, it would expand the ranks of the uninsured and raise premiums.

Naturally, his proposal would hand over the reins to the insurance companies and allow them the freedom to take us back to the days when they offered bare-bones plans without essential health care coverage. In Wisconsin, this means going back to the days when there were no—none, zip, zero—individual health care plans in the entire State that offered maternity coverage for families. We cannot go back, we must not go back, and we will not go back.

We know the Affordable Care Act is providing access, affordability, and quality in the State of Wisconsin. We also know that in the United States of America, health care should be a right guaranteed to all and not just a privilege reserved for the few. That is what we have fought for, and that is what we are going to continue to fight for as we move the Affordable Care Act forward.

I wish to once again thank my colleagues, Senator STABENOW and Senator MURPHY, for joining me on the floor this afternoon.

We have a case that is about to be decided by the U.S. Supreme Court. There has been effort after effort in the Congress of the United States to repeal or defund all or part of the Affordable Care Act, but it is providing lifesaving coverage and good news for Wisconsinites and people across America.

I yield back my time.

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

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for up to 1 hour.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

TRADE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe we are moving to a very important debate in the next week as the Senate moves forward with legislation passed by the House of Representatives today that would advance trade promotion authority. Trade promotion authority is a delegation by the U.S. Con-

gress to the President of the United States, the Chief Executive—power that Congress has—authorizing and directing that the President go forward to negotiate a trade agreement. This trade agreement would then be brought back to the Congress and, through legislation, would be implemented. But the trade agreement would never be subject to full evaluation, full debate under the normal processes of Congress, nor would it be subject to any amendment. Indeed, if the trade promotion authority passes the Senate—maybe next week—this legislation, this trade agreement would be fast-tracked. That is why they call it a fast-track agreement.

The fast-track would mean that the treaty—they call it “agreement”—to avoid the fact that a treaty requires a two-thirds vote—that this trade agreement would be brought up so that Congress—it would be on the floor for 20 hours, it would be subject to no amendment, and it would be voted on, up or down. It would be filed, for example, at 4 o'clock on a Monday afternoon and voted on final passage the next day at noon. That is the kind of situation we are faced with.

Fast-track has been used for a number of years, a number of times, but it has always been focused on trade—what the tariff rates might be between trading partners, details of trade agreements and definitions and those kinds of things. But this agreement is far more extensive. It is more extensive in the size and the scope of the trade agreement, the number of nations, and the fact that it would cover—if the Atlantic agreement is also approved—75 percent of the world's economy.

But even more significant to me is that it creates something that is a non-trading entity, a commission, a transpacific international commission. This commission will meet regularly. It will be created by legislation with certain rules. But according to the Trade Representative who is negotiating in advance of this legislation on behalf of President Obama and who is advocating for it, it will be a living agreement. That means the entity itself, the commission, will then be entitled to make the TPP say different things, eliminate provisions it does not like, and add provisions it does like. In fact, the commission is required to meet regularly and to hear advice for changes from outside groups and from inside committees of the commission so that they can update the situation to change circumstances.

It is a breathtaking event. It says it is designed to promote the international movement of people, services, and products—basically the same language used to start the European Union. In fact, I have referred to it as a nascent European Union. I do not think that is far off base.

So we will have 12 Pacific nations come together in this agreement. Well, the trade agreement, I would suggest, colleagues, is not that big of a deal—a

part of it. We have free-trade agreements with big nations, such as Canada, Australia, Mexico, Chile. The negotiations—really have an impact with two nations of significance: Japan and Vietnam. Why we can't negotiate trade agreements with them in a bilateral fashion? I don't know. Why do we have to create a transnational union, an institution that has the power, as I will explain, to impact the laws of the United States of America? It is not necessary.

I voted for—it has not worked as well as we were told it would work, but I voted for the last bilateral agreement with South Korea. South Korea, like Japan, is our good friend. We do not have any fundamental disagreements with them. They are part of the civilized world and so forth. But they have a different view of trade than we have. They are mercantile. They have to be approached and considered in a different way. They just approach trade differently. They believe manufacturing and exports mean power. An actual study has shown not too long ago that mercantilism has enhanced their power. A nation with trading deficits like the United States has had their power diminished as their trade deficits have accrued.

So some of our colleagues reject mercantilism. It is not healthy to trade for sure. We would like to see it go away. But it is our trading partner's policy. We have to deal with that reality when we negotiate agreements.

So what I will say, colleagues, is that this is a significant event. I see no reason that when we are attempting to create a trade agreement, it can't be like South Korea in 2012. Why do we have to create an entirely new transnational union with the power where each nation has one vote? The Sultan of Brunei—Brunei is one of the countries, one of the 12—the Sultan of Brunei gets one vote, and the President of the United States gets one vote it appears, although from my reading of the document it is difficult to fully understand what they mean.

I would say, at the most fundamental level, this Congress should not fast-track any transnational union of which we are a part until we understand every word in it, we know exactly what it means, and the President can answer. I have asked questions. I have asked him what it means—the living agreement language—in a letter. No answer. I asked the President of the United States: Do you contend this agreement will reduce the big trade deficit we have or will it increase the trade deficit? They don't answer. The only thing advocates for this treaty say is that it will advance or enhance employment in the exporting industry. That is the only statement they have made. Why are they being careful about that? I have listened to them. No one has ever said much more than that.

Well, in 2011, the President of the United States asserted, when he was promoting the trade agreement with South Korea—this was his statement:

We don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other country's goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America . . .

Well, I agree with that. I think we do need to focus on that. We have a sustained trade deficit, we have a sustained decline in American manufacturing, and we have seen the wages of America's middle class decline for over a decade—since 2000. We have not had increases in wages but a decline in wages. Part of that is because of a decline in manufacturing, which is where higher wages are paid.

So this is what the President said with regard to the Korea Free Trade Agreement in his announcement back in 2011: "I'm interested in agreements that increase jobs and exports for the American people."

Well, I am, too. Well, what do we know about the Korea trade agreement? Did it work? President Obama said this at that announcement. I hate to recall what he said, but this is what the promise was when he made this announcement. This is the President's statement that he personally delivered: "In short, the tariff reductions in this agreement alone are expected to boost annual exports of American goods by up to \$11 billion." Annual exports would be increased by \$11 billion: "This would advance my goal of doubling U.S. exports over the next 5 years."

So what happened after the trade agreement was signed? We have had less than \$1 billion in 3 years in export increases to South Korea. They have had a \$12 billion increase in imports to the United States, virtually doubling the trade deficit that was already large between our countries.

This is a chart which shows how that worked. This black line is when the treaty was signed. This is the trade deficit we have been running with South Korea. This is zero. These are the deficits we have been running. Then when the treaty was signed—the agreement was signed—we had a marked decline in exports. I wish it were not so. I voted for it. I bought into free trade and drank the free trade Kool-Aid. But did it work? I have to say it hasn't worked yet. The reason? Mr. Clyde Prestowitz, who was a trade negotiator for President Reagan with the Pacific and with Japan in the 1980s, said: They have nontariff barriers. They have a mercantilist philosophy, and their philosophy is to buy the least possible from abroad, make everything they can possibly make at home, and export as much as possible, creating jobs in their country, creating surpluses in trade, creating wealth, they believe, and also creating power.

So I am concerned about this. I would just contend that we do not need to be listening to Pollyannaish promises that these trade agreements are going to be so great for working Americans. They have not been doing so well, in my opinion.

In fact, Mr. Prestowitz, whom I just mentioned, wrote a book on trade. In

January of this year, he wrote an op-ed for the Los Angeles Times in which he said this. Instead of saying that we are going to have a \$10 billion increase annually in exports, let's look at the facts. This is Mr. Prestowitz:

Over the last 35 years, the U.S. has brought China into the World Trade Organization and concluded many free-trade agreements, including one with South Korea three years ago. In advance of each, U.S. leaders promised the deals would create high-paying jobs, reduce the trade deficit, increase [gross domestic product] and raise living standards. But none of these came true. In fact, the U.S. non-oil trade deficit continued to grow, millions of jobs are offshored and mean household income has hardly risen since 2000. And economists overwhelmingly agree that rising U.S. income inequality is being driven in part by international trade.

That is President Reagan's adviser, a student of these issues who knows the Pacific well, who has written a book on trade and documents—contrary to what some people say—that for the first 150 years of our country we had high tariffs on products imported.

Now, I believe we should eliminate tariffs. I believe we should move to trade, and I have supported that over the years. But I just have to say I am less convinced that in a world where our partners aren't operating on the same policies we operate on, we have to be careful about these agreements.

What our trading partners want, in substance, is access to the U.S. market, access so they can sell their products in the U.S. market and bring home wealth to their countries. That is their goal. It just is. That is the way they approach life.

We want access to their markets. There is nothing wrong with that. That is just what the world is about, and we are not negotiating very effectively.

So many of these countries have nontariff barriers that cause difficult problems in trade. And we reduce our tariff barriers and we have virtually no other barriers to the sale of foreign products in the United States, while we are not able to export competitive products abroad because of their nontariff barriers or even sometimes their tariff barriers.

I just wish to say at the beginning that I am not of the view that we have to have a trade agreement passed this week and as part of it that we have to pass some union with 12 countries each having one vote. I don't see that has to be done.

If we don't sign a trade agreement that affects Japan or Vietnam today, what, is the world going to collapse? We have been getting along without it for decades, apparently, maybe since the beginning of the history of the Republic. So I would say let's slow down, and I say we have to focus more effectively on what is good for America.

Fast-track is a decision by Congress to suspend several of its most basic powers for 6 years, and any treaty that is created in the next 6 years can take advantage of fast-track, be brought directly to the floor, and be passed on a

simple majority in the House and the Senate without an amendment.

One of my Republican colleagues said: Oh, well, we will have a Republican President, and we can really put up some good trade bills. Who knows who is going to be elected President next year. Who knows if the President, if he is a Republican, will send up a good trade bill. Congress has its duty to respond and study trade agreements and cast a knowledgeable vote on it. I don't think Congress, in this instance, should give up its procedural processes for passing any important legislation. I think a decision of the magnitude we are dealing with deserves the most careful scrutiny.

This is not a trade agreement with one friend and ally, South Korea, it includes 12 nations in the Pacific. As soon as that is inked, we have been told—and brought forward for passage in the Congress—and, historically, if we get trade promotion authority, the agreements that are presented have always passed. Once that is said and done, we will begin to debate the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP. This transatlantic agreement, I suppose, will also have some sort of commission, a transatlantic union with powers that discipline and set rules outside the powers of the Congress.

Then there is going to be a services agreement that has already been talked about. It has been leaked. Somebody leaked this. The other two are secret and cannot be seen by the American people.

So this services agreement has 10 pages on immigration. They are going to fast-track through changes in our immigration law. It is a very serious matter. We have other issues out there like environmental law—that I will mention in a minute—that absolutely the President intends to advance through this trade agreement.

So those are three major treaties, and those treaties would impact 75 percent of the GDP of America, but that is not all. For the next 6 years, any other treaty can be advanced in this same way. Presumably, three or four countries could get together and agree on some environmental regulation, and it could be advanced as some trade agreement in a fast-track procedure through Congress.

So I think the burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to demonstrate why three-fifths of the Senate shouldn't be required to agree, since this is so akin to a treaty, and/or advance this contrary to the proceedings of Congress.

Some of my colleagues have been saying that the trade promotion authority, which the President is so desperately seeking—he has been hammering and bludgeoning his Members in the Senate and the House to get them to not vote their conscience but vote with what he wants—they say we should pass it because it restricts the power of the President.

Well, give me a break. If this were true, why would the President want it? If he could do all he wants to do without Congress, why isn't he doing it anyway? The entire purpose of fast-track is for Congress to surrender its power to the executive branch for 6 years. Legislative concessions include control over the content of the legislation. The President negotiates it, he brings it back, we can't amend it. He controls the content on it, the power to fully consider the legislation on the floor. It is filed on one day and voted the next day. The power to keep debate open until Senate cloture is invoked—on any other legislation, you have to get a cloture vote.

We couldn't get cloture on the Defense bill today. The Democrats refused to give 60 votes to pass the bill that appropriates the funds to defend America, but the President would be able to bring up this bill with a simple majority and no ability for extended debate that the Senate is famous for, and there is the constitutional requirement that a treaty receives a two-thirds vote.

When you are creating an international union, I mean, this crosses the line. May be someone can technically say that somehow this is an agreement and not a treaty. I don't know, lawyers could perhaps disagree, but Congress should assert its power.

We should say: Mr. President, we have seen you operate. We are not going to authorize you to enter into the creation of an international union where you get to impose additional powers on us without creating it through the treaty process.

The legislation, finally, is not amendable, which is exceedingly unusual.

So without fast-track, Congress retains all its legislative powers. Individual Members retain all their procedural tools, and every single line of trade text is publically available before any action is taken to grease the skids for its final passage. I think that is the important issue.

What about this union. What kind of powers is it that we are talking about? I am of the belief that the President hasn't been a strong advocate of trade. His supporters, many of them oppose this kind of trade agreement. I am coming to believe the primary part of his understanding of the importance of this legislation, and why he is breaking arms and heads over it, is the union, this international commission that has powers that he believes will allow him to advance agendas. I don't say that conspiratorially. I will explain in a moment that clearly seems to be one of the incentives this President has to advance this legislation.

In a Ways and Means House document on a new Pacific union being formed by President Obama, a committee in the House hints at some of this union's power, this international commission on trade:

If a proposed change to a trade agreement is contemplated [by the TPP Commission]

that would require a change in U.S. law, all of TPA's congressional notification, consultation, and transparency requirements would apply.

In other words, Ways and Means is intimating that this new secret Pacific union would function like a third House of Congress, with legislative primacy, the ability to advance legislation, sending changes to the House and Senate under fast-track procedures—receiving less procedure, for example, than post office reform.

Further, this legislative fast-track, Ways and Means implies, is a change in U.S. law, meaning that if this President or the next argues it is simply an Executive action, not a legal action, the Executive would have a free hand to implement any agreement the Commission creates without any approval of Congress.

Well, he said he wouldn't do that. Did you see where people who were unlawfully in the country were given a photo ID card by the President of the United States, were given a Social Security number, and it says on the card "work authorization," when the law says if you are in the country illegally you cannot have a Social Security number. He did that.

He made a recess appointment in blatant violation of a definition of what a recess is. It took 2 or 3 years for the Congress to take it to the Supreme Court, and in a unanimous 9-to-0 ruling, the Supreme Court overturned it.

So to say the President will not push his powers is naive indeed. How do you stop it? Do you file a lawsuit to say the President shouldn't have agreed to the Pacific Commission? Now a whole government bureaucracy is carrying out some global warming, some immigration, some trade issues that Congress opposes.

Is a President capable of doing something like that, actually carrying out ideas and policies that Congress doesn't approve of. Absolutely. We have seen it time and again.

So this is not merely a loophole, it is a purposeful delegation of congressional authority to the Executive and to an international body. We should understand what we are doing. Not enough of our people have read some agreement and fully understand. The fast-track-implementing legislation would have the ability to make these binding delegations binding as a matter of law, it seems to me. Well, maybe not. It probably wouldn't work that way. I don't think it works that way.

Look, that is why I wrote the President and I said: Mr. President, make this part of the proposed TPP, the Trans-Pacific Partnership public. Let's have the lawyers study it. You explain to us exactly what these words mean—which he has refused to do. As a matter of fact, I don't think the American people have fully grasped that this is not a normal trade agreement but that it is the creation of an international entity.

Amendments to specify Congress retains exclusive legislative authority

and to actively prohibit foreign worker increases were blocked by the fast-track supporters. I offered legislation that would make clear that the President couldn't alter the constitutionally exclusive power of Congress over immigration, and they refused to give us a vote. It is not in the bill. Why not?

I said: Well, we are not going to change immigration law.

Some administration underlings say that. They don't have the power to bind the President. They are not lawyers, perhaps. They don't know what the words mean. The President of the United States hasn't said it publically, neither has his Trade Representative. He has come close, but if you read his words, you will see that they were clever words, in my opinion, with little meaning.

Fast-track supporters have tried to temper concerns about the formation of this transnational union and the subsequent Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, TTIP, and the Trade in Services Agreement, TISA, that would be approved through fast-track by adding additional negotiating objectives via a separate Customs bill.

However, negotiation objectives are, by design, not explicit or realistically enforceable. They include such vague language as saying it must be the goal of the White House "to ensure that trade agreements reflect and facilitate the increasingly interrelated, multi-sectoral nature of trade and investment activity." Those are the kinds of things in this language. That is not enforceable and has virtually no meaning.

One of the vague goals is "to recognize the growing significance of the Internet as a trading platform in international commerce." What does that mean?

Under the Ways and Means solution, TPP, TTIP, and TISA would establish broad goals for labor mobility—immigration—allowing Ways and Means to say their negotiating objective, about requiring or obligating certain changes, had not been violated. And the President would then implement those changes through Executive action or as a result of fast-track where the laws have changed.

So, together, TPP, TTIP, and TISA—these three trade agreements which we know are going to be advanced under fast-track—represent the goal of advancing the unrestricted global movement of goods and people and services.

The European Commission—this is how they started, how they were formed. In explaining TISA—presumably the second major trade agreement that would be submitted after the Pacific agreement and we move to trade in services—this is how the European Commission explains what it means:

TISA is open to all WTO members who want to open up trade in services. China and Uruguay have asked to join the talks. The EU supports their applications—

The EU supports their applications because it wants as many countries as possible to join the agreement.

TISA, of course, is the services agreement, and it will be worldwide. Anybody—even China—could be admitted to it. And the European Union Commission specifies that this services agreement, TISA, will be modeled on the General Agreement on Trade in Services, GATS. This provides insight into how TISA will affect U.S. immigration procedures.

When the United States became a member of the WTO in 1994, it signed on to the GATS and committed to issue certain numbers of work visas each year, immigration visas. Congress's ability to control the U.S. temporary entry programs has therefore been curtailed, as it would open up the United States to foreign lawsuits in an international tribunal.

In other words, they made an agreement on immigration visas under work ideas as part of GATS in the WTO, and it violates and complicates our ability to enforce American immigration law. But if we enforce the law the way it is written, then we will get disciplined by the foreign body. So when we sign up to a foreign body, we agree to rules. They say we have to do this. So it is not being enforced.

So who wrote the law for the United States of America with regard to immigration? Under the Constitution, it is Congress, but in reality, once you join an international union, they have certain powers to enforce their will over the elected representatives, the accountable representatives of the people of the United States, and some other group does it.

TISA—this services agreement—will, as the European Union suggests, require the United States to make additional legislative commitments on a much larger scale. Do we understand that? When people are voting for this trade agreement, this Pacific trade agreement, do we understand that we are opening up a mechanism for the services agreement and for the Atlantic agreement and perhaps another commission for the Atlantic? Will there be a commission set up under the TISA or TTIP bills? Do we know? Do we want to give a fast-track to grease the skids for the President to negotiate such a thing as this? I think not.

The preamble to the South Korea Free Trade Agreement, for example, states that a principal goal of the agreement is to “create new employment opportunities, and improve the general welfare . . . by liberalizing and expanding trade and investment between their territories.”

In announcing that agreement, President Obama said:

Because we don't simply want to be an economy that consumes other countries' goods. We want to be building and exporting the goods that create jobs here in America and that keeps the United States competitive in the 21st century.

That is what he said at that time.

So for too long the United States has entered into trade deals on the promise of economic bounty, only to see work-

ers impoverished, industries disappear, and manufacturing jobs decline. And we have been on a steady decline in manufacturing jobs.

Mr. Dan DiMiccio, one of the great CEOs in America and chairman emeritus of Nucor Steel, has written about these issues recently. He explains that these deals haven't worked as they have been promised. They haven't been, he says, free-trade deals at all. Instead, they have been “unilateral trade disarmament,” where we lower our barriers to foreign imports but they retain their barriers to our exports. Mr. DiMiccio calls this the “enablement of foreign mercantilism.”

So consider this in the context of automobiles. In May, the Wall Street Journal—who is a free-trade entity for sure—published a news story about how the American auto sector could be jeopardized by the TPP. The Wall Street Journal wrote:

In the transportation sector, led by cars, the TPP could boost imports by an extra \$30.8 billion by 2025, compared with an exports gain to Japan of \$7.8 billion, according to a study co-written by Peter Petri, professor of international finance at Brandeis University.

I think that is exactly accurate. We are not going to have an increase in sales of automobiles in Japan. They have a 4 million automobile surplus capacity. They want to hire their people and they want to sell automobiles in Japan by producing automobiles in Japan, not by importing them. They are mercantilists in their approach. They have successfully resisted the penetration of their automobile market for decades, and it is not going to happen under this agreement. It is just not. But if we reduce our little 2.5 percent tariff on automobile imports to America, this, on the Japanese, has some sort of balancing effect for their failure to allow their markets to be open, and we will increase imports to the United States.

I am not condemning Japan. I am just saying that is how they operate, and we need to understand that and be more effective in defending American interests.

So what we hear from the promoters of this deal is “We believe this trade deal will increase exports.” Well, surely we will get some additional ability to sell products abroad. Surely the President can honestly say: If you sign the agreement with South Korea, well, we will have increased exports to South Korea. And we did—\$800 million instead of the \$11 billion he promised. So we got a little increase, but they got a \$12 billion increase to the United States. And what did that do? That diminished manufacturing in the United States.

Additionally, Clyde Prestowitz, who also served as trade negotiator under President Clinton in addition to President Reagan, offered this warning about the TPP:

Two intertwined elements pose a virtually insuperable barrier to mass market auto im-

ports in Japan. First, Japan's capacity for vehicle production is 13 million. Annual domestic sales are 4 million and exports are another 5 million. That leaves 4 million vehicles equivalent of excess capacity that constitutes a heavy cost burden on the Japanese automobile industry. In the face of this, neither the Japanese industry nor the Japanese Government will want to make life easier for imports. The second structural element is auto dealerships. By law U.S. dealers are independent of the automakers and are free to sell any brand they wish. Exporters to the United States thus find it easy to achieve national distribution of their vehicles. Not so in Japan where the automakers effectively control the dealers.

And that is the big automobile manufacturing companies. I don't think anybody will dispute that.

The essence of what he is saying is that we are really not going to gain market share in Japan, while they are going to gain market share in the United States. So that is why people would like to see tougher, more vigorous negotiation of trade agreements.

Then there is the issue of currency manipulation. The President has made clear that he has no intention of enforcing currency manipulation, which can easily dwarf the impact of tariffs. A former Federal Reserve Chairman, a number of years ago—a great Chairman—said currency manipulation can dwarf the impact of tariffs. By manipulating their currency, our trading partners can artificially raise the price of our exports while lowering the price of their imports. This improper practice has resulted in closed plants, shuttered factories, and the shifting of U.S. jobs and wealth overseas. And China is a huge player in that.

The middle class has shrunk 10 percentage points in the United States since 1970, and real hourly wages are lower today than they were more than four decades ago. That is hard to believe. The real hourly wages are lower than they were 40 years ago. The percentage of men age 25 to 54 not working was less than 6 percent in the late 1960s; it has nearly tripled to 16.5 percent. The labor force participation rate for women—the percentage of women in their working years who are actually working—has fallen 3 full percentage points since 2009 alone.

We can't keep doing the same thing and expecting a different result. So last month, I sent a letter to the President asking how he planned to use fast-track authority and what it would mean for American workers. Those questions should not have been difficult to answer. These negotiators should have been having that on the front of their negotiating minds from the very beginning.

They have been working on this agreement for years. Not one of these questions have been answered—not one. Nor have they been answered by anybody promoting fast-track. They won't answer these questions—the questions about the trade pact, the text of which remains confidential, locked downstairs in a secret room.

This is a question I asked: Will it increase or reduce the trade deficit, and by how much?

Shouldn't we know that? Shouldn't that be discussed? Shouldn't that be the first thing we discuss? Is this going to help the U.S. economy?

No. 2, will it increase or reduce manufacturing employment and wages, including the auto sector, and accounting for jobs lost to imports?

No answer. Shouldn't we know that?

No. 3, will you make the "living agreement" section public and explain fully the implications of the new global governance authority known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Commission?

Mr. President, shouldn't you tell us before we grease the skids to pass a new international commission? Shouldn't we know what it is about?

Congress should just say no on this, colleagues. We don't have to advance fast-track. We ought to insist that at least this new Commission part be fully public. We want to study it before we agree to committing this great Nation to an entity that has very small nations with the same vote as we have.

We asked: Will China be added to this Commission?

No answer. In fact, they have hinted they could be added, and apparently the Commission can vote in new members without Congress voting on it. That looks to me to be pretty clear, from my reading of it.

Will you pledge, we asked further, not to issue any Executive actions or enter into any future agreements impacting the flow of foreign workers into the United States?

No answer. Not one of these questions has been answered. Yet they want us to shut off debate, limit congressional procedural power, and advance this legislation with no amendments. I don't see how anyone can say Congress is not entitled to have at least these questions answered.

What about the American people? Shouldn't they know before their Members vote on whether it is going to improve their job prospects or reduce their job prospects, whether a new factory will be opened in Alabama or New Hampshire or closed? So we need to know about this.

We must know what powers this Commission will have, and how the United States will be represented, how the votes will be counted, how the Commission will impact immigration, environment or patent law, and how Congress can deal with decisions of the Commission it doesn't like.

The TPP is the agreement sitting in the basement room that lawmakers can go and read. It is the first secret fast-track agreement that would be put into effect.

But the TPP is just the first of three colossal agreements. There are two more.

Under what rationale should we in Congress acquiesce to such profound changes involving the global economy?

We will be talking about it in light of the rules of a new trade agreement—a new agreement that could impact 70 to 75 percent of the world economy, and we haven't given it sufficient thought.

Fast-track is an affirmative decision by the Congress of the United States to suspend several of Congress's most basic powers for the next 6 years and to delegate those powers to the Executive. A decision of this magnitude should only be based upon the most thorough debate, the most complete evidence, and the most compelling data provided by proponents on the key questions at stake. A burden of proof rests on the promoters of fast-track to compel three-fifths of the Senate to agree to give up these powers. Fast-track not only authorizes the President to enter the United States into Trans-Pacific Partnership but into an unlimited group of agreements and partnerships in the future.

The President will sign these agreements before Congress votes on them. He will then deliver implementing legislation to Congress that overrides previous law of the United States. This implementing legislation cannot be amended, cannot be filibustered, cannot be debated more than 20 hours, and cannot be subjected to the two-thirds treaty vote in the Senate.

Well, I have been analyzing and thinking about this Commission—this transpacific Union, it is fair to call it. This goes far beyond the normal trade agreement. While it appears to give some respect to our domestic law, this respect is undermined by the difference between the trade agreement—the TPP—and the implementing legislation. While a trade agreement alone may not trump U.S. law—although it could—the implementing legislation necessary for the trade agreement would. Indeed, the implementing legislation is law. And as the last-passed law of the United States, it overrules any previous laws with which it might conflict. Then it would appear that, by implementing the trade agreement, the trade agreement itself could have the impact of law.

So we pass a law that says: Mr. President, we agree with this treaty. Not a treaty—they call this an agreement. We agree with this agreement, Congress said, and the President implements it. Does it then become superior to any law in the United States? I think a good argument can be made that it does. We need to know that absolutely. Certainly, the implementing law states that the Congress agrees that the United States will be bound by the obligations under the trade agreement. The President signs a trade agreement with 12 nations, and when we ratify that, we then say we agree. The United States is bound by these provisions. As part of the provisions we are bound by is a new commission—one nation, one vote.

But there is a further danger. What happens if the Commission uses its living agreement powers—as it will—to

alter the obligations under the agreement? The Commission is empowered then to change its rules, clearly, by the powers given it. Is the United States bound by new rules that we never saw but are passed by the 12 nations?

What if President Obama or some other President has an agenda, and they all get together and pass it? Is the United States bound by it? Does Congress have no control over it?

Well, we don't sufficiently know. That is why we ought not to be fast tracking an international agreement until we have had it made public and it is studied by good lawyers who understand these things.

Is the United States bound by the new rules they have changed? Can they add new members to the Commission? There are provisions about how new members should be added in the document itself. Does it say the Congress has to vote to do that? Can China be admitted?

How about this. Can this new 12-nation body adopt environmental regulations or adopt liberal immigration laws? We have discussed these things in Congress. Congress has rendered opinions and passed legislation and rejected legislation. Can this Commission pass things that impact and override the powers of Congress?

President Obama has said that climate change is one of his—actually, I think he said it is his highest—priority. His Trade Representative has been open and frank about this. The Trade Representative has negotiated this treaty. I am going to talk about that in a minute.

But some say: JEFF, you are wrong. But I don't think I am wrong. I think the issues I raised are very real, and I believe the concerns I raised may in fact be what this new treaty requires. I believe this is a plausible scenario.

But if you don't agree, bring the thing out, lay it out, bring lawyers in here, bring trade people, and explain every provision of it. Before I am going to vote to fast-track it, count that down. Congress should never fast-track any agreement for any transnational union that has the power to bind this Nation.

Goodness gracious, every word should be studied, and all consequences understood. A vote for fast-track is a vote to erase valuable procedural and substantive powers of Congress concerning a matter of utmost importance involving the very sovereignty of this Nation.

Without any doubt, the creation of this living Commission, with all its powers, will erode the power of the American people to directly elect or dismiss from office the people who impact their lives.

Do you remember that in England they woke up one morning and somebody in the European Union in Brussels had outlawed fox hunting? How did this happen? They said: Well, it started just like this.

Well, you say: JEFF, this is an exaggeration. They wouldn't use the Pacific

union to advance political agendas outside of trade, tariffs, and those kinds of things. Well, let's look.

This is an article in the American Thinker, "Fast Tracking an International EPA," by Howard Richman, Raymond Richman, and Jesse Richman. They are professors, I think, all three. But this is on the Web site.

This is a statement by Mr. Froman, President Obama's Trade Representative. He laid out environmental protection as President Obama's bottom line in trade negotiations—environmental protection. This is a quote from the Trade Representative:

The United States' position on the environment in the Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations is this: Environment stewardship is a core American value, and we will insist on a robust, fully enforceable environment chapter in the TPP or we will not come to agreement.

If they reach an agreement on the environmental issues that Congress won't pass, what happens then? The President signs off on it, votes for it, and then we will be disciplined by this Commission for failure to abide by the rules of the Commission.

His Trade Representative—I believe this is Mr. Froman—continues:

Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws. . . .

Let me repeat that:

Our proposals in the TPP are centered around the enforcement of environmental laws, including those implementing multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in TPP partner countries, and also around trailblazing, first-ever conservation proposals that will raise standards across the region. Furthermore, our proposals would enhance international cooperation and create new opportunities for public participation in environmental governance and enforcement.

Well, that is a powerful statement. So there is no doubt that this President is intent on utilizing this agreement to drive his environmental agenda, whether the Congress or the American people agree with it or not. He is not bringing it up to the floor of the Senate, because Democrats and Republicans have no intention of passing his environmental agenda. I am not worried. This is the President's top negotiator on this trade agreement.

Mr. Joshua Meltzer at the Brookings Institute said this:

As a twenty-first-century trade agreement, the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement (TPP) presents an important opportunity to address a range of environment issues, from illegal logging to climate change and to craft rules that strike an appropriate balance between supporting open trade and ensuring governments can respond to pressing environmental issues.

Ensuring that governments respond to pressing environmental issues.

Who is going to ensure? Who has the power to ensure that the United States meets some environmental standard somebody somewhere has set or even the President would like to see set? That is a serious matter. I don't think we should treat it lightly.

I do believe that the American people are correct to be dubious about this trade agreement. Polling data, as I understand it, clearly shows that it is not supported by the American people. Yet forces are at work, breaking arms and breaking hands and bludgeoning people into acquiescence to vote for this thing. It cleared the House by the narrowest of margins. We had 62 votes when it passed through the Senate. They needed 60, and they got 62. The President was working, the Republican leaders were working, the chamber of commerce was working, Big Business was working, money was working and wheeling and dealing, and pork projects were promised, I am sure, to get the votes to pass this, to put it on a fast-track skid.

I am against it. I believe I am speaking on behalf of the working people of the United States of America. I don't believe their interests are being properly considered. I am confident that if this agreement goes into effect, the trade deficit we have with Japan and with Vietnam will increase. Vietnam has 100 million people. We will not be much different with places such as Canada or Australia or Mexico because we basically have a free-trade agreement with them.

So it is not necessary that we create some 12-nation entity, some commission. Why don't we just negotiate trade agreements that serve the interests of the American people with Japan and Vietnam and ensure exactly that they comply with what they say, that their markets are open to ours, as well as our markets are open to theirs? And we should have some reasonable expectation that if we enter into this agreement, it will be good for American workers, not just Japanese workers or workers in Vietnam.

I don't say we shouldn't have a trade agreement. I am saying let's be more careful about it. Let's negotiate some trade agreements for a change that advance the interests of the United States. We need to reduce our trade deficits, not increase them. They are weakening our GDP. The deficit subtracts from the current account trade deficit, subtracts from our gross domestic product. It is not healthy for America to have this kind of deficit.

One of the reports that was done lays out the argument that power comes from this mercantilist approach. The Richmans' and the American Thinker—I will quote a study, and it says this:

To see if mercantilism works—

This is the exporting drive of our trading partners and competitors—[the Richmans'] conducted a statistical study of 11,623 country-year observations for 186 countries from 1870 through 2007 using panel data models. The results: a strong statistically-significant correlation between balance of trade and national power. A favorable balance of trade is associated with an increase in power (national material capabilities), an unfavorable balance with a decrease.

This is what China believes to the core. This is what most of the Asian

countries believe and act on. And apparently the Richmans' conclude—an objective study—that it is accurate. I don't know. But those are the kinds of things we need to be careful about.

They have two scenarios they have laid out based on this scenario. The first envisions 20 years of trade deficits at the rate of the trade deficit we ran in 2007. The second scenario envisions balanced trade, where we don't have a trade deficit. Under trade deficit, their definition of "national power" declined 28 percent. So the national power declined 28 percent. Under a balanced trade, our national power remains basically stable, increasing by one-half of 1 percent. I think balanced trade is certainly preferable. It is certainly preferable for working Americans.

Mr. President, I thank the Chair for your patience and allowing me to share these remarks. It could be that I am wrong. Maybe trade deficits make no difference. Maybe the loss of manufacturing is offset by the fact that we get cheaper goods. That is what some of our people in the United States say.

When somebody sends subsidized goods here and that closes the U.S. factory and people can purchase their goods for below cost, we should send those countries a thank-you note—no concern about the people who got laid off and the jobs lost. I am not sure that model is now appropriate. Maybe it was 20 years ago.

I sort of believe that cheaper products was the ultimate goal and voted that way, but I am reevaluating it. I think this country needs to go through a serious evaluation of that, No. 1. Secondly, we absolutely—colleagues, we absolutely should not fast-track a movement to the establishment of an international commission or international union and maybe creating two more of them as part of two more trade agreements—the three trade agreements that will be part of fast-track if it passes. And, of course, any number of other trade agreements for the next 6 years could be accelerated through this fast-track process, if it passes.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise today to again speak about the North Dakotans who made the ultimate sacrifice while serving our country in the Vietnam war.

Since March, I have had the honor of learning from families about the lives

of their sons, brothers, husbands, fathers, and uncles who died during the Vietnam war.

Before speaking about the 13 of the 198 North Dakota young men who didn't return home from Vietnam, I want to first talk about Dan Stenvold of Park River. Dan is a Vietnam veteran who survived the war.

While a student at Sargent Central High School, Dan thought about joining the military. After graduation, he felt he should grow up before going to college, and he enlisted in the Army. He was sent to Vietnam and served three continuous tours of duty there. His records count that he was in Vietnam for 802 days. After returning home from Vietnam, Dan enrolled in college at North Dakota State School of Science in Wahpeton so he could fulfill his dream of playing college football. The combination of Dan's time in Vietnam and a football knee injury made Dan feel old, and he left college. He then had a 33-year career with Polar Communications in Park River.

In 1999, the North Dakota Vietnam Veterans of America voted him as their State president, and he has served in that position for the last 16 years. For the last 6 years, he has served on the National Board of Vietnam Veterans of America. The national president asked him to run for another 2-year term, and I wish Dan well in that upcoming election.

Dan also serves his community as a member of the DAV, AMVETS, VFW, and the American Legion, and he is currently in his third term as mayor of the city of Park River in North Dakota.

Dan is proud of his three wonderful children and seven grandchildren.

Agent Orange exposure education is one of his top priorities. He has seen his own family affected by the side effects of Agent Orange. Dan is grateful to the North Dakota State Legislature for once again approving funding for education and outreach related to Agent Orange exposure.

I thank Dan for his continuing service to our country.

And please, Dan, keep up your good work on behalf of the citizens of your community and Vietnam veterans all across this country.

RICHARD "RICH" BOEHM

Richard "Rich" Boehm was born on June 23, 1951. He was from Mandan. He served in the Army's 198th Infantry Brigade. Rich died on March 26, 1971. He was 19 years old.

Rich was one of six children. All three boys served our country in the military—Marvin and Clarence in the Army National Guard and Rich in the Army.

Rich served in Vietnam with Myron Johnson from Mandaree, and they became very close friends. Rich was engaged, and Myron was going to be his best man.

Keith Nolan's book "Sappers in the Wire: The Life and Death of Firebase Mary Ann" includes details of the day

Rich and Myron died. Rich and Myron were in a foxhole together, ran for safety, and were both shot in the back and killed.

Dennis Bollinger was assigned to escort Rich's body home, and his family knew Rich's family. Dennis continues to serve our State and my community of Mandan as the current city of Mandan chief of police. Rich's brother Marvin says he is grateful to Rich's squad leader who contacted him from Texas and shared memories and photos of Rich during his time in Vietnam.

LARRY JACOBSON

Larry Jacobson was from Norma. He was born on March 15, 1949. He served in the Army's 1st Aviation Brigade. Larry was 21 years old when he died August 26, 1970.

He was the second of six children and grew up on his family's farm near Norma. He attended grade school in Norma and high school in Kenmare. His best friend in high school, Craig Livingston, remembers Larry as a shy person who never had an enemy.

Larry's older brother remembers the week Larry was killed in Vietnam. The family had been in Fargo celebrating his sister's graduation from nursing school. They had planned to host a party at home, too, but when they arrived home, there were a sergeant and captain waiting for them to deliver the news of Larry's death.

This year on Memorial Day weekend, a large memorial was dedicated at the Mouse River Park honoring Renville County veterans. The memorial includes Larry's photo, images of the soldier's cross, and a helicopter like the one Larry was riding in when it was shot down and he was killed.

CARL WOODS

Carl Woods was from Bottineau. He was born June 8, 1933. He served as a Navy pilot. Carl was 32 years old when he died on September 28, 1965.

His father Monte also served our country during World War I, and six of the eight boys in Carl's family served in the military.

Carl was an honor student in high school and college in Bottineau, where he made the All-Conference Football team. He then chose to enlist in the Navy. He served our country as a Navy pilot for over 12 years, reaching the rank of lieutenant commander.

While serving in the Vietnam war, Carl's plane was hit by an anti-aircraft missile. Instead of bailing out over North Vietnam, Carl maneuvered the plane 40 miles to the Tonkin Gulf, where he died after his parachute failed to open.

The family is grateful to Carl's wingman for sharing with them the details of Carl's service and extraordinary flight skills the day he died.

In addition to his brother, Carl left behind his wife Elaine and three children, Mark, Jennifer, and Kathryn.

Carl is buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

This summer, the Bottineau AMVETS Post 25 is going to rename

themselves the Carl J. Woods Memorial Post 25 in honor of Carl's service and his sacrifice.

JOEL ELLINGTON

Joel Ellington was from Rolette. He was born January 21, 1945. He served in the Navy. Joel was 22 years old when he died on June 26, 1967.

Joel was the oldest of three boys. They were 3 years apart in age. At Rolette High School, Joel played in the band. Right after high school, Joel enlisted in the Navy. After serving 2 years, he returned home and worked in the local grocery store.

Due to the Vietnam war draft, Joel reenlisted in hopes that his brothers, Dennis and Doyle, would not have to serve in Vietnam. Dennis said of Joel's reenlistment, "I think he did that to try to protect me; he didn't think they'd take two brothers."

DAVID HAEGELE

David Haegele was from Napoleon. He was born on September 28, 1948. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. David died February 28, 1969. He was 20 years old.

He was the fifth of eight children and grew up on his family's dairy farm. His brother Tim also served our country in the Marines.

David's family said that he was such a kind person and a hard worker. They remember his jokes and how much he enjoyed playing fun pranks on people.

David's letters home to his family requested three things he and his fellow soldiers desired most: Kool-Aid, baked goods, and dry socks.

His mother gave David's niece Veronica a box she filled with David's things, such as the letters he mailed home from Vietnam and his wallet. She said that Veronica would know what to do with them. About 3 months before David's mother passed away at age 95, Veronica finished David's scrapbook, and his mother thought it was perfect.

GARRY KLEIN

Garry Klein was born November 22, 1947. He served in the Marine Corps' Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 9th Marines, 3rd Marine Division. Garry was 19 years old when he died on May 27, 1967.

He was third from the youngest of nine children. His sister Arlene said that Garry was an easygoing kid who was lighthearted and never caused any trouble. She remembers the cartoons he liked to draw.

Garry chose to enlist in the Marines to serve his country. When he went home during Christmastime on leave, he told Arlene and her children, "I won't see you again, but you may see me."

He died almost exactly 1 year after he graduated from high school.

RANDY LEE HANSEN

Randy Lee Hansen was born October 23, 1948. He was from South Dakota, but he was living in Williston when he enlisted. He served in the Army's 1st Signal Brigade as a field radio repairer. Randy died on Easter Sunday, April 6, 1969. He was only 20 years old.

Randy's brothers, Jim and Mike, served our country in the Navy. His stepbrother, Arthur, also served in the Army.

Randy's brother, Jim, remembers that Randy liked to fish. Jim believed Randy had some great stories from his time fishing, as many fishermen do.

While his brothers, step-brothers, step-sister, and mother remained in South Dakota, Randy attended Williston High School, where his father was working in Williston as a brick-layer.

In 1966, Randy enlisted in the Army before he graduated from high school. The product of a service-oriented family, Randy felt it was important that he serve his country.

FRED JOHNSON

Fred Johnson was born on November 3, 1939. He grew up in Watford City and Leeds. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Fred was 27 years old when he died on January 20, 1967.

Fred's wife's name was Jacqueline, and they had one son and three daughters. Their oldest child, Richard, said that Fred loved to hunt and fish. Fred's dad was a game warden and Fred would go to work with his dad sometimes. They would bring home injured animals and nurse them back to health. Among the most memorable animals were a white owl, a baby skunk that behaved like a pet cat, and a raccoon that he kept for 6 years.

After high school, Fred joined the Army. He served for 7 years before he was killed in action in Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's son, Richard, remembers going fishing with his dad often and fishing together the week before Fred left for Vietnam on his second tour of duty.

Fred's brother, Robert, said he took Fred to the airport before he returned to Vietnam the last time. Fred was scared and didn't know if he would be back again.

Fred died shortly thereafter when his vehicle hit a landmine.

LYLE JOHANNES

Lyle Johannes was born June 25, 1949, and spent his high school years in Kulm. He served in the Army as a radio operator. Lyle died January 29, 1970. He was 20 years old.

Lyle was the oldest of four children. His youngest sister, Sally, said that Lyle was a happy person who didn't get rattled by anything. He loved a good joke and had lots of friends. Sally said, "You'd never want to turn your back on him because you never knew what he might do!" He was a daredevil who loved motorcycles, had a number of Hondas—and crashes—over the years. He spent a lot of time hanging over the engine of a car. He would buy old cars and fix them up. He also worked on the cars of elderly women who lived in town. After high school, he attended a technical college in Denver for mechanics.

Lyle was glad to be in the Army serving in Vietnam. He kind of "adopted" a young Vietnamese boy. The boy really

liked blue jeans and a turtleneck sweater, so Lyle asked his mom to send them for him. She said she sent them as well as other things, but for packing material she put popcorn in Lyle's packages. When the packages arrived, the soldiers would eat the stale popcorn because they were so happy to have something from home.

Lyle was accidentally killed by friendly fire. Since his death, the family occasionally finds items someone leaves on Lyle's grave.

Lyle had shipped cashmere sweaters home for the family as Christmas presents in late 1969. The package arrived after his funeral in January of 1970.

ERIC NADEAU

Eric Nadeau was born November 12, 1948. He was from Grand Forks and was a member of the Turtle Mountain band of Chippewa. He served in the Army's 101st Airborne Division, the Screaming Eagles. Eric died May 26, 1969, just days before his tour of duty was scheduled to end. He was 20 years old.

He was the eldest child of his family and had three sisters. Eric's sisters remember how much he loved hunting game in the Turtle Mountains before he enlisted in the Army, and they think that is part of the reason why he joined the Armed Forces.

Everyone liked Eric. He had a circle of friends he grew up with, and if he was ever in town on break from the service, Eric and his best friend Dale were inseparable. Wherever Dale was, one could find Eric, and vice versa.

His sister remembers a time when Eric came home and surprised their mother. She and her mother were playing bingo in the local church basement. When he walked into the room, everything stopped, and everyone stood up and sang the National Anthem. Eric's mother was shocked and thrilled.

Eric died when his company was outnumbered and overrun. He jumped back in to save his crew members, and did save some, but was killed in the process. Eric's sister thinks of Eric not only as her brother but her hero.

FRED JANSONIUS

Fred Jansonius was born June 23, 1948. He was from Jamestown. He served in the Army's 9th Infantry Division. Fred died February 2, 1968. He was only 19 years old.

He was the oldest of four children. His sister, Claire, said that Fred was a gentle soul and that his younger siblings looked up to him. In high school, Fred was a good student and enjoyed photography, golf, and tennis. After graduation, he attended Drake University and studied journalism.

One of his Drake professors told Fred's class, "To be a good journalist, you really need to see the world." Fred's draft number was high, but he was deferred for being in college. So he quit college and traveled to New York City to see part of the world while waiting to be drafted.

Claire shared some of Fred's letters he wrote home to his family, which revealed a talent for writing and the wis-

dom of someone who had definitely seen his share of the world in his 19 years. Many of his letters included vivid descriptions of Fred's experiences in Vietnam, so you could imagine Fred sleeping in a cemetery, using a bag of grenades for a pillow or his fellow soldiers drinking Coca-Colas and using their imaginations to create their own entertainment.

After Fred was killed in Vietnam, his casket arrived in Jamestown on the train. The same conductor who drove the train the day Fred left to go to basic training was driving the train that delivered Fred's body back to Jamestown.

About a year ago, one of Fred's officers, Lee Moorman, was traveling the United States visiting the graves of the soldiers he knew in Vietnam. Lee told Fred's family that Fred liked to read and was well liked by everyone.

GREGORY KRUEGER

Gregory Krueger was born March 1, 1949. He was from Garrison. He served in the Army's 173rd Airborne Division. Gregory died July 17, 1970. He was 21 years old.

He was the oldest of three boys. His brother, Stephen, said that Gregory was hard-working, responsible, and well-liked by everyone who knew him.

Stephen remembers that Gregory loved everything to do with the farm. He had fond memories of working with Gregory, hauling many bales of hay on Saturdays. Their brother, Fred, continues to farm that family farm today.

Gregory had a special relationship with a nearby farmer who trusted him at a young age to run his farm equipment and to help on the farm. Gregory hoped to eventually take over the neighbor's farm after completing his service in Vietnam.

The Heritage Park in Garrison is currently in the process of adding a stone memorial in memory of Gregory's service and his family's sacrifice.

RICHARD HOVLAND

Richard Hovland was from Williston, and he was born August 12, 1946. He served in the Army's 20th Engineer Brigade. Richard was 21 years old when he died on January 31, 1968.

He was one of four children and his family and friends called him Ricky.

Growing up, Richard was active in the Boy Scouts. He played baseball and sang in the choir. His sister, Deanne, remembers his beautiful voice and him singing country music in their living room with his friend, Charles Hanson.

Deanne thought she and her brother were the coolest when he would drop her off at school in his Chevy Impala. She looked up to Richard very much. When he left for Vietnam, she was in junior high and was in awe about what he was going to do.

Deanne said Richard was a fun-loving and family-oriented man who was especially kind and good with their brother, Duane, who had Down Syndrome. Richard always mentioned Duane in his letters he sent home from Vietnam.

After completing his service in Vietnam, Richard had plans to go to college

and become a farmer. Deanne has drawings that Richard made of the farmhouse he wanted to build on the land he was picking out in the Williston area. His parents Arlene and Oscar often said Richard wanted to farm and loved the land so much that he didn't realize his true calling was becoming an architect.

These are just some of the stories of North Dakotans who sacrificed their lives on behalf of our country in Vietnam.

I have to say that every time I do this, I wonder who would they be today. Would they be standing here instead of me? But I do know the men and women in uniform who serve our country continue to serve when they take off the uniform. I also know our country suffers a great loss any time we lose a young man or a young woman in service of our country. That loss must be remembered, it must be respected, and we can never forget.

In this anniversary and commemoration of the Vietnam war, it is so important that we spend our time talking about the sacrifices our country and our servicemen gave in Vietnam and continue to give through the ravages of Agent Orange—the issue Dan worked so hard on. They continue to suffer the post-traumatic stress that was part of that service, and they continue to overrepresent in the homeless populations and populations of people who continue to be troubled from the experiences they suffered in Vietnam.

So today we celebrate these lives and we think about who they might have been. We offer a very humble and grateful thank-you to all of the family members who have helped us with these memorials but who have experienced this loss in a way we will never understand.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). 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.

DEFENDING PUBLIC SAFETY EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 2146.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes," with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146 with an amendment numbered 2060.

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:

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2061 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2060

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 2061 to amendment No. 2060.

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:

In the amendment

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2062

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 2146 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] moves to refer H.R. 2146 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2062.

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. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2063

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions 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 2063 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 2146.

The amendment is as follows:

In the instructions

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

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. 2064 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2063

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 2064 to amendment No. 2063.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike "4 days" and insert "5 days"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 2146, an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

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

TRADE PREFERENCES EXTENSION ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 1295.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 1295) entitled "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the process for making determinations with respect to whether organizations are exempt from taxation under section 501(c)(4) of such Code," and that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the aforementioned bill, with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2065

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295 with an amendment numbered 2065.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

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. 2066 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2065

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 2066 to amendment No. 2065.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2067

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move to refer to the Committee on Finance H.R. 1295 with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer H.R. 1295 to the Committee on Finance with instructions being amendment numbered 2067.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2068

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions 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 2068 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 1295.

The amendment is as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike "2 days" and insert "3 days"

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. 2069 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2068

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 2069 to amendment No. 2068.

The amendment is as follows:

In the amendment

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a cloture motion at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1295, an act to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes, with an amendment.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Daniel Coats, John Cornyn, Michael B. Enzi, Kelly Ayotte, Orrin G. Hatch, Roger F. Wicker, Deb Fischer, Rob Portman, Cory Gardner, Richard Burr, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum under rule XXII be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, following today's encouraging vote over in the House, I wish to update the Senate on where we stand with regard to trade.

First, a brief look back at how we got where we are today. Back in April, the Finance Committee came together to advance four trade bills on a big bipartisan vote. It was everyone's goal at that time to consider all of those bills and to begin the process of passing this

significant trade agenda, and it remains everybody's goal now. That is a point that has been proven many times over.

When our Democratic colleagues insisted on tying TAA to TPA, it was difficult for most on my side to swallow. Many in my conference opposed TAA. But with the larger goal in mind—and understanding that for my friends on the other side, TAA has often ridden alongside TPA—we put the two policies together. This was not an easy lift, but in the interest of moving forward, we compromised.

The process was not easy. We had a few close calls. We even worked through a filibuster to address our colleagues' concerns, but all the hard work paid off. It eventually led to a good result at the end of last month, a 62-to-37 vote in the Senate in favor of more opportunities for American paychecks, for American workers and farmers, and for the American economy.

Unfortunately, though, as we all know now, that was not to be the end of the Senate's role in the process. That is OK. Not every plan turns out perfectly every time, but the point is that you don't give up. The American people didn't send us here to sulk but to work through tough problems. So that is what we are going to do.

Here is what it is going to take: No. 1, working together toward the shared goal of a win for the American people; No. 2, trusting each other to get there. I think we can do that.

So here are the next steps. In the judgment of Members of both parties in the House and in the Senate, our best way forward now is to consider TPA and TAA separately. That means TAA will come second after TPA, but the votes will be there to pass it—reluctantly, not happily, but they will be there if it means getting something far more important accomplished for the American people.

To that end, I just filed cloture on the motion to concur with the House-passed TPA bill. I then filed cloture on the AGOA and preferences bill—with an amendment that adds to that bill TAA. This puts the Senate on a procedural glidepath to consider and then pass the TPA bill, the AGOA and preferences bill, and TAA. So assuming everyone has a little faith and votes the same way they did just a few weeks ago, we will be able to get all of those bills to the President soon.

I know there is a fourth bill, too, the Customs bill. Given the complex and thorny procedural processes at work on that bill, we will have to turn to that one as soon as we are able—but we will turn to it. It will have to go to a conference committee and then return to the Senate floor, where it, too, will be passed and sent to the White House.

I know it is hard to do, but if we step back a few paces and recall what we were all asking for just a few weeks ago, we should be able to take some

satisfaction in all of this. It means that before July 4, the President will have signed TPA, TAA, and the AGOA and preferences bill, and we will be well on our way toward enactment of a robust Customs package. All of that together would be quite an accomplishment. All it is going to take is some hard work, some faith in one another, and everybody voting the same way the next time they voted the last time.

TRIBUTE TO BOB LAWSON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to one of Kentucky's greatest teachers, and a man who has served the public good and the law for 5 decades. My friend Professor Bob Lawson, who has taught law at the University of Kentucky College of Law for 50 years, will be retiring this July 1.

Over the course of his 50 years of teaching, Professor Lawson has become one of the most respected lawyers and teachers in the Commonwealth. He is also well known and admired for his work outside the classroom as the author of much of the Commonwealth's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence.

Professor Lawson was born in a small town in southwestern West Virginia, not far from the Kentucky border, in a coal community. Encouraged by his father to get an education and escape life in the coal camps, he attended Berea College in Kentucky and then earned his law degree at UK in 1963.

In 1965, he was asked to teach law at UK, which he has done ever since. His specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. In the 1970s, he worked with the State legislature to rewrite Kentucky's penal code, which was in need of an overhaul.

I would point out that of Professor Lawson's thousands of students, I was one of them. Bob Lawson was one of my favorite professors, and I still recall his teachings today. I am also proud to call him a friend over the years. UK has greatly benefitted from having him as a member of the faculty for all this time, and he will be sorely missed.

I want to thank Professor Bob Lawson for his five decades of service to the University of Kentucky and to the Commonwealth. For 50 years he led Kentucky's brightest young minds into the legal profession, and his many thousands of students serve as a fitting tribute to his legacy. I wish him all the best as he retires from UK and begins a new stage in life.

The Lexington Herald-Leader published an article detailing Professor Lawson's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

AFTER 50 YEARS AT UK, PROFESSOR WHO WROTE MUCH OF KENTUCKY LAW AND INVESTIGATED UK ATHLETICS IS RETIRING

(By John Cheves)

Robert Gene Lawson, who is retiring July 1, wrote much of Kentucky law and taught thousands of the people who practice it.

Lawson spent 50 years as a professor at the University of Kentucky College of Law, and he was dean twice. Among his students were U.S. Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Gov. Steve Beshear, U.S. Reps. Andy Barr and Ed Whitfield, and most of the Kentucky Supreme Court.

"It's been really interesting watching my students go on in life," Lawson, 76, said Friday, sitting in a cluttered campus office that showed no sign of getting packed up any time soon. "They've done important things and mostly have done them well."

Lawson built an equally large reputation for himself outside the classroom. He authored the state's penal code for criminal offenses and its rules of courtroom evidence. He harangued the General Assembly, with what he considers limited success, for packing the state's jails and prisons with the mentally ill and the addicted. He led investigations into ethics violations at the UK Athletics Department, which didn't win him many friends, and into the nightmarish Beverly Hills Supper Club fire in 1977 that killed 165 people in northern Kentucky.

"He was Kentucky law," said Allison Connelly, a onetime Lawson student who later joined him on the law school faculty. "He has done so much, when you look at his lifetime of work, to make Kentucky a better place."

The son of a coal miner, Lawson was born in 1938 in a tiny Logan County, W.Va., community almost entirely owned by Island Creek Coal Co. His father urged him to escape the coal camp through an education. He worked his way through tuition-free Berea College and then earned a law degree at UK in 1963.

After two years of practicing law, which he enjoyed, Lawson accepted an invitation in 1965 to teach at UK.

"I never thought I'd stay here," he said. "I thought I'd try teaching for a little bit, see what it was like, and get back into my law practice. But it was a wonderful experience from day one—for one thing: being around all of these bright young people."

Lawson's specialty is Kentucky criminal law and evidence law. He wrote the books on those subjects, books that occupy the shelves of law libraries and judicial chambers. In the 1970s, he worked with the legislature to rewrite the state's penal code, which was hugely disorganized at the time. "We had never reformed our criminal laws in Kentucky, so you had offenses that had been added one by one over a period of, what, 150 years, 180 years, and a lot of inconsistency in how these offenses were treated," he said.

To Lawson's frustration, within a decade of his penal code work, the national "war on drugs" and concern over urban violence led politicians in Kentucky and elsewhere to enact much tougher sentencing laws.

It's one thing to imprison a murderer for decades, but these new laws put even minor criminals behind bars for long stretches, Lawson said. For example: In dozens of Kentucky cases Lawson researched, people were convicted of the felony of "drug trafficking within 1,000 yards of a school" after police caught them with a small personal stash of drugs in their homes or cars several blocks from a school.

"Bob Lawson's philosophy was always, 'You lock up the people who genuinely scare you because they're dangerous, they're violent, and for the other people, you see if you

can't rehabilitate them and make them productive members of society,'" said Fayette Family Court Judge Kathy Stein, a former chairwoman of the state House Judiciary Committee.

In 1974, the year Lawson's penal code changes took effect, Kentucky spent \$11 million housing about 3,000 inmates at two prisons. This year, the state expects to spend about \$500 million to keep about 22,000 inmates in 12 prisons and dozens of county jails that are paid to hold the state's felon spillover.

The General Assembly's effort four years ago to cut the inmate population—at Lawson's urging—has fallen short "because they aimed too low," he said. "They tinkered; they did too little."

Some county jails are so overcrowded that state inmates who are serving five to 10 years must sleep on the floor and seldom leave their cells, he said. There is little education or addiction treatment provided, so felons are no better off when they're finally released, and in many cases, they're probably harder than ever, he said.

"We got mad at the people who were committing criminal offenses, and we veered away from a philosophy of trying to correct them, which originally had been the thrust of our justice system," Lawson said. "We jacked up the penalties on everything. As a result, we've created this huge problem of trying to pay for all of this. We're just making things worse for ourselves than they were."

One of Lawson's other crusades over the years was trying to be a watchdog of UK's lucrative and popular sports programs. At the request of various UK presidents, he led investigations into possible ethics violations, including cases that brought about the departures of basketball coach Eddie Sutton in 1989 and athletics director Larry Ivy in 2002.

In 2002, as a member of the UK Athletics Administration's board of directors, Lawson cast the sole dissenting vote against hiring Mitch Barnhart as athletics director. Lawson said he didn't object to Barnhart, but the \$375,000-a-year salary was "ridiculous" compared to the more modest sums paid to other UK faculty and staff. (Barnhart remains in the job and now makes \$600,000 a year.)

Over the past 50 years, the UK Athletics Department evolved into its own universe with its own rules, Lawson said.

"They have become an independent entity, separate from the rest of the university, which is a problem," he said. "Their budget is their budget. The athletics department regards the money that comes in for athletics as their money, not the university's money."

"And I guess I have felt, watching it through the years, that they sort of lost what I would consider to be a reasonable connection of these students to the university as compared to athletics. Let me just give you an example. When I first came here, the basketball season was 20 games. It's now 40. I have my doubts about how they can be a legitimate college student when they've got that problem."

Lawson said he also regrets the explosion in tuition costs at UK and other state universities around the nation, largely because of shrinking public support from state governments. The next UK budget will get just eight percent of its revenue from state appropriations, the smallest share ever.

"I think everyone who is 50 years old and older—including me—ought to be ashamed of themselves for what we're doing to our young people, making an education all but unaffordable," he said.

"When Mitch McConnell and Steve Beshear were in my classroom, I doubt they paid much more than \$100 a semester for

their tuition. They went to school almost without any cost, substantially free," Lawson said. "A resident law student next year will pay between \$21,000 and \$22,000 in tuition. You can't work your way through school at that level. I have students graduating with \$100,000 or more in loan debts that will affect them for the rest of their lives. Shame on us."

EGYPT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week Egyptian government investigators working on behalf of a judge who is overseeing a 4-year-old case against international and Egyptian nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, visited the main office of the Cairo Institute for Human Rights Studies, or CIHRS, and asked for registration and financial documents. The investigators reportedly tried to pass off an informal search warrant as legal cover, but CIHRS staff made clear they couldn't search the office without an official one. The investigators left, but their message was clear: a new crackdown is on the way.

According to information I have received, CIHRS is the second organization to receive such a visit this year. The same investigators previously visited another organization, the Egyptian Democratic Academy, and looked into their activities and funding sources. Four members of the academy have since been banned from leaving Egypt.

Some Senators may remember this case: it is the same one that led to the conviction of 43 foreign and Egyptian NGO workers, including 16 Americans, in 2013. The fact that the Egyptian authorities have decided to resuscitate this old case against these NGOs shows that President Abdel Fattah al-Sisi's administration is confident that it can silence critical voices with little international objection.

Since the 2011 revolution, the government has made several efforts to replace a harsh 2002 law on associations—unevenly implemented under former President Hosni Mubarak—with even more draconian regulations, including a draft law that would have given the government and security agencies effective veto power over NGO boards of directors, foreign funding, and very existence. Although a new law has yet to be passed, the authorities have previously raided or detained staff from respected organizations such as the Hisham Mubarak Law Center, Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, and the Egyptian Center for Economic and Social Rights.

I am deeply concerned with the reinvigoration of this 4-year-old case and the message it sends about Cairo's intent to restrict independent NGOs. I am similarly concerned with recent press reports alleging that the authorities have disappeared a significant number of young people, some of whom later died, in a coordinated campaign, activists say, to silence dissent. Such actions, if true, are deplorable and are

no way to effectively combat terrorism and related insecurity.

Support for a strong and flourishing independent civil society is a critical part of any pluralistic society, but we are seeing the reverse in Egypt. As the ranking member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Department of State and Foreign Operations which provides assistance for Egypt, I am dismayed by the al-Sisi government's rejection of basic freedoms, whether it is the right to express oneself or the right to assemble. Such repressive tactics are not likely to contribute to greater security or stability in Egypt—instead they are likely to do just the opposite.

VOTES ON NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT AND MOTION TO PROCEED TO DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commend the honorable men and women in Maryland—including the 28,939 men and women on Active Duty, the 6,223 in the National Guard, our Reservists, and our civilian employees and contractors—who are serving our Nation.

When I go around the State to bases such as Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Fort Meade, Fort Detrick, the U.S. Naval Academy, and others, I see the people who put their lives on the line every day to defend America.

I support you. I am fighting to make sure you and your families have the resources you need, from equipment, to training, to fresh, healthy food at our commissaries. That is why today I voted against the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act and the motion to proceed to the Defense appropriations bill. My vote was not a vote against our national defense; it was a vote for our national defense. It was a vote to end sequester and a vote for military readiness.

How will voting against a funding bill help end sequester? Because it brings us to the table now—in June—to agree on how we are going to fund the vital programs that we all agree are necessary to protect our Nation. Not in September. Not in November. Not when another funding deadline looms or when there is a clock ticking until the government shuts down. We are going to address this now, so the Senate can do its job to support our troops, our military families, our veterans, and our national security.

National security is more than the Department of Defense. We need diplomacy around the world to prevent conflicts when we can and end them once started. So we need our State Department. We need embassy security to keep our Foreign Service safe—and that is not funded by the Department of Defense.

Our law enforcement agencies here at home also protect our national security. The FBI, tracking down "lone wolf" terrorists; the Coast Guard, pro-

tecting our coasts from smugglers and drug traffickers; Customs and Border Patrol; the Drug Enforcement Administration; Immigration and Customs Enforcement—all standing sentry to protect America. Yet none are funded by the Department of Defense.

Nation states and organized crime are infiltrating our cyber networks, and we need the Department of Homeland Security, the FBI, and the National Institute of Standards and Technology to help us protect dot-com and dot-gov. Those key cyber warriors are not funded by the Department of Defense.

Finally, we need troops ready for duty. Sadly, only one in four recruits can pass muster, many for lack of education or lack of physical fitness. We need great schools turning out great graduates ready to work. We need childhood nutrition to feed them healthy meals that build healthy bodies. But education and nutrition are not funded by the Department of Defense.

In order make the Department of Defense successful, we need to stop hollowing out America. This means making sure our other agencies have the resources necessary to meet national security needs at home and abroad.

However, the Republican Budget uses two sets of rules—first, pretend funding for basic, essential military operations—things that are supposed to be in the base budget—taken from the Overseas Contingency Operations, OCO, account that was created for funding wars. This gimmick allows \$38 billion of extra defense spending by evading the budget caps. The second rule the Republicans are using is saying: We are going to apply the sequester budget constraints to the rest of the Federal agencies. That is not acceptable, but we can fix it.

We need to end sequester for defense, without gimmicks, and we need to end sequester for the rest of our agencies. We need to make sure defense has the right resources, but we also need to make sure that the other agencies that protect our country and make it great and are not included in the Defense bill have the resources they need too. Today, I voted no to moving to the Defense appropriations bill, but that no is meant to speed up the process of getting a better outcome for our troops and our country.

Many of my colleagues fail to mention that we in Congress can go through these motions: We can pass funding bills, go to conference, and send them to the President's desk. But that will do no good if the President vetoes these bills, which he has said he will do if they include budget gimmicks.

I hope that after having this vote, our leadership will sit down and negotiate a new budget deal, now in June. We need to have a real solution for the budget constraints that impact all of

our Federal agencies, so that our Nation can be protected and the government can serve the people. That is what the people deserve.

RECOGNIZING THE SIXTH BIENNIAL JAMAICAN DIASPORA CONFERENCE

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, today, I want to take a moment to recognize the important relationship between the United States and Jamaica and the role Jamaican Americans play in promoting trade and development between our two nations.

The United States has a robust and important relationship with Jamaica. President Obama's trip to Jamaica in April 2015 illustrated that we see Jamaica as a key regional leader and that we have a strong interest in strengthening our bilateral security relationship with Jamaica.

The United States is Jamaica's leading partner in trade, chief source of foreign direct investment, FDI, and home to the largest Jamaican diaspora in the world. The more than 1 million Jamaicans in the United States make crucial contributions to the Jamaican economy through remittances and support for friends and family still in Jamaica. Proud Jamaicans like Delaware's Lorraine Badley connect business leaders with opportunities for investment and trade, host ministers and other Jamaican officials, and strengthen community connections in both countries.

From Bob Marley, who first emigrated from Jamaica to my home State, to former NBA basketball player Patrick Ewing and former Secretary of State Collin Powell, first- and second-generation Jamaican Americans have made significant and lasting contributions to our economy, sports, art, and political system.

The Jamaican Government recognizes the critical role Jamaicans living abroad play in Jamaica's economic advancement, and this week they are hosting the Sixth Biennial Jamaica Diaspora Conference in Montego Bay. The conference brings together members of the Jamaican diaspora from the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, and other countries to build connections and boost diaspora investment in the Jamaican economy. I would like to commend the Jamaican Government for their efforts to diversify their economy and become a regional leader in trade and investment.

The Diaspora Conference taking place this week will leverage that support into targeted investments to grow Jamaica's infrastructure, ports, and logistics capacity to make it the central hub for the transport of goods between Latin America and the United States.

As the Jamaica Diaspora Conference draws to a close, the United States looks forward to seeing new partnerships between the Jamaicans and the Jamaican diaspora emerge to further an economic development agenda that

will result in mutual growth and benefit both our countries.

TRIBUTE TO SISTER MARGARITA BREWER

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize a 2015 Northern Kentucky University Lincoln Award recipient, my friend and a community leader, Sister Margarita M. Brewer.

Sister Margarita has dedicated her life to serving the Latino community in Greater Cincinnati. Originally from Panama, Sister Margarita has taken an active role in programs assisting the underserved in her local community as well as in Central America.

Sister Margarita founded the English Language Learning—ELL—Foundation, Inc., in 2003 and continues to serve as its president, working with Cincinnati public schools to help English language learners become successful in their academic lives while fostering their cultural identities.

I had the privilege of being one of Sister Margarita's ELL tutors while serving in the House of Representatives. I had to stop tutoring when I was appointed U.S. Trade Representative, but during my time as a tutor, I had the chance to see her good work in action. More recently, my wife Jane has worked as an ELL tutor and shares my admiration for Sister Margarita and her service. Jane was honored to receive the English Language Learning Foundation Tutor of the Year Award in 2014.

In collaboration with Latino Programs and Services' English Language Learners Program at Northern Kentucky University, she also helped develop NKY's Fun with Science Camp, exposing students to all fields of science through hands-on learning activities.

Additionally, Sister Margarita has been involved with the Crossroad Health Center, Family Service of Cincinnati, and Christian Community Health Services.

I join the community in congratulating Sister Margarita, who has served the people of Greater Cincinnati and Ohio with distinction.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I wish to honor Lincoln University of Jefferson City, MO, on the 125th anniversary of the signing of the Second Morrill Act of 1890, which provided Lincoln University and many other historically Black colleges and universities with land-grant institution status. Lincoln University has provided student-centered, post secondary education opportunities to countless students from a variety of backgrounds for more than a century.

On January 14, 1866, Lincoln University, at the time called the Lincoln Institute, was founded by soldiers and officers of the 62nd United States Colored Infantry, following their service in the Civil War. After its incorporation and

the establishment of its board of trustees, the institution opened its doors to the first class in its history on September 17, 1866. Lincoln Institute moved to its current campus in 1871, where it would eventually gain land-grant university status under the Second Morrill Act of 1890.

Since then, Lincoln University, which changed its name from the Lincoln Institute in 1921, has continued to provide a wide variety of educational specializations with over 50 bachelor's degree programs along with master's degree programs in education, business, and the social sciences. Outside of its well-known, grant-funded research programs, Lincoln has also distinguished itself with its popular nursing program and state-of-the-art aquaculture facilities.

Lincoln University is an outstanding and diverse educational institution that continues to impact future generations by looking forward without ever forgetting its roots. I congratulate Lincoln University on more than a century of successes.●

RECOGNIZING THE CARSON CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce, an important entity to Northern Nevada. I am proud to honor this chamber that gives so much support to local businesses and continues to fight to grow the capital city's economy and job market.

Growing up in Carson City and spending a lot of time working in my dad's automotive shop, I learned the importance of a day's work and what it took for my father to keep his business. No doubt, Carson City's businesses—small and large—play an important role in our State's growth.

It is through the hard work of the Carson City Chamber of Commerce that the business community continues to strive and maintain a high quality of life for Carson City residents. Even when Nevada's economy took a difficult turn, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce was there every step of the way to lift local businesses back up. It helped owners adapt to an adverse economic climate through innovation, creativity, and ingenuity. To say this chamber has had a positive impact on Northern Nevada would be an understatement. The strong foundation it has built will be felt for years to come.

Aside from helping local businesses expand and thrive, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce also offers Carson City's entrepreneurs networking opportunities, social functions, and educational programs. It is highly involved throughout the community, gathering volunteers to clean and revamp areas across the city, as well as supporting the sheriff and district attorney's offices. The chamber has 11 directors and 5 committee executives, all

dedicated to making Nevada's capital the best it can be. I am thankful for their leadership and for the great things they are doing for businesses in Northern Nevada.

For the past 70 years, the Carson City Chamber of Commerce has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and true dedication to Nevada. Without the hard work of those who have served this chamber, Carson City would not have developed to be the city it is today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Carson City Chamber of Commerce on its 70th anniversary and in thanking it for all it does to press on and find ways to unleash the Nevada comeback.●

CONGRATULATING SERGEANT JON WRIGHT, RETIRED

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate SGT Jon Wright, Retired, on receiving a Bronze Star with V-Device for valor, honoring his heroic actions while serving this great Nation. It gives me great pleasure to recognize Mr. Wright for both his bravery and his accomplishments during his time with the U.S. Army.

On March 24, 2010, Mr. Wright, who was serving in Afghanistan, led and acted as security for a squad of engineers and explosive ordnance disposal team members working to diminish improvised explosive devices, IEDs. Soldiers from Wright's squad noticed three bystanders, one of whom threw a grenade, landing between Mr. Wright and another sergeant. Mr. Wright quickly responded by picking up the grenade and throwing it away from his group, ultimately saving the lives of those around him. His lifesaving actions were heroic and selfless and remain invaluable to this country.

I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Wright for his courageous contributions to the United States of America and to freedom-loving nations around the world. His service to his country and his bravery earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly defended our nation.

His commitment to helping those around him, as well as serving the country, demonstrates his unwavering selfless character. His actions represent only the greatest of Nevada's values, including a sense of community and an obligation to help others.

As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I recognize that Congress has a responsibility not only to honor these brave individuals who serve our Nation but also to ensure they are cared for when they return home. I remain committed to upholding this promise for our veterans and servicemembers in Nevada and throughout the Nation. Mr. Wright's sacrifice warrants only the greatest respect and care in return.

Mr. Wright continues to serve his community and now lives in Lovelock with his wife and three children. He re-

tired from the U.S. Army nearly 4 years ago and earned a degree in environmental science from American Military University. He now works for a mining company and the local youth football league.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Wright demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the U.S. Army. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Jon Wright on his much-deserved accolade and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING DELTA FUEL

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, small businesses are often vital in driving rural economies. The success of these entities provides crucial job creation and economic opportunity—especially among low-income and minority populations. This week I am proud to recognize Delta Fuel of Ferriday, LA, as Small Business of the Week.

In 1977, a small bulk fuel distributor serving ranchers and farmers was founded in the heart of the Louisiana and Mississippi Delta region. Today, Delta Fuel has grown to employ over 65 workers between their eight operations—7 in Louisiana and 1 in Mississippi—serving a cross-section of the agriculture, construction, aviation, marine, government, manufacturing, automotive, emergency response, and trucking industries with a variety of fuels, lubes, tanks, trailers, oil stations, and lube equipment. In a State known for its robust energy and natural resource industries, Delta Fuel's reputation for dependability, reliability, and exceptional service standards has helped it become one of the fastest growing distributors in the southeast.

In rural east Louisiana, Clint Vegas, president of Delta Fuel, has led the company to exponential growth, earning the company numerous recognitions as one of the most successful Hispanic-owned businesses in the United States. Vegas' business skills have led to crucial job creation for the region. Delta Fuel's success can be attributed in part to their being located in a Historically Underutilized Business Zone, or HUBZone. The Small Business Administration's HUBZone program was created to spur economic activity in economically disadvantaged areas—helping small businesses in urban and rural communities gain preferential access to government contracting opportunities. By using the resources at hand, including the HUBZone program, Delta Fuel has been able to expand, resulting in the addition of numerous jobs and service centers throughout the rural east Louisiana region.

Congratulations again to Delta Fuel for being selected as Small Business of the Week. Thank you for your continued commitment to creating quality

jobs and advancing economic opportunity in East Louisiana.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:51 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2505. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2582. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes.

At 1:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2146) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 2505. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require the annual reporting of data on enrollment in Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish an annual rulemaking schedule for payment rates under Medicare Advantage; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2570. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, establish a demonstration program requiring the utilization of Value-Based Insurance Design to demonstrate that reducing the copayments or coinsurance charged to Medicare beneficiaries for selected high-value prescription medications and clinical services can increase their utilization and ultimately improve clinical outcomes and lower health care expenditures

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 2582. An act to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to delay the authority to terminate Medicare Advantage contracts for MA plans failing to achieve minimum quality ratings, to make improvements to the Medicare Adjustment risk adjustment system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

Report to accompany S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-67).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-68).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Lawrence B. Jackson and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Luke M. McCollum, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Christina M. Alvarado, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Katherine A. McCabe, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Grafton D. Chase, Jr., to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Daniel V. MacInnis, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Captain Alan D. Beal and ending with Captain Andrew C. Lennon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 12, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Brian K. Antonio and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Mark R. Whitney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Paul A. Sohl, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (1h) Nancy A. Norton and ending with Rear Adm. (1h) Robert D. Sharp, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 10, 2015.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Terry J. Moulton, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Bret J. Muilenburg, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (1h) Mark L. Leavitt, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Ann M. Burkhardt, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. James P. Downey and ending with Capt. Stephen F. Williamson, which nominations were

received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 13, 2015.

Navy nomination of Capt. Michael W. Zarkowski, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. David G. Manero, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Paul Pearigen, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Anne M. Swap, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. Peter G. Stamatopoulos, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nomination of Capt. John W. Korka, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Air Force nomination of Col. Paul E. Bauman, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Antonio A. Aguto, Jr. and ending with Colonel Daniel R. Walrath, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. William W. Way, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Michael K. Hanifan and ending with Brig. Gen. Daniel M. Krumrei, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Hugh T. Corbett and ending with Colonel Gervasio Ortiz Lopez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. William C. Mayville, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Colonel Michael S. Cederholm and ending with Colonel Rick A. Uribe, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 19, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Clifford B. Chick, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. John W. Hesterman III, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Leela J. Gray, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Donald B. Tatum, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Timothy E. Gowen, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. William A. Brown, to be Vice Admiral.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Ronald F. Lewis, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Abrams, to be General.

Marine Corps nomination of Col. John G. Baker, to be Brigadier General.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of Daniel A. Lapostole, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Cynthia Aitaholmes and ending with Ryan J. Wang, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Donald W. Algeo and ending with Amy L. H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 13, 2015. (minus 2 nominees: James V. Crawford; Colin A. Meghoo)

Army nominations beginning with Robert B. Allman III and ending with Edward J. Yurus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Lyde C. Andrews and ending with D012582, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Army nomination of Elizabeth M. Libao, to be Major.

Army nomination of John J. Morris, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher A. Wodarz, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Karen M. Wrancher, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Susan R. Cloft, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Robert A. Petersen and ending with Gene C. Wynne, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Ian D. Branum and ending with Bryan P. Hyde, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Josue M. Bellinger and ending with Donald E. Meserve, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with George J. Eberly III and ending with David Garlinghouse, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Gregory K. Emery, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel B. Copeland and ending with George W. Laskey, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Scott W. Arnold and ending with Kurt J. Zahnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher P. Brown and ending with Van T. Wennen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sabrina J. Bobkowski and ending with Diane C. Leblanc, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin R. Boardman and ending with Sean P. McDonauld, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nomination of Carl O. Pistole, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Jon E. Rugg, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Victor S. Chen and ending with Elizabeth A. Zimmermannyoung, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Donald W. Babcock, Jr. and ending with John J. Woods, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Glen A. Dieleuterio and ending with William Y. Pike, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 20, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard A. Braunbeck III and ending with Jeffrey J.

Pronesti, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Thurraya S. Kent and ending with Wendy L. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael E. Biery and ending with Ricky M. Ursery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Neil T. Smith and ending with Dominick A. Vincent, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason B. Babcock and ending with Christopher P. Slattery, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nicholas E. Andrews and ending with Vincent S. Tionquiao, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sowon S. Ahn and ending with Craig M. Whittinghill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Steven W. Connell and ending with Michael A. Whitt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christine J. Caston and ending with James V. Walsh, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael A. Hurni and ending with Elizabeth R. Sanabia, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert C. Bandy and ending with Douglas L. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Dominic S. Caronello and ending with Michael J. Supko, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 30, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Fatmatta M. Kuyateh and ending with Michael J. Scarcella, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Maregina L. Wicks, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Nikki K. Conlin, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael R. Cathey and ending with Eric H. Twerdahl, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Teresa M. Allen and ending with Joon S. Yun, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Martin J. Anerino and ending with Martha S. Scotty, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David J. Bacon and ending with Richard G. Zeber, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Arthur R. Blum and ending with Florencio J. Yuzon,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Patrick K. Amersbach and ending with Nancy V. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Craig L. Abraham and ending with Scott Y. Yamamoto, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Chad M. Brooks and ending with Rod W. Tribble, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Heather J. Walton, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with William A. Hlavin and ending with Bashon W. Mann, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 14, 2015.

Navy nomination of Jacky P. Cheng, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Charles S. Abbot and ending with David G. Zook, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with John J. Andrew and ending with Mark C. Wadsworth, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with David A. Backer and ending with Scott E. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Antonio Alemar and ending with John L. Young III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Lyle P. Ainsworth and ending with Juan C. Varela, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Karin R. Burzynski and ending with Francisco E. Magallon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paolo Carcavallo, Jr. and ending with Matthew G. Zubic, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Shelley D. Caplan and ending with Mike E. Svatek, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Audrey G. Adams and ending with Joel A. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Eugene A. Albin and ending with Kenya D. Williamson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Allan M. Baker and ending with Dennis M. Zogg, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Robert E. Beaton and ending with James L. Willett, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Paul T. Antony and ending with Peter C. Wagner,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jeffrey M. Clark and ending with Carol W. Watt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Laura M. Mussulman and ending with Kenneth W. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Kerry L. Abramson and ending with Ian K. Thornhill, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Tamberlynn W. Baker and ending with Angelia W. Thompson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Saravoot P. Bagwell and ending with Kathy M. Warren, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Gregory T. Stehman and ending with Rodney E. Tugade, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Terry W. Eddinger and ending with David R. Glassmire, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Daryll D. Long and ending with Milton W. Washington, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Holman R. Agard and ending with Mark E. Zematis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 2, 2015.

Navy nomination of Natalie R. Bakan, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Patrick R. O'Mara, to be Commander.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1604. A bill to establish the Transition to Independence Medicaid Buy-In Option demonstration program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 1605. A bill to amend the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003 to authorize concurrent compacts for purposes of regional economic integration and cross-border collaborations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1606. A bill to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative strategies and methods to increase out-of-school access to digital learning resources for eligible students in order to increase student and educator engagement and disseminate evidence-based strategies to relevant

stakeholders and the public; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1607. A bill to affirm the authority of the President to require independent regulatory agencies to comply with regulatory analysis requirements applicable to executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, reenfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote reentry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1611. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1612. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify the final rule relating to flightcrew member duty and rest requirements for passenger operations of air carriers to apply to all-cargo operations of air carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1613. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to convene a panel of citizens to make a recommendation to the Secretary regarding the likeness of a woman on the ten dollar bill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 1614. A bill to provide for the inclusion of court-appointed guardianship improvement and oversight activities under the Elder Justice Act of 2009; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1615. A bill to reform and modernize domestic refugee resettlement programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1616. A bill to provide for the identification and prevention of improper payments and the identification of strategic sourcing opportunities by reviewing and analyzing the use of Federal agency charge cards; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1617. A bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 1618. A bill to reallocate Federal Government-held spectrum for commercial use, to promote wireless innovation and enhance wireless communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

S. 1619. An original bill making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1620. A bill to reduce duplication of information technology at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 1621. A bill to prohibit universal service support of commercial mobile service and Internet access service through the Lifeline program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to devices; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 1623. A bill to establish the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area in the State of Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. NELSON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1624. A bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C-130 Modular Airborne Fire-fighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1626. A bill to reauthorize Federal support for passenger rail programs, improve safety, streamline rail project delivery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. 1627. A bill to ensure the Secretary of State complies fully with reporting requirements in section 116(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1629. A bill to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency

for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1630. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to deter labor slowdowns at ports of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. BALDWIN):

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; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1632. A bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1633. A bill to require that the face of Federal Reserve Notes bear the likeness of Jeannette Rankin before the likeness of any other woman appears on a Federal Reserve Note, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1634. A bill to amend the Federal anti-trust laws to provide expanded coverage and to eliminate exemptions from such laws that are contrary to the public interest with respect to railroads; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORKER:

S. 1635. An original bill to authorize the Department of State for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Foreign Relations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1636. A bill to streamline the collection and distribution of government information; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 1637. A bill to promote permanent families for children, privacy and safety for unwed mothers, responsible fatherhood, and security for adoptive parents by establishing a National Responsible Father Registry and encouraging States to enter into agreements to contribute the information contained in the State's Responsible Father Registry to the National Responsible Father Registry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1638. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to submit to Congress information on the Department of Homeland Security headquarters consolidation project in the National Capital Region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1639. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to assure educational stability for children in foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 204. A resolution recognizing June 20, 2015 as "World Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK):

S. Res. 205. A resolution congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 206. A resolution congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 299

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 299, a bill to allow travel between the United States and Cuba.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to address and take action to prevent bullying and harassment of students.

S. 313

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 313, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize *locum tenens* arrangements under Medicare.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 349

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 349, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 389

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to amend section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to require that annual State report cards reflect the same race groups as the decennial census of population.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 488

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 488, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow physician assistants, nurse practitioners, and clinical nurse specialists to supervise cardiac, intensive cardiac, and pulmonary rehabilitation programs.

S. 491

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 491, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project.

S. 600

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 600, a bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish an energy efficiency retrofit pilot program.

S. 682

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 682, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to modify the definitions of a mortgage originator and a high-cost mortgage.

S. 688

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare hospital readmission reduction program to respond to patient disparities, and for other purposes.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) 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. 845

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 845, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to implement security measures in the electronic tax return filing process to prevent tax refund fraud from being perpetrated with electronic identity theft.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 1040

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1040, a bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission and the National Academy of Sciences to study the vehicle handling requirements proposed by the Commission for recreational off-highway vehicles and to prohibit the adoption of any such requirements until the completion of the study, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1347

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1347, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1349, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by

such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

S. 1362

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1362, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

S. 1434

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1434, a bill to amend the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish an energy storage portfolio standard, and for other purposes.

S. 1461

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1461, a bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1516

At the request of Mr. REID, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1516, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the energy credit to provide greater incentives for industrial energy efficiency.

S. 1528

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1528, a bill to improve energy savings by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes.

S. 1543

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1543, a bill to lift the trade embargo on Cuba, and for other purposes.

S. 1552

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1552, a bill to authorize the Dry-Redwater Regional Water Authority System and the Musselshell-Judith Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes.

S. 1588

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1588, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and violence to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

AMENDMENT NO. 1772

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor

of amendment No. 1772 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1735, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1608. A bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Consumer Drone Safety Act.

In recent years, privately-operated unmanned aircraft have grown in popularity and capability. In many ways, this is brand new technology.

It is worrisome that these new drones, which are capable of flying thousands of feet in the air and at speeds in excess of 30 miles per hour, are available commercially to completely untrained consumers.

This combination of advanced new technology and broad availability has resulted in a rising number of reports of dangerous operations and narrowly avoided mid-air collisions between drones and passenger planes.

Our airports, pilots and travelers deserve meaningful safety protections, as do the people on the ground, in our stadiums and on our highways.

If we don't act, it's only a matter of time before we have a tragedy on our hands.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act would put in place common-sense safety precautions to minimize the risk of disaster.

As with any new technology, drones have attracted significant interest and have promising commercial uses, including package delivery, search and rescue, pipeline inspection, and agriculture.

I agree that the possibilities for this technology are promising, if properly managed. That is why I support research to make sure that the technology is safe and can be used in ways that respect people's privacy.

But there is no question that the technology comes with great risks, and its potential will never be developed if there is a big aircraft disaster.

What if, for example, a drone accidentally flew into a jet engine and brought down a commercial airliner? What if an airliner, having been hit by a drone on approach to a major airport like JFK or LAX, crashes in an urban area?

Safety must come first.

In the last year, unlawful drone use has proliferated and it's clear that there is a high risk to public safety.

In July of 2014, following an exposé by Craig Whitlock of the Washington Post, I wrote to the Federal Aviation Administration asking for data about drone flights and accidents.

What I received from the FAA was—simply put—startling, and it really crystallized for me the magnitude of the problem we face.

In nine months last year, from March through November, there were approximately 25 incidents where a drone nearly collided in midair with a manned aircraft, sometimes requiring evasive action.

In this time period, there were more than 190 incident reports. Since July 1, at least one incident per day was reported to the FAA. For example: On May 29, 2014, two aircraft on approach to LAX reported a “trash can sized” unmanned aircraft at 6,500 feet above ground level.

On June 29, 2014, an airplane on descent to Dulles Airport reported a near midair collision with a drone that flew within 50 feet of the plane at 2,800 feet above ground level.

On September 8, 2014, three separate airplanes reported “a very close call” with a drone on descent to LaGuardia airport at 1,900 feet above ground level.

On October 12, 2014, an aircraft near Tinker Air Force Base in Oklahoma reported taking evasive action at 4,800 feet above ground level to avoid a drone that came between 10 to 20 feet of the plane.

On February 8, 2015, a Southwest passenger jet on its way to land at LAX and reported that a small red drone flew “right over the top” of the plane at 4,000 feet above ground level.

These close calls are absolutely unacceptable. It is not just airplanes and airports that are at risk. For example, the general manager of the Golden Gate Bridge reports that drones routinely fly over traffic on the bridge. One drone recently crashed onto the bridge roadway.

Drones equipped with cameras have also flown by the bridge in areas where photography is not permitted for security reasons, which is alarming.

The California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection—CAL FIRE—is also growing increasingly concerned about the unsafe use of drones. It reports that during last year's fire season, there were numerous incidents involving drones.

For example, in September, one of its helicopters, which was responding to the Pasquale fire, had to brake in mid-air to avoid colliding with a recreational drone just 10 feet ahead of it.

In May, several drones were filming an active firefight in order to post videos online. If local police hadn't been able to identify the operators and convince them to stop, CAL FIRE believes it might have had to shut down its aerial firefighting operations for the Poinsettia and Cocos fires to avoid the risk of collision.

As far back as 2012, the Government Accountability Office, GAO, has issued

warnings about obstacles to the safe operation of drones, which include the fact that many drones cannot “detect, sense and avoid” other aircraft or objects in the airspace.

Drones are also plagued by a phenomenon known as “lost link”—in which the remote connection between the pilot on the ground and the aircraft is simply lost, resulting in a loss of command and control of the aircraft.

The GAO’s report also noted that many drones “currently use unprotected radio spectrum and, like any other wireless technology, remain vulnerable to unintentional or intentional interference.”

GAO continued: “This remains a key security and safety vulnerability because, in contrast to a manned aircraft in which the pilot has direct physical control of the aircraft, interruption of radio transmissions can sever the UAS’s only means of control.”

Even the operators of consumer drones often know that their operations can be dangerous. Let me just read to you from one commenter on Amazon’s page for a popular consumer drone:

It just kept climbing as it disappeared into the clouds. I lost visual, and was sure I’d never see my Phantom again. . . . From calculations based on DJI’s web site that it climbs 16 meters per second, which means it attained an altitude . . . somewhere between 5,000 and 7,000 feet. I didn’t realize until I got video back.

The commentator continued: “This is ‘not’ good, though, since until I saw the video, I didn’t realize I was in controlled airspace. Do ‘not’ do this.”

This comment, to me, is really emblematic of what is happening. Consumers with no training, certification, or instruction are buying highly-capable drones with few technological safeguards.

There are precautions we can take to reduce the risk of a catastrophic accident.

For example, after a consumer drone crashed on the White House lawn in January 2015, the manufacturer voluntarily released a firmware update to prevent flights near Washington, D.C.

The update was easy for consumers and commonsense. However, the FAA has no authority to require all manufacturers to follow suit, or to specify other areas that deserve similar protection.

Another easy precaution is education of drone operators. For example, the FAA has partnered with the Academy of Model Aeronautics, the Association for Unmanned Vehicle Systems International, and the Small UAV Coalition to develop an educational campaign called “Know Before You Fly.”

This campaign includes sensible advice about staying under 400 feet in elevation, keeping the drone within range of eyesight, flying sober, and staying away from pedestrians, vehicles, and airports.

However, the FAA can’t require manufacturers to print this type of infor-

mation and include it in the box for consumers when they buy a new drone.

FAA needs the authority to require these basic safety precautions.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act calls for sensible new safety regulations in how drones are manufactured and used.

These new safety regulations apply only to consumer drones: civil unmanned aircraft that are manufactured for commercial distribution and that are equipped with an automatic stabilization system or are capable of providing a video signal allowing operations beyond the visual line of sight of the operator.

Notably, this definition does not override Section 336 of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, which means that model aircraft flown for recreational purposes would continue to be subject to the safety guidelines of a community-based organization rather than to operational regulations of the Federal Aviation Administration.

The bill has operational requirements.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act directs the FAA to clearly lay out what is acceptable for consumer drones that are operated outside the programming of a community-based organization, detailing when, where, and under what conditions drones can be operated. This includes how high, how close to airports or stadiums, and under what weather conditions a drone may be flown.

The bill has manufacturer requirements.

Any drone advanced enough to fly autonomously should also be equipped with advanced safety features, including geo-fencing.

But FAA does not currently have authority to require even the most basic safety precautions like providing educational materials.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act authorizes FAA to set meaningful safety requirements for manufacturers. These may include geo-fencing to govern the altitude and location of flights, a transponder or other method for pilots and air traffic control to detect and identify the drones, collision-avoidance software, and precautions for the loss of a communications link, anti-tampering safeguards, and educational materials.

The bill also requires manufacturers to update existing consumer drones to meet these new requirements when feasible.

The bill would allow FAA to exempt particular types of consumer drones from any requirement that is technologically infeasible or cost-prohibitive if other precautions enable safe operations.

The Consumer Drone Safety Act is straightforward, balanced, and necessary. For the first time, it would allow the FAA to proactively respond to the increasing use and capabilities of consumer drones by requiring sensible precautions to protect the safety

of our nation’s airports and hospital helipads, stadiums and fairgrounds, bridges, electrical infrastructure, highways, and city sidewalks.

Congress must not wait for a tragedy before taking action. I encourage my colleagues to join me in this legislation to ensure that consumer drones are built and operated safely.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Mrs. Boxer, Mr. Casey, Mr. Whitehouse, and Mr. Warner):

S. 1609. A bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, as the labor market of the 21st century continues to transform, it will be critical to ensure that American workers are equipped with the skills and expertise needed to meet the variety of demands in the global marketplace. It is critical that we continue to reform and update our education system to ensure that America’s students are prepared for cutting-edge careers. Today, many students enter high school and postsecondary education with little knowledge of the careers available to them outside of traditional pathways. Research has found that few middle school students have a lack of understanding of how what they are learning in school relates to careers. With college costs continuing to rise, it is critical that students have exposure to the wide range of available work and career choices early in their academic careers so that, by the time they enter high school, they are more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them.

Career and technical education, CTE, programs play a pivotal role in preparing students for America’s job market, and are proven to help students explore their own strengths and preferences, and match up with potential future careers. However, a lack of Federal investment in middle school CTE programming often means students have to wait until high school for this exposure.

Middle school is a critical time when students explore their own strengths, likes, and dislikes, and begin to form long-term career goals. Studies have found that middle school students who participate in career and technical education development programs that promote career exploration skills are able to make more informed career decisions by increasing knowledge of career options and career pathways that match their interests. Additionally, these programs play a positive role in engaging students in the classroom and on their academic success.

I am proud to introduce the Middle School Technical Education Program Act, which establishes a pilot program for middle schools to partner with postsecondary institutions and local businesses to develop and implement

career and technical exploration programs. This legislation will provide support for middle schools to create career and technical education programs that will provide students with introductory courses, hands-on learning, or afterschool programs. Career guidance and academic counseling is vital to ensuring that our students understand the educational requirements for high-growth, in-demand career fields. Many times students receive this information too late in their academic careers.

We need to work to improve middle school education to prepare students for cutting-edge careers and expose students to the variety of career pathways. This legislation also requires that programs help students draft a high school graduation plan that demonstrates what courses would prepare them for a given career field. If we provide youth with applied career exploration opportunities, they will be more informed about future paths and what they need to do to pursue them. I am hopeful this bill will help highlight current shortcomings in middle schools, and instigate further discussion on the importance of educating youth early on the multitude of educational and career pathways.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 1610. A bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement officers, promote accountability for State and local law enforcement agencies, re-enfranchise citizens, eliminate sentencing disparities, and promote re-entry and employment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I have introduced legislation along with Senator CARDIN called the Building And Lifting Trust In order to Multiply Opportunities and Racial Equity, or the BALTIMORE Act.

The people of Sandtown-Winchester, the people of Baltimore, and all Americans need to know they have a government on their side. Right now there is a trust gap between the people and the police department.

Baltimore is my hometown. I have lived there all my life. But what happened in Baltimore earlier this year could have happened anywhere, in anyone's hometown. I don't want to see this happen anywhere else. Where there is broken trust, we must rebuild it. And where there is lost hope, we must restore it.

That is why I joined Senator CARDIN in introducing the BALTIMORE Act. This bill is a package of reforms intended to reestablish a sense of trust between communities and the police departments that protect them.

First, the bill would ban discriminatory profiling by State and local law enforcement based on race, ethnicity, religion, or national origin. The bill makes sure that if police departments are receiving Federal funding, they are also adopting practices to cease the use

of discriminatory profiling. It holds police departments accountable by requiring them to share officer training information, including how officers are trained in the use of force, racial and ethnic bias, de-escalating conflicts, and constructive engagement with the public. It also authorizes a grant program to assist local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras.

We need to look at how our sentencing laws contribute to racial disparity in our justice system. That is why this bill would reclassify specific, low-level, non-violent drug possession felonies as misdemeanors. The bill also eliminates the distinction between crack and powder cocaine.

Finally, the bill authorizes \$200 million annually for the Department of Labor's Reentry Employment Opportunities Program through the Workforce Investment Opportunity Act. This is important funding to give people a hand up—not a hand out. It also encourages the White House to "ban the box" in the Federal contracting process. This would allow employers to eliminate questions about criminal convictions on initial job applications.

Baltimore has begun to heal. We will come together as a community and a city to rebuild. But I do not want to see another great American hometown follow in Baltimore's footsteps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1625. A bill to require a report on the location of C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1625

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPORT ON THE LOCATION OF C-130 MODULAR AIRBORNE FIREFIGHTING SYSTEM UNITS.

Not later than September 30, 2016, the Secretary of the Air Force shall submit to Congress a report setting forth an assessment of the locations of C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System (MAFFS) units. The report shall include the following:

- (1) A list of the C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System units of the Air Force.
- (2) The utilization rates of the units listed under paragraph (1).
- (3) A future force allocation determination with respect to such units in order to achieve the most efficient use of such units.
- (4) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of modifications to the C-130 Modular Airborne Firefighting System program to enhance firefighting capabilities.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 1628. A bill to preserve the current amount of basic allowance for housing for certain married members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1628

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PRESERVATION OF CURRENT BASIC ALLOWANCE FOR HOUSING FOR CERTAIN MARRIED MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the amount of basic allowance for housing payable under section 403 of title 37, United States Code, as of September 30, 2015, to a member of the uniformed services who is married to another member of the uniformed services shall not be reduced unless—

- (1) the member and the member's spouse undergo a permanent change of station requiring a change of residence; or
- (2) the member and the member's spouse move into or commence living in on-base housing.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 204—RECOGNIZING JUNE 20, 2015 AS "WORLD REFUGEE DAY"

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KING, Mr. BROWN, Mr. REED of Rhode Island, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 204

Whereas World Refugee Day is a global day to honor the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children who are forced to flee their homes under the threats of conflict, violence, and persecution;

Whereas according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (referred to in this preamble as "UNHCR")—

- (1) there are nearly 60,000,000 displaced people worldwide, the highest levels ever recorded, including almost 20,000,000 refugees, 38,000,000 internally displaced people, and 1,800,000 people seeking asylum;
- (2) children account for 51 percent of the refugee population in the world;
- (3) nearly 4,000,000 refugees have fled Syria since the start of the Syrian conflict and more than 7,600,000 people are internally displaced;
- (4) approximately 1,325,000 people are displaced within Ukraine with approximately 800,000 Ukrainians seeking protection in other countries as a result of a worsening humanitarian situation in nongovernment controlled areas;
- (5) since April 2015, sporadic outbursts of violence in Burundi have prompted more than 100,000 Burundians to flee to the neighboring countries of Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;
- (6) violent insurgent attacks in Nigeria have forced 167,000 people to flee to the neighboring countries of Cameroon, Chad,

and Niger, and have internally displaced nearly 1,500,000 people;

(7) more than 88,000 women, men, and children, including many persecuted Rohingya refugees from Burma, have departed on smugglers' boats from the Bay of Bengal since 2014, more than 1,000 of whom have died at sea;

(8) as of June 2015, more than 100,000 refugees and migrants have crossed the Mediterranean Sea from North Africa and at least 1,800 women, men, and children have died during such crossings or are missing;

(9) more than 180,000 Iraqi refugees and nearly 3,000,000 internally displaced Iraqis;

(10) nearly 6,000,000 internally displaced Colombians;

(11) nearly 700,000 South Sudanese refugees in neighboring countries; and

(12) more than 465,000 refugees from the Central African Republic;

Whereas refugees who are women and girls are often at a greater risk of sexual violence and exploitation, forced or early marriage, human trafficking, and other forms of gender-based violence;

Whereas the United States provides critical resources and support to the UNHCR and other international and nongovernmental organizations working with refugees around the world; and

Whereas since 1975, the United States has welcomed more than 3,000,000 refugees who are resettled in communities across the country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of the millions of refugees and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, and torture in search of peace, hope, and freedom;

(2) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue its international leadership role in response to those who have been displaced, including the most vulnerable populations who endure sexual violence, human trafficking, forced conscription, genocide, and exploitation; and

(B) to find political solutions to existing conflicts and prevent new conflicts from beginning;

(3) commends those who have risked their lives working individually and for the countless nongovernmental organizations and international agencies such as UNHCR that have provided life-saving assistance and helped protect those displaced by conflict around the world; and

(4) reiterates the strong bipartisan commitment of the United States to protect and assist millions of refugees and other forcibly uprooted persons worldwide.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a resolution to mark World Refugee Day, June 20, and to address the growing global crisis of people forcibly displaced by persecution or conflict.

According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, for the first time since World War II, over 60 million people have been forced from their homes and displaced in their own countries or forced to flee abroad. Last year alone, 14 million people were uprooted by violence and persecution, most escaping conflicts in Syria, Iraq, South Sudan, Ukraine, Burma, and Afghanistan. There are more and more protracted crises, and the result is an exponential increase in humanitarian needs.

The worldwide displacement from wars, conflict, and persecution in 2014

was the highest level recorded and accelerating fast, escalating to 60 million last year from 51.2 million in 2013, and a dramatic increase from the 37.5 million of a decade ago. We are on course to over double the number of refugees worldwide.

The increase since 2013 was the highest ever seen in a single year.

Syria is still the world's largest producer of internally displaced persons at 7.6 million and refugees at nearly 4 million.

The 60 million that I previously mentioned can be broken down to 20 million refugees, over 38 million internally displaced persons, and 1.8 million asylum seekers.

The magnitude of the Syrian disaster is perhaps the most shocking. After 4 years of conflict, the situation is increasingly desperate for both the refugees and the host countries such as Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and northern Iraq. Since 2011, 4 million people have fled Syria. The futures of over 3 million Syrian children have been stolen because they have no access to education. Over 2 million Syrian women are in the neighboring countries trying to survive. Dangerous coping mechanisms are on the rise. More and more families are forced to send their children to work or marry off their young daughters. In the tiny country of Lebanon alone, there are over 300,000 Syrian refugee children who have no access to school.

It is hard to comprehend the demographic, economic, and social impact of millions of refugees in Lebanon, Jordan, and Turkey. The number of refugees in Lebanon will be equivalent to 88 million new refugees arriving in the United States. Turkey has already spent \$6 billion in direct assistance for refugees in its care. At the same time, many countries in the West have been extraordinarily reluctant to admit the most vulnerable Syrians as refugees. While contributing generously to humanitarian funding, the United States has only accepted about 900 Syrian refugees. Because Syrians are finding it increasingly difficult to find safety, they are being forced to move further afield. Since January, over 100,000 people, mostly from Syria, have crossed the Mediterranean in boats in search of protection in Europe—an extremely dangerous journey.

We know that the Syrian humanitarian disaster, which has destabilized an entire region, is not the accidental byproduct of conflict. It is instead one result of a strategy pursued by the Assad regime. The United Nations Commission of Inquiry in Syria has documented that the Assad regime intentionally engages in the indiscriminate bombardment of homes, hospitals, schools, and water and electrical facilities in order to terrorize the civilian population. ISIL and al-Nusra have also shelled areas with high concentrations of civilians.

In Syria's neighbor next door, Iraq, the number of people requiring human-

itarian assistance has grown to 8.2 million people. Three million people have been forced from their homes. Half of the displaced are children.

To the south, in Yemen, there is a grave and escalating humanitarian crisis. The country was particularly vulnerable even before this conflict. Now civilians throughout the country are facing alarming levels of suffering and violence. Over 1 million have been forced from their homes and are now living in empty schools and other public buildings or along highways.

We are also witnessing religious and ethnic persecution become part of the violent conflict that has pushed millions of people out of the regions of Sub-Saharan Africa. The unfolding human tragedy in South Sudan, which is perhaps the most frustrating to me, never should have happened. The violence engulfing that small country is entirely manmade and wholly the responsibility of the President and opposition leader and their affiliate militias and armed groups.

Each leader refuses to prioritize the well-being of his own people and instead continues to seek military advantage, violating multiple ceasefire agreements and refusing to meet numerous deadlines for reaching a peace deal. It is hard to overstate the gravity of conditions in South Sudan. I fear there is no end in sight to the suffering of the people there.

The 18-month conflict in South Sudan has already killed an estimated 50,000 people and has displaced over 2 million more, including one-half million who fled to neighboring countries and over 120,000 sheltering in United Nations peacekeeping bases across the country. A nationwide famine was averted in 2014, thanks largely to the assistance from international community.

But the World Food Programme recently warned that 4.6 million people, nearly half the population, will need food aid by the end of this month. Conditions in the country of Sudan are hardly better for those affected by the continuing conflict in Darfur. Attacks on U.N. peacekeepers are on the rise in Darfur. Military offenses by the Khartoum have caused well over 50,000 people to flee their homes this year. The Khartoum has also expelled international nongovernmental organizations, NGOs, and is trying its best to drive out the U.N. peacekeeping mission in Darfur. This number does not include the hundreds of thousands of people who have fled the violence in the South Kordofan and Blue Nile states. But there has been little information about conditions in government-held areas in both of these states, as Sudan has not allowed human rights investigators access.

In northeastern Nigeria, 1.5 million people have fled their homes due to attacks by the terrorist group Boko Haram. Boko Haram is estimated to have killed over 12,000 people, kidnapped thousands, including 276 girls

from the Chibok School whose whereabouts remain unknown.

Over 74,000 Nigerians are refugees in Cameroon, another 100,000 refugees are in the area. The global refugee trends are indeed alarming. The international assistance being provided is not keeping pace with the scale of the problem. For example, almost halfway through 2015, the United Nation's humanitarian appeal for Syria is only 20 percent funded. Yet, in the spirit of World Refugee Day, we must redouble our efforts to prevent conflicts that force families to flee their homes, villages, and cities. We must also then create the conditions to get these refugees safely back home.

First, we need to ask ourselves hard questions about how we can increase the effectiveness of the assistance we provide. Most refugees live in urban areas, not in traditional refugee camps. Refugees who live in cities face unique vulnerabilities, which must change how international assistance is now being given. Moreover, protracted crises are the new normal. Seventy-five percent of the world refugees are caught in long-term crisis situations, with many refugees displaced for an average of 17 years. We need to use our humanitarian and development dollars more skillfully so we are providing durable solutions to chronic vulnerabilities.

Second, the international community must get serious about protecting the most vulnerable refugees: women and children. Women are facing horrible threats in conflicts across the globe, where rape and sexual assault are being used as weapons of war, and as vulnerable refugees they continue to be targets of gender-based violence. Moreover, children now make up half of all refugees worldwide. We must do more to protect them from sexual exploitation and abuse, recruitment as child soldiers, and early marriages. The United Nations Population Fund, Mercy Corps, the International Rescue Committee, and Catholic Relief Services know how to provide targeted support and protection to women and children refugees, but we in the international community must fund them adequately to do the job.

Third, we must strengthen the capacity of U.N. peacekeeping. As David Miliband, former British Foreign Secretary, now head of the International Rescue Committee noted:

At a time of cuts in defense budgets, new and asymmetric threats, and record numbers of people fleeing conflict, the case of strengthened and more fairly shared UN peacekeeping is overwhelming. Peacekeepers, properly resourced and led, have never been more needed and the consequences of inaction never more evident.

Finally, we must do more to hold accountable the leaders who are responsible for mass humanitarian atrocities. The U.N. Commissioner for Refugees recently commented that he continues to be shocked by the indifference of those who carry the political responsi-

bility for millions of people being uprooted from their homes. They accept forced displacement, with an impact on individuals, on countries, communities, and entire regions, as normal collateral damage of the wars they lead.

They act with the conviction that humanitarian workers will come and pick up the pieces. It is clear the international humanitarian community can no longer stanch the human misery brought on by this callous indifference and criminal leadership. The international community must hold those responsible accountable, those who break all the rules in pursuit of their war aims.

To that end, it was a grave mistake that between October 2011 and July 2012, Russia and China vetoed three Security Council resolutions which were designed to hold the Syrian Government to account for its mass atrocities. It was also unfortunate that Sudanese President Umar al-Bashir was allowed to depart South Africa earlier this week without being detained again, escaping an arrest warrant from the International Criminal Court, where he would be on trial for crimes against humanity in Darfur.

In closing, we must recognize that as these conflicts proliferate, no corner of the world will be left unaffected. On World Refugee Day, we recognize that every person fleeing his or her home deserves compassion and help and to live in safety and dignity. We must recommit to work smarter and harder to assist the world's most vulnerable people.

Next year on this day, I want to stand before the Senate again and speak of the progress we have made and the lives we have saved by our collective efforts. History will judge us accordingly if we fail.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States has long been a safe and welcoming home for those fleeing persecution around the world. The refugees and asylum seekers who join our communities help to create new businesses, build more vibrant neighborhoods, and enrich us all. They are also a reminder of our history as a nation of immigrants and our American values of generosity and compassion. Saturday marks World Refugee Day, and to honor it we must renew our commitment to the ideal of America as a beacon of hope for so many who face human rights abuses abroad.

Millions of refugees remain displaced and warehoused in refugee camps in Eastern Africa, Southeast Asia, and other parts of the world. Ongoing political struggles and military conflicts in the Middle East and North Africa are dislocating large populations. Too many are without their families or safe places to find refuge. Some, though far too few, have been able to flee and rebuild their lives.

Peter Keny, one of the "Lost Boys" of South Sudan, is one of those inspiring refugees who escaped a civil war in his home country and has rebuilt his life in my home State of Vermont. He is just one of thousands of refugees Vermonters have welcomed over the years. Peter was 19 when he came to Burlington in 2001, and in the years since he has learned English, completed high school, and is earning a college degree. In describing his voyage to the United States and ultimately to Vermont, Peter told "The Burlington Free Press" that arriving here "was like a dream come true." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article, "A Found Man Returns to South Sudan."

I am proud of Vermont's long history of supporting refugees by opening its communities, schools, and homes to those in need. It is not always easy, but it is a powerful example of our belief in the most basic ideals of human dignity and hope, and our commitment to responding to the suffering of others. We are fortunate to have remarkable organizations like the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program leading the effort with its decades of experience and award-winning volunteer program, and the tremendous legal advocacy provided by the Vermont Immigration and Asylum Advocates. The hard work of these and other organizations and the daily welcoming gestures of Vermonters all over the State have made Vermont a role model for the rest of the country.

On this year's World Refugee Day, it is also important to acknowledge that there is more that we as a country can and must do. I remain deeply concerned about the administration's expanded family detention policy. The women and children it is placing in prolonged detention have fled extreme violence and persecution in Central America. They come seeking refuge from three of the most dangerous countries in the world, countries where women and girls face shocking rates of domestic and sexual violence and murder. Here in the United States, we recently celebrated the 20th anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, a law we hold out as an example of our commitment to take these crimes seriously and to protect all victims. The ongoing detention of asylum-seeking mothers and children who have made credible claims that they have been victims of these very same crimes is unacceptable. I again urge the administration to end the misguided policy of family detention.

We must also do more to address the humanitarian crisis in Syria. Almost 4 million Syrians are officially recognized as refugees by the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The vast majority of these are women and children, including hundreds of thousands of children under the age of 5. The United States traditionally accepts at least 50 percent of resettlement cases from UNHCR. However, we

have accepted only approximately 700 refugees since the beginning of the Syrian conflict, an unacceptably low number.

Congress also plays an important role. Soon I will reintroduce the Refugee Protection Act to improve protections for refugees and asylum seekers and provide additional support and improvement to the national resettlement program and groups such as the Vermont Refugee Resettlement Program. This bill, which I have long championed with Representative ZOE LOFGREN, reaffirms the commitments made in ratifying the 1951 Refugee Convention, and will help to restore the United States to its rightful role as a safe and welcoming home for those suffering from persecution around the world.

As we pause to take stock on World Refugee Day, let each of us reflect on what this great country means to those escaping persecution. Let us now and always live by and burnish the light of Lady Liberty's torch, our eternal beacon of hope to those struggling to breathe free.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, June 7, 2015]

A FOUND MAN RETURNS TO SOUTH SUDAN
(By Zach Despart)

Peter Keny sat on the side of the road in late December as the sun disappeared behind the acacia trees. He had traveled more than 7,000 miles from Burlington, only to be stranded just north of the South Sudanese capital of Juba.

The taxi he hired an hour earlier had broken down, and he was still 50 miles south of his destination, his native village of Kalthok. The driver walked back to Juba five hours earlier and had yet to return.

Keny took another delay in stride, as he had waited to return home since fleeing his country's civil war 25 years earlier. That decade-long journey, forged in tragedy and perseverance, took Keny on a dangerous trek through the Sudanese bush to a series of refugee camps and, finally, to a new start in America.

For most of his life, Keny has straddled two worlds. Each day he reconciles his life of opportunity in the United States with a longing for his war-torn homeland. For years, Keny balanced work to put himself through school and to save for a trip to Kalthok, the village of his brief childhood and keeper of the only memories of his parents.

Exhausted from two flights and a 12-hour bus ride from Uganda, Keny tried to imagine what the reunion would be like. As he peered through darkness toward Kalthok, he wondered if anyone would remember him.

A CHILD OF WAR

Keny was born in Kalthok in 1982, the youngest of four sons. He lived with his mother and father, who like many in the village were sorghum farmers. The Kenys belonged to the Dinka tribe, the largest ethnic group in southern Sudan.

In November 1989, farmers had finished the annual harvest as the wet season came to a close. One afternoon, 6-year-old Keny and a group of boys played on the banks of the White Nile north of Kalthok, as they often did when little else occupied their time.

Around five o'clock, the boys heard gunfire and saw smoke in the village's direction. They rushed toward home but were intercepted by a villager who told them returning was unsafe. The boys, some of whom were Keny's cousins, hid along a riverbank that night. Keny would never again see his parents.

For most of the past 60 years, Sudan has been engulfed in civil war. By 1989, the Second Sudanese Civil War already had raged for six years. When war ended in 2005, 1 million to 2 million people were dead and another 2 million were displaced. Many of those killed or displaced were from the Dinka tribe.

As a child Keny knew about the war, but until that day in 1989, fighting had never come to Kalthok.

"We were all the way to the south of the country, and the government militia did not have a problem with the local people," Keny recalled in a recent interview in Burlington. "There was no tension."

Unable to return to their village, Keny and his friends faced a harrowing journey. The morning after the attack on Kalthok, the boys crossed the river and joined a larger group of refugees who were walking east, away from the fighting. They walked each day until their legs could carry them no farther. Each time the boys stopped to rest, they feared lion attacks and roaming militias, which abducted children to use as soldiers. Keny was shoeless and without a change of clothing. He thought only of how to survive another day.

"The worry was, 'Are you going to make it to the next town?'" he recalled. "You focused on living to the next day, and that's all. There was nothing else you could do."

The Sudanese government was able to distribute grain to fleeing refugees. Keny and others received two cups each, which they made last as long as they could. Keny had nowhere to put the grain, so he wrapped it carefully in his shirt. When the grain ran out, the boys foraged for wild fruit and berries whenever they stopped to rest.

Keny said he was among an estimated 20,000 "Lost Boys of Sudan"—children separated from their parents during the war. As many as half died of disease and starvation during the journey to refugee camps.

After traveling several hundred miles over three months, Keny crossed from Sudan into Ethiopia and settled with others at Dimma, a refugee camp established by the Ethiopian government in 1986 to handle an enormous influx of Sudanese refugees.

Keny remained at Dimma for about a year, until spring 1991, when rebels overthrew Ethiopia's government in a coup. The boys fled back across the border and camped near the Sudanese community of Pakok until 1992, when the United Nations moved thousands of refugees to the newly opened Kakuma refugee camp in Kenya. Keny would live there for nine years.

At the Kakuma camp, Keny learned English and went to school daily. He said U.N. staff members encouraged the boys to settle into a routine. But he could not stop thinking about his family. Keny said some of the Lost Boys tried to find their way back to their villages, but he judged the trip back to Kalthok too dangerous. Refugees at Kakuma relied on new arrivals and wounded soldiers seeking care at the U.N. hospital for news about the war.

"The hope was that I would see someone from my village, so I might ask the situation of my family," Keny said. "But no one ever showed up. It was very difficult for me. I never knew whether someone was still there or not."

Keny received a surprise in 1998, when his oldest brother, Riak, found him at the

Kakuma camp. Riak had joined the Sudanese army and had been granted a one-month leave. The brothers had not seen each other in nine years.

"It was one of the best days of my life, after going all that time without seeing my family," Keny said.

But the reunion was bittersweet. Riak brought news Keny had long feared: Their parents and brother were killed in the war, and remaining brother had died of disease. Keny was devastated, but relieved finally to know the fate of his family. Riak tried to lift his spirits.

"He was like, 'Look, this is what it is. Someone has to die for someone to live. If we all had to die, and you lived, that's the best we can do,'" Keny recalled his brother saying.

Riak and Peter spent several weeks together, until the soldier's leave expired and he returned to war. Keny never again saw his brother. Riak died in 2006 after he succumbed to injuries received years earlier.

A NEW LIFE IN AMERICA

In 2001, when he was 19, Keny moved to the U.S. through the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement. He had several cities to choose among, but he picked Burlington because his cousin Abraham Awolich already had settled there. Five others from the Kakuma camp came with him.

For the first time in his life, Keny thought about his future.

"It was like a dream that had come true," he said. "I felt like this is the moment, if I don't have my parents, maybe in the future I'll be able to meet my extended family. Maybe I would be able to do something that my family would remember me."

In the U.S., Keny became proficient in English, earned a high school degree and dreamed of attending college.

Now 32, Keny lives in a small apartment on Front Street in Burlington with three other Lost Boys who immigrated to the U.S. He works as a janitor for the University of Vermont, where he cleans the athletic complex from 10 p.m. to 6:30 a.m., five days a week. When school is in session, he attends classes during the day, where he is a decade older than his peers. In the next year and a half, he hopes to complete a degree in community development and applied economics.

Keny is able to cram in only a few hours of sleep before walking uphill to class, but he said he must work to afford tuition if he ever hopes to find a better-paying job.

"It's about being willing," he said, sitting on the front porch of his home. "If I don't do it, I will be stuck here. I just tell myself I have to do it. Otherwise I don't have options."

Ever since moving to the U.S., Keny always hoped return to visit Kalthok. He was able to contact several uncles by telephone in 2002 and remained in touch with relatives regularly. He secured a travel visa in 2006 but was unable to use it, because a trip would have interrupted his studies at community college.

"The biggest fact was that I was struggling with my education," Keny said. "Every time I'd say, 'If I go home while I'm trying to complete this process, I might fall behind.'"

While studying, Keny kept abreast of news back home.

In 2005, civil war ended with a peace agreement that many Sudanese hoped finally would put an end to violence that had torn apart the country for half a century. In 2011, southern Sudanese voted overwhelmingly to break off from the north to form a new nation, South Sudan. The fragile peace collapsed two years later, when South Sudan plunged into civil war. Keny said Kalthok has so far been spared heavy violence, but the community is inundated with refugees again fleeing to the east.

Finally, in 2014, Keny acquired a new visa and was able to raise enough money for the costly trip, which required a stopover in Europe.

RETURN TO SOUTH SUDAN

Even after dusk in December, the air was still humid. Keny's driver returned around 7 p.m. with tools, but couldn't fix the car. Keny planned to spend the night on the side of the road and at dawn walk back to Juba. He lay down in the brush, careful not to wrinkle the dress shirt and slacks he had put on for the reunion.

Keny was comforted that he at least had company: Some of his cousins, who met him at the bus station in Juba, agreed to wait until another ride could be arranged.

Around midnight, Keny's fortunes turned. A Somali trader came upon him and agreed to drive him to Kalthok. As he braced himself for potholes that shook the vehicle, Keny tried to piece together fragmented memories of his youth.

"Will I remember anyone in the village? Will I remember the places I used to know? Is life still the same as when I left? All those questions were on my mind," Keny said.

Although the trip was only 55 miles, the roads were in such poor condition that Keny arrived in Kalthok at 5 a.m. It was Christmas morning. He was exhausted and hoped to find somewhere to sleep, but he found the entire village had stayed up waiting for him in the church.

"They were singing and dancing and praying for us, because they heard we had car trouble," Keny said.

At 8 a.m., Kalthok's villagers held a welcome ceremony. Keny said he recognized only a few faces, his maternal and paternal uncles. But all the village elders remembered him.

"They said, 'You look just like you did when you left,'" he recalled. "There was a lot of emotional reaction. They talked about my family, my mom and my dad."

Keny stood at the front of the sanctuary to greet the hundreds of villagers who came to see him. After daybreak they took him around Kalthok, but Keny couldn't pick out any landmarks.

He asked his cousins to take him to a lake with a waterfall he remembered from childhood. From there he looked back toward the village, and memories came back to him. He was able to point out his uncles' houses.

"They said, 'Yes, you now know. You recognize this place,'" Keny said.

Instead of having Keny stay in one of his uncles' homes, villagers arranged for him to sleep in the church. Each evening for the three weeks he was in Kalthok, villagers set up tents and slept outside the church to be closer to their returned son. Keny said many were surprised he came back after settling into a prosperous life in the U.S.

"They thought I would never go back, because I don't have a living parent anymore," Keny said. "But they still believe I belong to the village."

Keny had another reason to return to Kalthok, beside visiting relatives. He wanted to ensure success of the local clinic the Sudan Development Foundation, a Burlington nonprofit, helped fund. The clinic is vital to Kalthok, Keny said. In South Sudan, some villages are more than 100 miles from a hospital. South Sudan's infrastructure is so poor this can mean several days of traveling on foot.

Keny returned to Vermont in mid-January. He said leaving his uncles and cousins was difficult, but his visa expired after 30 days.

STRADDLING TWO WORLDS

The son of Kalthok said he is unsure if he will ever move back to South Sudan. Keny wants to help Kalthok and keep the clinic

operational. He worries war will come again to the village.

"I see myself living in two worlds, here and South Sudan," he said. "I want to help my people in any form they need. If I ever get married, maybe I would bring my wife over."

Keny talks to his uncles regularly. A consequence of war, inflation has made staple goods too expensive for many villagers. A drought has raised the prospect of crop failure.

"This month they are supposed to cultivate, but there is no rain," he said, referring to May.

Keny wants to help his countrymen and -women in Vermont. More than 150 Sudanese have resettled in Burlington since the late 1990s, and many have started families here. Keny said the small community rents out local halls and churches to meet and celebrate holidays such as South Sudan's Independence Day.

Keny hopes to help lease or purchase a permanent home to aid local Sudanese in preserving their culture. He said parents are concerned children will forget tribal languages when they speak English outside the home.

Keny reflects on what his life would have been like if he never had the opportunity to immigrate to the United States. If he stayed in South Sudan, Keny believes he likely would have been killed in the war or conscripted into the army. He said he feels blessed to have been given the chance to start a new life here, because so many Sudanese never had that option.

"It gave me the chance to look at the world differently," he said. "I have people who support me, and even though I do not yet have a college degree, I feel I've learned enough to help myself and help my people."

Keny often thinks of his brothers and parents. In their memory, he wants to make the most of opportunities he now has.

"You have this feeling that for the rest of your life, you're going to be living knowing that you don't have someone you'd be taking care of," he said. "I just want to make sure I live a better life, and live it in a peaceful way."

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE 2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. KIRK) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 205

Whereas, on June 15, 2015, the Chicago Blackhawks Hockey Team won the Stanley Cup;

Whereas the 2015 Stanley Cup title is the third Stanley Cup title for the Blackhawks in 6 years;

Whereas Blackhawks fans at the "Madhouse on Madison" witnessed Duncan Keith and Patrick Kane score show-stopping goals while goaltender Corey Crawford seemed to stand on his head at times, stopping all 25 shots he faced;

Whereas the Blackhawks won their sixth Stanley Cup, tying the Boston Bruins for fourth on the franchise list of most titles won;

Whereas the Blackhawks joined the National Hockey League (referred to in this preamble as "NHL") in 1926 and have a rich history in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks were 1 of the 6 original teams in the NHL;

Whereas the Blackhawks won the Stanley Cup in 1934, 1938, 1961, 2010, and 2013;

Whereas for the first time in 77 years, the Blackhawks fans saw their heroes win the Stanley Cup on home ice;

Whereas the Blackhawks began the playoffs with a double-overtime victory against the Nashville Predators;

Whereas a goal scored by Brent Seabrook in triple-overtime of Game 4 helped the Blackhawks defeat the Predators in 6 games;

Whereas a sweep of the Minnesota Wild followed in the second round of the playoffs, setting up a showdown with the Anaheim Ducks in the Western Conference Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks earned triple and double-overtime victories against the Anaheim Ducks in Games 2 and 4 on their way to winning the series in 7 games and clinching a berth in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas the Blackhawks followed a familiar pattern in dropping Games 2 and 3 of the Stanley Cup Finals against the Tampa Bay Lightning, but took a 3-2 series lead into Game 6 on home ice on the night of Monday, June 15, 2015;

Whereas in another close contest, Patrick Kane scored a goal during Game 6 that marked the first time either team led by more than 1 goal in the series;

Whereas it was a great night for fans of the Blackhawks and the culmination of a tremendous team effort;

Whereas Antoine Vermette, acquired at the trade deadline, scored 2 game-winning goals in the Stanley Cup Finals;

Whereas Goaltender Scott Darling, when called upon in relief of Corey Crawford, stood tall in net when his team needed him the most against the Predators;

Whereas Duncan Keith was an "ironman", earning the Conn Smythe Trophy for Most Valuable Player in the playoffs while logging more than 700 minutes of ice time in 23 games;

Whereas Niklas Hjalmarsson blocked shots left and right and seemed to be in the right place at all times;

Whereas General Manager Stan Bowman, Head Coach Joel Quenneville, President John F. McDonough, and owner Rocky Wirtz have put together and led one of the greatest dynasties in NHL history;

Whereas the Stanley Cup returns to the City of Chicago and gives Blackhawks fans across the State of Illinois a chance to celebrate championship hockey;

Whereas the Nashville Predators, Minnesota Wild, Anaheim Ducks, and Tampa Bay Lightning proved to be worthy and honorable adversaries and also deserve recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup;

(2) commends the fans, players, and management of the Tampa Bay Lightning for an outstanding series; and

(3) respectfully directs the Secretary of the Senate to transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the 2015 Chicago Blackhawks hockey organization and Blackhawks owner Rocky Wirtz.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 206

Whereas, on June 16, 2015, the Golden State Warriors won their second National Basketball Association (referred to in this preamble

as the “NBA”) Championship as a California team by defeating the Cleveland Cavaliers with a score of 105-97 in the sixth game of the NBA Finals;

Whereas during the 2015 NBA playoffs, the Warriors defeated the New Orleans Pelicans, the Memphis Grizzlies, the Houston Rockets, and the Cleveland Cavaliers en route to the NBA Championship;

Whereas during the playoffs, the Golden State Warriors twice overcame 2-1 series deficits and, in both series, responded with 3 straight victories to win the series;

Whereas in the regular season, the Warriors won a league-best 67 games;

Whereas all 15 players on the 2014-2015 Warriors roster should be congratulated, including NBA Finals MVP Andre Iguodala, the NBA regular season MVP Stephen Curry, as well as, Leandro Barbosa, Harrison Barnes, Andrew Bogut, Festus Ezeli, Draymond Green, Justin Holiday, Ognjen Kuzmic, David Lee, Shaun Livingston, James Michael McAdoo, Brandon Rush, Marreese Speights, and Klay Thompson;

Whereas first-year coach, Steve Kerr, did a tremendous job leading the Warriors to the NBA Title and, through his coaching, built a team that is the best in the NBA; and

Whereas the fans of the Warriors have been ever-loyal in their support of the team, waiting 40 years for their second NBA title, but can now again call their team a champion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship because of their selfless teamwork;

(2) recognizes the achievements of all the players, coaches, and staff who contributed to the 2014-2015 season; and

(3) celebrates the unique contributions of the Warriors fan base, who, through its unrelenting and vocal support of the Warriors came to be known as “Dub Nation”.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2060. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes.

SA 2061. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2062. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2063. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2064. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, *supra*.

SA 2065. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes.

SA 2066. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2067. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2068. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed

by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

SA 2069. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2060. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2061. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2060 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 2062. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

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

SA 2063. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the instructions

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 2064. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2063 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2062 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 2146, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow Federal law enforcement officers, firefighters, and air traffic controllers to make penalty-free withdrawals from governmental plans after age 50, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike “4 days” and insert “5 days”

SA 2065. Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to ex-

tend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Findings.

Sec. 103. Extension of African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Sec. 104. Modifications of rules of origin for duty-free treatment for articles of beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 105. Monitoring and review of eligibility under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 106. Promotion of the role of women in social and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 107. Biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

Sec. 108. Deepening and expanding trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States.

Sec. 109. Agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.

Sec. 110. Reports.

Sec. 111. Technical amendments.

Sec. 112. Definitions.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

Sec. 201. Extension of Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 202. Authority to designate certain cotton articles as eligible articles only for least-developed beneficiary developing countries under Generalized System of Preferences.

Sec. 203. Application of competitive need limitation and waiver under Generalized System of Preferences with respect to articles of beneficiary developing countries exported to the United States during calendar year 2014.

Sec. 204. Eligibility of certain luggage and travel articles for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

Sec. 301. Extension of preferential duty treatment program for Haiti.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

Sec. 401. Short title.

Sec. 402. Application of provisions relating to trade adjustment assistance.

Sec. 403. Extension of trade adjustment assistance program.

Sec. 404. Performance measurement and reporting.

Sec. 405. Applicability of trade adjustment assistance provisions.

Sec. 406. Sunset provisions.

Sec. 407. Extension and modification of Health Coverage Tax Credit.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

Sec. 501. Short title.

Sec. 502. Consequences of failure to cooperate with a request for information in a proceeding.

Sec. 503. Definition of material injury.

Sec. 504. Particular market situation.

Sec. 505. Distortion of prices or costs.

Sec. 506. Reduction in burden on Department of Commerce by reducing the number of voluntary respondents.

Sec. 507. Application to Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

Sec. 601. Tariff classification of recreational performance outerwear.

Sec. 602. Duty treatment of protective active footwear.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Sec. 701. Report on contribution of trade preference programs to reducing poverty and eliminating hunger.

TITLE VIII—OFFSETS

Sec. 801. Customs user fees extension.

Sec. 802. Additional customs user fees extension.

Sec. 803. Time for payment of corporate estimated taxes.

Sec. 804. Payee statement required to claim certain education tax benefits.

Sec. 805. Special rule for educational institutions unable to collect TINs of individuals with respect to higher education tuition and related expenses.

Sec. 806. Penalty for failure to file correct information returns and provide payee statements.

Sec. 807. Child tax credit not refundable for taxpayers electing to exclude foreign earned income from tax.

Sec. 808. Coverage and payment for renal dialysis services for individuals with acute kidney injury.

TITLE I—EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “AGOA Extension and Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 102. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Since its enactment, the African Growth and Opportunity Act has been the centerpiece of trade relations between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa and has enhanced trade, investment, job creation, and democratic institutions throughout Africa.

(2) Trade and investment, as facilitated by the African Growth and Opportunity Act, promote economic growth, development, poverty reduction, democracy, the rule of law, and stability in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Trade between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa has more than tripled since the enactment of the African Growth and Opportunity Act in 2000, and United States direct investment in sub-Saharan Africa has grown almost sixfold.

(4) It is in the interest of the United States to engage and compete in emerging markets in sub-Saharan African countries, to boost trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries, and to renew and strengthen the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(5) The long-term economic security of the United States is enhanced by strong economic and political ties with the fastest-growing economies in the world, many of which are in sub-Saharan Africa.

(6) It is a goal of the United States to further integrate sub-Saharan African countries into the global economy, stimulate economic

development in Africa, and diversify sources of growth in sub-Saharan Africa.

(7) To that end, implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization would strengthen regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa and contribute to economic growth in the region.

(8) The elimination of barriers to trade and investment in sub-Saharan Africa, including high tariffs, forced localization requirements, restrictions on investment, and customs barriers, will create opportunities for workers, businesses, farmers, and ranchers in the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(9) The elimination of such barriers will improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and strengthen regional and global integration, accelerate economic growth in sub-Saharan Africa, and enhance the trade relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa.

SEC. 103. EXTENSION OF AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466b) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(b) AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 112(g) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(g)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(2) EXTENSION OF REGIONAL APPAREL ARTICLE PROGRAM.—Section 112(b)(3)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(b)(3)(A)) is amended—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “11 succeeding” and inserting “21 succeeding”; and

(B) in clause (ii)(II), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

(3) EXTENSION OF THIRD-COUNTRY FABRIC PROGRAM.—Section 112(c)(1) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3721(c)(1)) is amended—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “SEPTEMBER 30, 2015” and inserting “SEPTEMBER 30, 2025”; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(C) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

SEC. 104. MODIFICATIONS OF RULES OF ORIGIN FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT FOR ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 506A(b)(2) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the direct costs of processing operations performed in one or more such beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries or former beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries shall be applied in determining such percentage.”

(b) APPLICABILITY TO ARTICLES RECEIVING DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER TITLE V OF TRADE ACT OF 1974.—Section 506A(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES OF ORIGIN UNDER THIS TITLE.—The exceptions set forth in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) shall also apply to any article described in section 503(a)(1) that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan Afri-

can country for purposes of any determination to provide duty-free treatment with respect to such article.”

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE HARMONIZED TARIFF SCHEDULE.—The President may proclaim such modifications as may be necessary to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTS) to add the special tariff treatment symbol “D” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS for each article classified under a heading or subheading with the special tariff treatment symbol “A” or “A*” in the “Special” subcolumn of the HTS.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and apply with respect to any article described in section 503(b)(1)(B) through (G) of the Trade Act of 1974 that is the growth, product, or manufacture of a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country and that is imported into the customs territory of the United States on or after the date that is 30 days after such date of enactment.

SEC. 105. MONITORING AND REVIEW OF ELIGIBILITY UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) CONTINUING COMPLIANCE.—Section 506A(a)(3) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) by striking “If the President” and inserting the following:

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not terminate the designation of a country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country under subparagraph (A) unless, at least 60 days before the termination of such designation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to terminate such designation, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”

(b) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) WITHDRAWAL, SUSPENSION, OR LIMITATION OF PREFERENTIAL TARIFF TREATMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment provided for any article described in subsection (b)(1) of this section or section 112 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with respect to a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country if the President determines that withdrawing, suspending, or limiting such duty-free treatment would be more effective in promoting compliance by the country with the requirements described in subsection (a)(1) than terminating the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country for purposes of this section.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—The President may not withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment under paragraph (1) unless, at least 60 days before such withdrawal, suspension, or limitation, the President notifies Congress and notifies the country of the President’s intention to withdraw, suspend, or limit such duty-free treatment, together with the considerations entering into the decision to terminate such designation.”

(c) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2466a), as so amended, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

“(d) REVIEW AND PUBLIC COMMENTS ON ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out subsection (a)(2), the President shall publish annually in the Federal Register a notice of review and request for public comments on whether beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries are meeting the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(2) PUBLIC HEARING.—The United States Trade Representative shall, not later than 30 days after the date on which the President publishes the notice of review and request for public comments under paragraph (1)—

“(A) hold a public hearing on such review and request for public comments; and

“(B) publish in the Federal Register, before such hearing is held, notice of—

“(i) the time and place of such hearing; and

“(ii) the time and place at which such public comments will be accepted.

“(3) PETITION PROCESS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection, the President shall establish a process to allow any interested person, at any time, to file a petition with the Office of the United States Trade Representative with respect to the compliance of any country listed in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act with the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of such Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of this Act.

“(B) USE OF PETITIONS.—The President shall take into account all petitions filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) in making determinations of compliance under subsections (a)(3)(A) and (c) and in preparing any reports required by this title as such reports apply with respect to beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries.

“(4) OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may, at any time, initiate an out-of-cycle review of whether a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is making continual progress in meeting the requirements described in paragraph (1). The President shall give due consideration to petitions received under paragraph (3) in determining whether to initiate an out-of-cycle review under this subparagraph.

“(B) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Before initiating an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A), the President shall notify and consult with Congress.

“(C) CONSEQUENCES OF REVIEW.—If, pursuant to an out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A), the President determines that a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country does not meet the requirements set forth in section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)), the President shall, subject to the requirements of subsections (a)(3)(B) and (c)(2), terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country.

“(D) REPORTS.—After each out-of-cycle review conducted under subparagraph (A) with respect to a country, the President shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report on the review and any determination of the President to terminate the designation of the country as a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country or withdraw, suspend, or limit the application of duty-free treatment with respect to articles from the country under subparagraph (C).

“(E) INITIATION OF OUT-OF-CYCLE REVIEWS FOR CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Recognizing that concerns have been raised about the compliance with section 104(a) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)) of some beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, the President shall initiate an out-of-cycle review under subparagraph (A) with respect to South Africa, the most developed of the beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries, and other beneficiary countries as appropriate, not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”

SEC. 106. PROMOTION OF THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

(a) STATEMENT OF POLICY.—Section 103 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3702) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(10) promoting the role of women in social, political, and economic development in sub-Saharan Africa.”

(b) ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.—Section 104(a)(1)(A) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703(a)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting “for men and women” after “rights”.

SEC. 107. BIENNIAL AGOA UTILIZATION STRATEGIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) beneficiary sub-Saharan African countries should develop utilization strategies on a biennial basis in order to more effectively and strategically utilize benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act (in this section referred to as “AGOA utilization strategies”);

(2) United States trade capacity building agencies should work with, and provide appropriate resources to, such sub-Saharan African countries to assist in developing and implementing biennial AGOA utilization strategies; and

(3) as appropriate, and to encourage greater regional integration, the United States Trade Representative should consider requesting the Regional Economic Communities to prepare biennial AGOA utilization strategies.

(b) CONTENTS.—It is further the sense of Congress that biennial AGOA utilization strategies should identify strategic needs and priorities to bolster utilization of benefits available under the African Growth and Opportunity Act. To that end, biennial AGOA utilization strategies should—

(1) review potential exports under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and identify opportunities and obstacles to increased trade and investment and enhanced poverty reduction efforts;

(2) identify obstacles to regional integration that inhibit utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act;

(3) set out a plan to take advantage of opportunities and address obstacles identified in paragraphs (1) and (2), improve awareness of the African Growth and Opportunity Act as a program that enhances exports to the United States, and utilize United States Agency for International Development regional trade hubs;

(4) set out a strategy to promote small business and entrepreneurship; and

(5) eliminate obstacles to regional trade and promote greater utilization of benefits under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and establish a plan to promote full regional implementation of the Agreement on Trade Facilitation of the World Trade Organization.

(c) PUBLICATION.—It is further the sense of Congress that—

(1) each beneficiary sub-Saharan African country should publish on an appropriate Internet website of such country public versions of its AGOA utilization strategy; and

(2) the United States Trade Representative should publish on the Internet website of the Office of the United States Trade Representative public versions of all AGOA utilization strategies described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 108. DEEPENING AND EXPANDING TRADE AND INVESTMENT TIES BETWEEN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA AND THE UNITED STATES.

It is the policy of the United States to continue to—

(1) seek to deepen and expand trade and investment ties between sub-Saharan Africa and the United States, including through the negotiation of accession by sub-Saharan African countries to the World Trade Organization and the negotiation of trade and investment framework agreements, bilateral investment treaties, and free trade agreements, as such agreements have the potential to catalyze greater trade and investment, facilitate additional investment in sub-Saharan Africa, further poverty reduction efforts, and promote economic growth;

(2) seek to negotiate agreements with individual sub-Saharan African countries as well as with the Regional Economic Communities, as appropriate;

(3) promote full implementation of commitments made under the WTO Agreement (as such term is defined in section 2(9) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501(9))) because such actions are likely to improve utilization of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and promote trade and investment and because regular review to ensure continued compliance helps to maximize the benefits of the African Growth and Opportunity Act; and

(4) promote the negotiation of trade agreements that cover substantially all trade between parties to such agreements and, if other countries seek to negotiate trade agreements that do not cover substantially all trade, continue to object in all appropriate forums.

SEC. 109. AGRICULTURAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA.

Section 13 of the AGOA Acceleration Act of 2004 (19 U.S.C. 3701 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “shall identify not fewer than 10 eligible sub-Saharan African countries as having the greatest” and inserting “, through the Secretary of Agriculture, shall identify eligible sub-Saharan African countries that have”; and

(B) by striking “and complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States” and inserting “, complying with sanitary and phytosanitary rules of the United States, and developing food safety standards”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “20” and inserting “30”; and

(B) by inserting after “from those countries” the following: “, particularly from businesses and sectors that engage women farmers and entrepreneurs.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COORDINATION.—The President shall take such measures as are necessary to ensure adequate coordination of similar activities of agencies of the United States Government relating to agricultural technical assistance for sub-Saharan Africa.”

SEC. 110. REPORTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and biennially thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries and on the implementation of this title and the amendments made by this title.

(2) MATTERS TO BE INCLUDED.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the status of trade and investment between the United States and sub-Saharan Africa, including information on leading exports to the United States from sub-Saharan African countries.

(B) Any changes in eligibility of sub-Saharan African countries during the period covered by the report.

(C) A detailed analysis of whether each such beneficiary sub-Saharan African country is continuing to meet the eligibility requirements set forth in section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the eligibility criteria set forth in section 502 of the Trade Act of 1974.

(D) A description of the status of regional integration efforts in sub-Saharan Africa.

(E) A summary of United States trade capacity building efforts.

(F) Any other initiatives related to enhancing the trade and investment relationship between the United States and sub-Saharan African countries.

(b) POTENTIAL TRADE AGREEMENTS REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the United States Trade Representative shall submit to Congress a report that—

(1) identifies sub-Saharan African countries that have expressed an interest in entering into a free trade agreement with the United States;

(2) evaluates the viability and progress of such sub-Saharan African countries and other sub-Saharan African countries toward entering into a free trade agreement with the United States; and

(3) describes a plan for negotiating and concluding such agreements, which includes the elements described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) of section 116(b)(2) of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

(c) TERMINATION.—The reporting requirements of this section shall cease to have any force or effect after September 30, 2025.

SEC. 111. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

Section 104 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3703), as amended by section 106, is further amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “(a) IN GENERAL.—”; and

(2) by striking subsection (b).

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BENEFICIARY SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term “beneficiary sub-Saharan African country” means a beneficiary sub-Saharan African country described in subsection (e) of section 506A of the Trade Act of 1974 (as redesignated by this Act).

(2) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICAN COUNTRY.—The term “sub-Saharan African country” has the meaning given the term in section 107 of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

TITLE II—EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES

SEC. 201. EXTENSION OF GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2465) is amended by striking “July 31, 2013” and inserting “December 31, 2017”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to articles entered

on or after the 30th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) RETROACTIVE APPLICATION FOR CERTAIN LIQUIDATIONS AND RELIQUIDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1514) or any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), any entry of a covered article to which duty-free treatment or other preferential treatment under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) would have applied if the entry had been made on July 31, 2013, that was made—

(i) after July 31, 2013; and

(ii) before the effective date specified in paragraph (1), shall be liquidated or reliquidated as though such entry occurred on the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) REQUESTS.—A liquidation or reliquidation may be made under subparagraph (A) with respect to an entry only if a request therefor is filed with U.S. Customs and Border Protection not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act that contains sufficient information to enable U.S. Customs and Border Protection—

(i) to locate the entry; or

(ii) to reconstruct the entry if it cannot be located.

(C) PAYMENT OF AMOUNTS OWED.—Any amounts owed by the United States pursuant to the liquidation or reliquidation of an entry of a covered article under subparagraph (A) shall be paid, without interest, not later than 90 days after the date of the liquidation or reliquidation (as the case may be).

(3) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) COVERED ARTICLE.—The term “covered article” means an article from a country that is a beneficiary developing country under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.) as of the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(B) ENTER; ENTRY.—The terms “enter” and “entry” include a withdrawal from warehouse for consumption.

SEC. 202. AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES AS ELIGIBLE ARTICLES ONLY FOR LEAST-DEVELOPED BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CERTAIN COTTON ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding paragraph (3), the President may designate as an eligible article or articles under subsection (a)(1)(B) only for countries designated as least-developed beneficiary developing countries under section 502(a)(2) cotton articles classifiable under subheading 5201.00.18, 5201.00.28, 5201.00.38, 5202.99.30, or 5203.00.30 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.”.

SEC. 203. APPLICATION OF COMPETITIVE NEED LIMITATION AND WAIVER UNDER GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES WITH RESPECT TO ARTICLES OF BENEFICIARY DEVELOPING COUNTRIES EXPORTED TO THE UNITED STATES DURING CALENDAR YEAR 2014.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of applying and administering subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) with respect to an article described in subsection (b) of this section, subsections (c)(2) and (d) of section 503 of such Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “October 1” for “July 1” each place such date appears.

(b) ARTICLE DESCRIBED.—An article described in this subsection is an article of a beneficiary developing country that is designated by the President as an eligible article under subsection (a) of section 503 of the

Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463) and with respect to which a determination described in subsection (c)(2)(A) of such section was made with respect to exports (directly or indirectly) to the United States of such eligible article during calendar year 2014 by the beneficiary developing country.

SEC. 204. ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES FOR DUTY-FREE TREATMENT UNDER THE GENERALIZED SYSTEM OF PREFERENCES.

Section 503(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2463(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “paragraph (4)” and inserting “paragraphs (4) and (5)”;

(2) in subparagraph (E), by striking “Footwear” and inserting “Except as provided in paragraph (5), footwear”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) CERTAIN LUGGAGE AND TRAVEL ARTICLES.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A) or (E) of paragraph (1), the President may designate the following as eligible articles under subsection (a):

“(A) Articles classifiable under subheading 4202.11.00, 4202.12.40, 4202.21.60, 4202.21.90, 4202.22.15, 4202.22.45, 4202.31.60, 4202.32.40, 4202.32.80, 4202.92.15, 4202.92.20, 4202.92.45, or 4202.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

“(B) Articles classifiable under statistical reporting number 4202.12.2020, 4202.12.2050, 4202.12.8030, 4202.12.8070, 4202.22.8050, 4202.32.9550, 4202.32.9560, 4202.91.0030, 4202.91.0090, 4202.92.3020, 4202.92.3031, 4202.92.3091, 4202.92.9026, or 4202.92.9060 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, as such statistical reporting numbers are in effect on the date of the enactment of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015.”.

TITLE III—EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI

SEC. 301. EXTENSION OF PREFERENTIAL DUTY TREATMENT PROGRAM FOR HAITI.

Section 213A of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2703a) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended as follows:

(A) Paragraph (1) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B)(v)(I), by amending item (cc) to read as follows:

“(cc) 60 percent or more during the 1-year period beginning on December 20, 2017, and each of the 7 succeeding 1-year periods.”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C)—

(I) in the table, by striking “succeeding 11 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(II) by striking “December 19, 2018” and inserting “December 19, 2025”.

(B) Paragraph (2) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(iii), by striking “11 succeeding 1-year periods” and inserting “16 succeeding 1-year periods”.

(2) Subsection (h) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” and inserting “September 30, 2025”.

TITLE IV—EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 402. APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS RELATING TO TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.

(a) REPEAL OF SNAPBACK.—Section 233 of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Extension Act of 2011 (Public Law 112-40; 125 Stat. 416) is repealed.

(b) APPLICABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS.—Except as otherwise provided in this

title, the provisions of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on December 31, 2013, and as amended by this title, shall—

(1) take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to petitions for certification filed under chapter 2, 3, or 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after such date of enactment.

(c) REFERENCES.—Except as otherwise provided in this title, whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a provision of chapters 2 through 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, the reference shall be considered to be made to a provision of any such chapter, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

SEC. 403. EXTENSION OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) EXTENSION OF TERMINATION PROVISIONS.—Section 285 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 note) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” each place it appears and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(b) TRAINING FUNDS.—Section 236(a)(2)(A) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2296(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking “shall not exceed” and all that follows and inserting “shall not exceed \$450,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2015 through 2021.”

(c) REEMPLOYMENT TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE.—Section 246(b)(1) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2318(b)(1)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(d) AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—Section 245(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2317(a)) is amended by striking “December 31, 2013” and inserting “June 30, 2021”.

(2) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—Section 255(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2345(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

(3) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FARMERS.—Section 298(a) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2401g(a)) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 and 2013” and all that follows through “December 31, 2013” and inserting “fiscal years 2015 through 2021”.

SEC. 404. PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT AND REPORTING.

(a) PERFORMANCE MEASURES.—Section 239(j) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2311(j)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by striking “DATA REPORTING” and inserting “PERFORMANCE MEASURES”;

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”; and

(ii) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”;

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking “core” and inserting “primary”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “that promote efficiency and effectiveness” after “assistance program”;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “CORE INDICATORS DESCRIBED” and inserting “INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) PRIMARY INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE DESCRIBED.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The primary indicators of performance referred to in paragraph (1)(A) shall consist of—

“(I) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjust-

ment assistance program who are in unsubsidized employment during the second calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(II) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program and who are in unsubsidized employment during the fourth calendar quarter after exit from the program;

“(III) the median earnings of workers described in subclause (I);

“(IV) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, subject to clause (ii), obtain a recognized postsecondary credential or a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, during participation in the program or within one year after exit from the program; and

“(V) the percentage and number of workers who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who, during a year while receiving such benefits, are in an education or training program that leads to a recognized postsecondary credential or employment and who are achieving measurable gains in skills toward such a credential or employment.

“(ii) INDICATOR RELATING TO CREDENTIAL.—For purposes of clause (i)(IV), a worker who received benefits under the trade adjustment assistance program who obtained a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent shall be included in the percentage counted for purposes of that clause only if the worker, in addition to obtaining such a diploma or its recognized equivalent, has obtained or retained employment or is in an education or training program leading to a recognized postsecondary credential within one year after exit from the program.”;

(4) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “DATA” and inserting “MEASURES”;

(B) by striking “quarterly” and inserting “annual”; and

(C) by striking “data” and inserting “measures”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ACCESSIBILITY OF STATE PERFORMANCE REPORTS.—The Secretary shall, on an annual basis, make available (including by electronic means), in an easily understandable format, the reports of cooperating States or cooperating State agencies required by paragraph (1) and the information contained in those reports.”.

(b) COLLECTION AND PUBLICATION OF DATA.—Section 249B of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2323) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “enrolled in” and inserting “who received”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”; and

(II) by striking “who were enrolled in” and inserting “, including who received”;

(iii) in subparagraph (E), by striking “complete” and inserting “exited”;

(iv) in subparagraph (F), by striking “complete” and inserting “exit”; and

(v) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) The average cost per worker of receiving training approved under section 236.

“(H) The percentage of workers who received training approved under section 236 and obtained unsubsidized employment in a field related to that training.”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking “quarterly” each place it appears and inserting “annual”; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) The median earnings of workers described in section 239(j)(2)(A)(i)(III) during

the second calendar quarter after exit from the program, expressed as a percentage of the median earnings of such workers before the calendar quarter in which such workers began receiving benefits under this chapter.”; and

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively; and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) the reports required under section 239(j);”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “a quarterly” and inserting “an annual”.

(c) RECOGNIZED POSTSECONDARY CREDENTIAL DEFINED.—Section 247 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2319) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(19) The term ‘recognized postsecondary credential’ means a credential consisting of an industry-recognized certificate or certification, a certificate of completion of an apprenticeship, a license recognized by a State or the Federal Government, or an associate or baccalaureate degree.”.

SEC. 405. APPLICABILITY OF TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE PROVISIONS.

(a) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS.—

(1) PETITIONS FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2014, AND BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CERTIFICATIONS OF WORKERS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(i) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIALS OF CERTIFICATIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in clause (iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) reconsider that determination; and

(II) if the group of workers meets the requirements of section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the group of workers as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(iii) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this clause is a petition for a certification of eligibility for a group of workers filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) ELIGIBILITY FOR BENEFITS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 222 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (A)(iii) shall be eligible, on and after the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, to receive benefits only under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(ii) COMPUTATION OF MAXIMUM BENEFITS.—Benefits received by a worker described in clause (i) under chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be included in any determination of the maximum benefits for which the worker is eligible under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of the Trade Act

of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) PETITIONS FILED BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2014.—A worker certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or before December 31, 2013, shall continue to be eligible to apply for and receive benefits under the provisions of chapter 2 of title II of such Act, as in effect on December 31, 2013.

(3) QUALIFYING SEPARATIONS WITH RESPECT TO PETITIONS FILED WITHIN 90 DAYS OF DATE OF ENACTMENT.—Section 223(b) of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall be applied and administered by substituting “before January 1, 2014” for “more than one year before the date of the petition on which such certification was granted” for purposes of determining whether a worker is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance pursuant to a petition filed under section 221 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after the date of the enactment of this Act and on or before the date that is 90 days after such date of enactment.

(b) TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

(1) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS NOT CERTIFIED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) CRITERIA IF A DETERMINATION HAS NOT BEEN MADE.—If, as of the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce has not made a determination with respect to whether to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall make that determination based on the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF CERTAIN PETITIONS.—If, before the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary made a determination not to certify a firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 pursuant to a petition described in subparagraph (C), the Secretary shall—

(i) reconsider that determination; and
(ii) if the firm meets the requirements of section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, certify the firm as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance.

(C) PETITION DESCRIBED.—A petition described in this subparagraph is a petition for a certification of eligibility filed by a firm or its representative under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on or after January 1, 2014, and before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) CERTIFICATION OF FIRMS THAT DID NOT SUBMIT PETITIONS BETWEEN JANUARY 1, 2014, AND DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall certify a firm described in subparagraph (B) as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, if the firm or its representative files a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 not later than 90 days after such date of enactment.

(B) FIRM DESCRIBED.—A firm described in this subparagraph is a firm that the Secretary determines would have been certified as eligible to apply for adjustment assistance if—

(i) the firm or its representative had filed a petition for a certification of eligibility under section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974 on a date during the period beginning on January 1, 2014, and ending on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the provisions of chapter 3 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on such date of enactment, had been in effect on that date during the period described in clause (i).

SEC. 406. SUNSET PROVISIONS.

(a) APPLICATION OF PRIOR LAW.—Subject to subsection (b), beginning on July 1, 2021, the provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2271 et seq.), as in effect on January 1, 2014, shall be in effect and apply, except that in applying and administering such chapters—

(1) paragraph (1) of section 231(c) of that Act shall be applied and administered as if subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of that paragraph were not in effect;

(2) section 233 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by substituting “104-week period” for “104-week period” and all that follows through “130-week period”; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by substituting “65” for “52”; and

(II) by substituting “78-week period” for “52-week period” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (g) as if it read as follows:

“(g) PAYMENT OF TRADE READJUSTMENT ALLOWANCES TO COMPLETE TRAINING.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in order to assist an adversely affected worker to complete training approved for the worker under section 236 that leads to the completion of a degree or industry-recognized credential, payments may be made as trade readjustment allowances for not more than 13 weeks within such period of eligibility as the Secretary may prescribe to account for a break in training or for justifiable cause that follows the last week for which the worker is otherwise entitled to a trade readjustment allowance under this chapter if—

“(1) payment of the trade readjustment allowance for not more than 13 weeks is necessary for the worker to complete the training;

“(2) the worker participates in training in each such week; and

“(3) the worker—

“(A) has substantially met the performance benchmarks established as part of the training approved for the worker;

“(B) is expected to continue to make progress toward the completion of the training; and

“(C) will complete the training during that period of eligibility.”;

(3) section 245(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007”;

(4) section 246(b)(1) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “the date that is 5 years” and all that follows through “State”;

(5) section 256(b) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of fiscal years 2003 through 2007, and \$4,000,000 for the 3-month period beginning on October 1, 2007”;

(6) section 298(a) of that Act shall be applied and administered by substituting “the 1-year period beginning on July 1, 2021” for “each of the fiscal years” and all that follows through “October 1, 2007”;

(7) section 285 of that Act shall be applied and administered—

(A) in subsection (a), by substituting “June 30, 2022” for “December 31, 2007” each place it appears; and

(B) by applying and administering subsection (b) as if it read as follows:

“(b) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—

“(1) ASSISTANCE FOR FIRMS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 3 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 3 pursuant to a petition filed under section 251 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.

“(2) FARMERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), assistance may not be provided under chapter 6 after June 30, 2022.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any assistance approved under chapter 6 on or before June 30, 2022, may be provided—

“(i) to the extent funds are available pursuant to such chapter for such purpose; and

“(ii) to the extent the recipient of the assistance is otherwise eligible to receive such assistance.”.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The provisions of chapters 2, 3, 5, and 6 of title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, shall continue to apply on and after July 1, 2021, with respect to—

(1) workers certified as eligible for trade adjustment assistance benefits under chapter 2 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 221 of that Act before July 1, 2021;

(2) firms certified as eligible for technical assistance or grants under chapter 3 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 251 of that Act before July 1, 2021; and

(3) agricultural commodity producers certified as eligible for technical or financial assistance under chapter 6 of title II of that Act pursuant to petitions filed under section 292 of that Act before July 1, 2021.

SEC. 407. EXTENSION AND MODIFICATION OF HEALTH COVERAGE TAX CREDIT.

(a) EXTENSION.—Subparagraph (B) of section 35(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “before January 1, 2014” and inserting “before January 1, 2020”.

(b) COORDINATION WITH CREDIT FOR COVERAGE UNDER A QUALIFIED HEALTH PLAN.—Subsection (g) of section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (13), and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (10) the following new paragraphs:

“(11) ELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not apply to any taxpayer for any eligible coverage month unless such taxpayer elects the application of this section for such month.

“(B) TIMING AND APPLICABILITY OF ELECTION.—Except as the Secretary may provide—

“(i) an election to have this section apply for any eligible coverage month in a taxable year shall be made not later than the due date (including extensions) for the return of tax for the taxable year, and

“(ii) any election for this section to apply for an eligible coverage month shall apply for all subsequent eligible coverage months in the taxable year and, once made, shall be irrevocable with respect to such months.

“(12) COORDINATION WITH PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An eligible coverage month to which the election under paragraph (11) applies shall not be treated as a coverage month (as defined in section 36B(c)(2)) for purposes of section 36B with respect to the taxpayer.

“(B) COORDINATION WITH ADVANCE PAYMENTS OF PREMIUM TAX CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who makes the election under paragraph (11) with respect to any eligible coverage month in a taxable year or on behalf of whom any advance payment is made under section 7527 with respect to any month in such taxable year—

“(i) the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year shall be increased by the excess, if any, of—

“(I) the sum of any advance payments made on behalf of the taxpayer under section 1412 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and section 7527 for months during such taxable year, over

“(II) the sum of the credits allowed under this section (determined without regard to paragraph (1)) and section 36B (determined without regard to subsection (f)(1) thereof) for such taxable year, and

“(ii) section 36B(f)(2) shall not apply with respect to such taxpayer for such taxable year, except that if such taxpayer received any advance payments under section 7527 for any month in such taxable year and is later allowed a credit under section 36B for such taxable year, then section 36B(f)(2)(B) shall be applied by substituting the amount determined under clause (i) for the amount determined under section 36B(f)(2)(A).”

(C) EXTENSION OF ADVANCE PAYMENT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 7527 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “August 1, 2003” and inserting “the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (1) of section 7527(e) of such Code is amended by striking “occurring” and all that follows and inserting “occurring—

“(A) after the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Reauthorization Act of 2015, and

“(B) prior to the first month for which an advance payment is made on behalf of such individual under subsection (a).”

(d) INDIVIDUAL INSURANCE TREATED AS QUALIFIED HEALTH INSURANCE WITHOUT REGARD TO ENROLLMENT DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “insurance if the eligible individual” and all that follows through “For purposes of” and inserting “insurance. For purposes of”.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—Subparagraph (J) of section 35(e)(1) of such Code, as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by striking “insurance.” and inserting “insurance (other than coverage enrolled in through an Exchange established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act).”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (m) of section 6501 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, 35(g)(11)” after “30D(e)(4)”.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013.

(2) PLANS AVAILABLE ON INDIVIDUAL MARKET FOR USE OF TAX CREDIT.—The amendment made by subsection (d)(2) shall apply to coverage months in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(3) TRANSITION RULE.—Notwithstanding section 35(g)(11)(B)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (as added by this title), an election to apply section 35 of such Code to an eligible coverage month (as defined in section 35(b) of such Code) (and not to claim the credit under section 36B of such Code with

respect to such month) in a taxable year beginning after December 31, 2013, and before the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) may be made at any time on or after such date of enactment and before the expiration of the 3-year period of limitation prescribed in section 6511(a) with respect to such taxable year; and

(B) may be made on an amended return.

(g) AGENCY OUTREACH.—As soon as possible after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretaries of the Treasury, Health and Human Services, and Labor (or such Secretaries’ delegates) and the Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation (or the Director’s delegate) shall carry out programs of public outreach, including on the Internet, to inform potential eligible individuals (as defined in section 35(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) of the extension of the credit under section 35 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the availability of the election to claim such credit retroactively for coverage months beginning after December 31, 2013.

TITLE V—IMPROVEMENTS TO ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTY LAWS

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “American Trade Enforcement Effectiveness Act”.

SEC. 502. CONSEQUENCES OF FAILURE TO COOPERATE WITH A REQUEST FOR INFORMATION IN A PROCEEDING.

Section 776 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677e) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (4) as subparagraphs (A) through (D), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(B) by striking “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—If” and inserting the following: “ADVERSE INFERENCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If”;

(C) by striking “under this title, may use” and inserting the following: “under this title—

“(A) may use”; and

(D) by striking “facts otherwise available. Such adverse inference may include” and inserting the following: “facts otherwise available; and

“(B) is not required to determine, or make any adjustments to, a countervailable subsidy rate or weighted average dumping margin based on any assumptions about information the interested party would have provided if the interested party had complied with the request for information.

“(2) POTENTIAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR ADVERSE INFERENCES.—An adverse inference under paragraph (1)(A) may include”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—When the” and inserting the following: “CORROBORATION OF SECONDARY INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), when the”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The administrative authority and the Commission shall not be required to corroborate any dumping margin or countervailing duty applied in a separate segment of the same proceeding.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) SUBSIDY RATES AND DUMPING MARGINS IN ADVERSE INFERENCES DETERMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the administering authority uses an inference that is adverse to the interests of a party under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority may—

“(A) in the case of a countervailing duty proceeding—

“(i) use a countervailable subsidy rate applied for the same or similar program in a countervailing duty proceeding involving the same country, or

“(ii) if there is no same or similar program, use a countervailable subsidy rate for a subsidy program from a proceeding that the administering authority considers reasonable to use, and

“(B) in the case of an antidumping duty proceeding, use any dumping margin from any segment of the proceeding under the applicable antidumping order.

“(2) DISCRETION TO APPLY HIGHEST RATE.—

In carrying out paragraph (1), the administering authority may apply any of the countervailable subsidy rates or dumping margins specified under that paragraph, including the highest such rate or margin, based on the evaluation by the administering authority of the situation that resulted in the administering authority using an adverse inference in selecting among the facts otherwise available.

“(3) NO OBLIGATION TO MAKE CERTAIN ESTIMATES OR ADDRESS CERTAIN CLAIMS.—If the administering authority uses an adverse inference under subsection (b)(1)(A) in selecting among the facts otherwise available, the administering authority is not required, for purposes of subsection (c) or for any other purpose—

“(A) to estimate what the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin would have been if the interested party found to have failed to cooperate under subsection (b)(1) had cooperated, or

“(B) to demonstrate that the countervailable subsidy rate or dumping margin used by the administering authority reflects an alleged commercial reality of the interested party.”

SEC. 503. DEFINITION OF MATERIAL INJURY.

(a) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY OF DOMESTIC INDUSTRIES.—Section 771(7) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(J) EFFECT OF PROFITABILITY.—The Commission may not determine that there is no material injury or threat of material injury to an industry in the United States merely because that industry is profitable or because the performance of that industry has recently improved.”

(b) EVALUATION OF IMPACT ON DOMESTIC INDUSTRY IN DETERMINATION OF MATERIAL INJURY.—Subclause (I) of section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iii)) is amended to read as follows:

“(I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity.”

(c) CAPTIVE PRODUCTION.—Section 771(7)(C)(iv) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(7)(C)(iv)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (I), by striking the comma and inserting “, and”;

(2) in subclause (II), by striking “, and” and inserting a comma; and

(3) by striking subclause (III).

SEC. 504. PARTICULAR MARKET SITUATION.

(a) DEFINITION OF ORDINARY COURSE OF TRADE.—Section 771(15) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(15)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(C) Situations in which the administering authority determines that the particular market situation prevents a proper comparison with the export price or constructed export price.”

(b) DEFINITION OF NORMAL VALUE.—Section 773(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(a)(1)(B)(ii)(III)) is amended by striking “in such other country.”

(c) DEFINITION OF CONSTRUCTED VALUE.—Section 773(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(e)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “business” and inserting “trade”; and

(2) by striking the flush text at the end and inserting the following:

“For purposes of paragraph (1), if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology. For purposes of paragraph (1), the cost of materials shall be determined without regard to any internal tax in the exporting country imposed on such materials or their disposition that is remitted or refunded upon exportation of the subject merchandise produced from such materials.”.

SEC. 505. DISTORTION OF PRICES OR COSTS.

(a) INVESTIGATION OF BELOW-COST SALES.—Section 773(b)(2) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

“(A) REASONABLE GROUNDS TO BELIEVE OR SUSPECT.—

“(i) REVIEW.—In a review conducted under section 751 involving a specific exporter, there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that are less than the cost of production of the product if the administering authority disregarded some or all of the exporter’s sales pursuant to paragraph (1) in the investigation or, if a review has been completed, in the most recently completed review.

“(ii) REQUESTS FOR INFORMATION.—In an investigation initiated under section 732 or a review conducted under section 751, the administering authority shall request information necessary to calculate the constructed value and cost of production under subsections (e) and (f) to determine whether there are reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product have been made at prices that represent less than the cost of production of the product.”.

(b) PRICES AND COSTS IN NONMARKET ECONOMIES.—Section 773(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677b(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) DISCRETION TO DISREGARD CERTAIN PRICE OR COST VALUES.—In valuing the factors of production under paragraph (1) for the subject merchandise, the administering authority may disregard price or cost values without further investigation if the administering authority has determined that broadly available export subsidies existed or particular instances of subsidization occurred with respect to those price or cost values or if those price or cost values were subject to an antidumping order.”.

SEC. 506. REDUCTION IN BURDEN ON DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BY REDUCING THE NUMBER OF VOLUNTARY RESPONDENTS.

Section 782(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677m(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and by moving such clauses, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(3) by striking “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—In” and inserting the following: “INVESTIGATIONS AND REVIEWS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In”;

(4) in paragraph (1), as designated by paragraph (3), by amending subparagraph (B), as

redesignated by paragraph (2), to read as follows:

“(B) The number of exporters or producers subject to the investigation or review is not so large that any additional individual examination of such exporters or producers would be unduly burdensome to the administering authority and inhibit the timely completion of the investigation or review.”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) DETERMINATION OF UNDULY BURDENSOME.—In determining if an individual examination under paragraph (1)(B) would be unduly burdensome, the administering authority may consider the following:

“(A) The complexity of the issues or information presented in the proceeding, including questionnaires and any responses thereto.

“(B) Any prior experience of the administering authority in the same or similar proceeding.

“(C) The total number of investigations under subtitle A or B and reviews under section 751 being conducted by the administering authority as of the date of the determination.

“(D) Such other factors relating to the timely completion of each such investigation and review as the administering authority considers appropriate.”.

SEC. 507. APPLICATION TO CANADA AND MEXICO.

Pursuant to article 1902 of the North American Free Trade Agreement and section 408 of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 3438), the amendments made by this title shall apply with respect to goods from Canada and Mexico.

TITLE VI—TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES

SEC. 601. TARIFF CLASSIFICATION OF RECREATIONAL PERFORMANCE OUTERWEAR.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO ADDITIONAL U.S. NOTES.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended—

(1) in Additional U.S. Note 2—

(A) by striking “For the purposes of subheadings” and all that follows through “6211.20.15” and inserting “For purposes of this chapter”;

(B) by striking “garments classifiable in those subheadings” and inserting “a garment”; and

(C) by striking “D 3600-81” and inserting “D 3779-81”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new notes:

“(c) For purposes of this chapter, the term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ means trousers (including, but not limited to, paddling pants, ski or snowboard pants, and ski or snowboard pants intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), coveralls and bib overalls, and jackets (including, but not limited to, full zip jackets, paddling jackets, ski jackets, and ski jackets intended for sale as parts of ski-suits), windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets) composed of fabrics of cotton, wool, hemp, bamboo, silk, or manmade fiber, or a combination of such fibers, that are either water resistant or treated with plastics, or both, with critically sealed seams, and with five or more of the following features:

“(1) Insulation for cold weather protection.

“(2) Pockets, at least one of which has a zippered, hook and loop, or other type of closure.

“(3) Elastic, drawcord, or other means of tightening around the waist or leg hems, including hidden leg sleeves with a means of tightening at the ankle for trousers and tightening around the waist or bottom hem for jackets.

“(4) Venting, not including grommet(s).

“(5) Articulated elbows or knees.

“(6) Reinforcement in one of the following areas: the elbows, shoulders, seat, knees, ankles, or cuffs.

“(7) Weatherproof closure at the waist or front.

“(8) Multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar.

“(9) Adjustable powder skirt, inner protective skirt, or adjustable inner protective cuff at sleeve hem.

“(10) Construction at the arm gusset that utilizes fabric, design, or patterning to allow radial arm movement.

“(11) Odor control technology.

The term ‘recreational performance outerwear’ does not include occupational outerwear.

“(d) For purposes of this Note, the following terms have the following meanings:

“(1) The term ‘treated with plastics’ refers to textile fabrics impregnated, coated, covered, or laminated with plastics, as described in Note 2 to chapter 59.

“(2) The term ‘sealed seams’ means seams that have been covered by means of taping, gluing, bonding, cementing, fusing, welding, or a similar process so that water cannot pass through the seams when tested in accordance with the current version of AATCC Test Method 35.

“(3) The term ‘critically sealed seams’ means—

“(A) for jackets, windbreakers, and similar articles (including padded, sleeveless jackets), sealed seams that are sealed at the front and back yokes, or at the shoulders, arm holes, or both, where applicable; and

“(B) for trousers, overalls and bib overalls and similar articles, sealed seams that are sealed at the front (up to the zipper or other means of closure) and back rise.

“(4) The term ‘insulation for cold weather protection’ means insulation with either synthetic fill, down, a laminated thermal backing, or other lining for thermal protection from cold weather.

“(5) The term ‘venting’ refers to closeable or permanent constructed openings in a garment (excluding front, primary zipper closures and grommet(s)) to allow increased expulsion of built-up heat during outdoor activities. In a jacket, such openings are often positioned on the underarm seam of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment. In trousers, such openings are often positioned on the inner or outer leg seams of a garment but may also be placed along other seams in the front or back of a garment.

“(6) The term ‘articulated elbows or knees’ refers to the construction of a sleeve (or pant leg) to allow improved mobility at the elbow (or knee) through the use of extra seams, darts, gussets, or other means.

“(7) The term ‘reinforcement’ refers to the use of a double layer of fabric or section(s) of fabric that is abrasion-resistant or otherwise more durable than the face fabric of the garment.

“(8) The term ‘weatherproof closure’ means a closure (including, but not limited to, laminated or coated zippers, storm flaps, or other weatherproof construction) that has been reinforced or engineered in a manner to reduce the penetration or absorption of moisture or air through an opening in the garment.

“(9) The term ‘multi-adjustable hood or adjustable collar’ means, in the case of a hood, a hood into which is incorporated two or more draw cords, adjustment tabs, or elastics, or, in the case of a collar, a collar into which is incorporated at least one draw cord, adjustment tab, elastic, or similar component, to allow volume adjustments

around a helmet, or the crown of the head, neck, or face.

“(10) The terms ‘adjustable powder skirt’ and ‘inner protective skirt’ refer to a partial lower inner lining with means of tightening around the waist for additional protection from the elements.

“(11) The term ‘arm gusset’ means construction at the arm of a gusset that utilizes an extra fabric piece in the underarm, usually diamond- or triangular-shaped, designed, or patterned to allow radial arm movement.

“(12) The term ‘radial arm movement’ refers to unrestricted, 180-degree range of motion for the arm while wearing performance outerwear.

“(13) The term ‘odor control technology’ means the incorporation into a fabric or garment of materials, including, but not limited

to, activated carbon, silver, copper, or any combination thereof, capable of adsorbing, absorbing, or reacting with human odors, or effective in reducing the growth of odor-causing bacteria.

“(14) The term ‘occupational outerwear’ means outerwear garments, including uniforms, designed or marketed for use in the workplace or at a worksite to provide durable protection from cold or inclement weather and/or workplace hazards, such as fire, electrical, abrasion, or chemical hazards, or impacts, cuts, punctures, or similar hazards.

“(e) Notwithstanding subdivision (b)(i) of this Note, for purposes of this chapter, Notes 1 and 2(a)(1) to chapter 59 and Note 1(c) to chapter 60 shall be disregarded in classifying goods as ‘recreational performance outerwear’.

“(f) For purposes of this chapter, the importer of record shall maintain internal import records that specify upon entry whether garments claimed as recreational performance outerwear have an outer surface that is water resistant, treated with plastics, or a combination thereof, and shall further enumerate the specific features that make the garments eligible to be classified as recreational performance outerwear.”.

(b) TARIFF CLASSIFICATIONS.—Chapter 62 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking subheading 6201.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
	6201.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
	6201.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(2) By striking subheadings 6201.12.10 and 6201.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6201.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6201.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6201.12.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(3) By striking subheadings 6201.13.10 through 6201.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6201.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6201.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6201.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6201.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				

6201.13.30	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(4) By striking subheadings 6201.19.10 and 6201.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6201.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"

(5) By striking subheadings 6201.91.10 and 6201.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.10	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU) 3.4% (OM)	58.5%	
6201.91.20	Other	49.7¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 19.8¢/kg + 7.8% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	"

(6) By striking subheadings 6201.92.10 through 6201.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.92.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.92.15	Other: Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	

6201.92.20	Other	9.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	------	--	-----	----

(7) By striking subheadings 6201.93.10 through 6201.93.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6201.93.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6201.93.20	Other: Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6201.93.25	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.5¢/kg + 19.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6201.93.30	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6201.93.35	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(8) By striking subheadings 6201.99.10 and 6201.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6201.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6201.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6201.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	
6201.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6201.99.90	Other	4.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.7% (AU)	35%	”.

(9) By striking subheading 6202.11.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.11 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.11.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.11	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6202.11.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	

6202.11.10	Other	41¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	"
------------	-------------	----------------	---	------------------	---

(10) By striking subheadings 6202.12.10 and 6202.12.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.12.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.12.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.12.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.12.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.12.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(11) By striking subheadings 6202.13.10 through 6202.13.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.13.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.13.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.13.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6202.13.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
6202.13.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.5¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.13.40	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	"

(12) By striking subheadings 6202.19.10 and 6202.19.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6202.19.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6202.19.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.19.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6202.19.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.19.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"

(13) By striking subheadings 6202.91.10 and 6202.91.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6202.91.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6202.91.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.91.05	Recreational performance outerwear	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	58.5%	”.
		Other:				
	6202.91.10	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 5.6% (OM)	58.5%	
	6202.91.20	Other	36¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 14.4¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(14) By striking subheadings 6202.92.10 through 6202.92.20 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6202.92.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6202.92.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.92.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
		Other:				
	6202.92.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
		Other:				
	6202.92.15	Water resistant	6.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.5% (AU)	37.5%	
	6202.92.20	Other	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(15) By striking subheadings 6202.93.10 through 6202.93.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6202.93.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6202.93.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6202.93.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.
		Other:				
	6202.93.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	4.4%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 3.9% (AU)	60%	
	6202.93.20	Padded, sleeveless jackets	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	

6202.93.40	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	43.4¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	46.3¢/kg + 58.5%	
6202.93.45	Other: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6202.93.50	Other	27.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	”.

(16) By striking subheadings 6202.99.10 and 6202.99.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6202.99.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6202.99.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6202.99.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6202.99.10	Other: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6202.99.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(17) By striking subheadings 6203.41 and 6203.41.05, and the superior text to subheading 6203.41.05, and inserting the fol-

lowing, with the article description for subheading 6203.41 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for sub-

heading 6203.41 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.41	Of wool or fine animal hair:				
6203.41.05	Recreational performance outerwear	41.9¢/kg + 16.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 16.7¢/kg + 6.5% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.41.10	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 9 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.8% (AU) 3% (OM)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	”.

(18) By striking subheadings 6203.42.10 through 6203.42.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.42.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6203.42.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
6203.42.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6203.42.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	10.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	

6203.42.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	-------	--	-----	----

(19) By striking subheadings 6203.43.10 through 6203.43.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.43.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6203.43.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	
6203.43.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
6203.43.15	Other: Bib and brace overalls: Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6203.43.20	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.43.25	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.43.30	Other: Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	49.6¢/kg + 19.7%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	52.9¢/kg + 58.5%	
6203.43.35	Other: Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU) 2.8% (KR)	65%	
6203.43.40	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.1% (KR)	90%	”.

(20) By striking subheadings 6203.49 through 6203.49.80 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6203.49 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for sub-

heading 6203.49 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6203.49	Of other textile materials:				
6203.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	
	Other:				
	Of artificial fibers:				

6203.49.10	Bib and brace overalls	8.5%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 7.6% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.15	Trousers, breeches and shorts: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	12.2%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
6203.49.20	Other	27.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6203.49.40	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	Free		35%	
6203.49.80	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 1.1% (KR)	35%	”.

(21) By striking subheadings 6204.61.10 and 6204.61.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.61.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.61.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.61.05	Recreational performance outerwear	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.10	Other: Trousers and breeches, containing elastomeric fiber, water resistant, without belt loops, weighing more than 6 kg per dozen	7.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 3% (OM) 6.8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6204.61.90	Other	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 5.4% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	”.

(22) By striking subheadings 6204.62.10 through 6204.62.40 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.62.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.62.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.62.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	
	6204.62.10	Other: Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
	6204.62.20	Other: Bib and brace overalls	8.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
	6204.62.30	Other: Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	37.5%	

6204.62.40	Other	16.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.6% (KR)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	-------	--	-----	----

(23) By striking subheadings 6204.63.10 through 6204.63.35 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.63.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.63.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.63.05	Recreational performance outerwear	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.10	Containing 15 percent or more by weight of down and waterfowl plumage and of which down comprises 35 percent or more by weight; containing 10 percent or more by weight of down	Free		60%	
		Other:				
		Bib and brace overalls:				
	6204.63.12	Water resistant	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.15	Other	14.9%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
	6204.63.20	Certified hand-loomed and folklore products	11.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.25	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
		Other:				
	6204.63.30	Water resistant trousers or breeches	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
	6204.63.35	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 11.4% (KR)	90%	”.

(24) By striking subheadings 6204.69 through 6204.69.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6204.69 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6204.69 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6204.69	Of other textile materials:				
	6204.69.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
		Other:				
		Of artificial fibers:				
	6204.69.10	Bib and brace overalls	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	76%	
		Trousers, breeches and shorts:				

6204.69.20	Containing 36 percent or more by weight of wool or fine animal hair	13.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
6204.69.25	Other	28.6%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU)	90%	
6204.69.40	Of silk or silk waste: Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, J, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	65%	
6204.69.60	Other	7.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.3% (AU)	65%	
6204.69.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	”.

(25) By striking subheadings 6210.40.30 and 6210.40.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.40.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.40.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.40.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.40.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.40.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(26) By striking subheadings 6210.50.30 and 6210.50.50 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading

6210.50.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading

6210.50.30 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6210.50.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.30	Other: Having an outer surface impregnated, coated, covered or laminated with rubber or plastics material which completely obscures the underlying fabric	3.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	
	6210.50.50	Other	7.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PE, SG)	65%	”.

(27) By striking subheading 6211.32.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.32 having the

same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6211.32.00 (as in effect

on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.32	Of cotton:				
	6211.32.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	

6211.32.10	Other	8.1%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	"
------------	-------------	------	--	-----	---

(28) By striking subheading 6211.33.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.33.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.33	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.33.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	
6211.33.10	Other	16%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	76%	"

(29) By striking subheadings 6211.39.05 through 6211.39.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.39.05 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.39.05	Recreational performance outerwear	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.10	Other:				
6211.39.10	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	58.5%	
6211.39.20	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	0.5%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
6211.39.90	Other	2.8%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E*, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	"

(30) By striking subheading 6211.42.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.42.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.42	Of cotton:				
6211.42.05	Recreational performance outerwear	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	
6211.42.10	Other	8.1%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	"

(31) By striking subheading 6211.43.00 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 6211.43.00 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

6211.43	Of man-made fibers:				
6211.43.05	Recreational performance outerwear	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG)	90%	

6211.43.10	Other	16%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 8% (AU) 6.4% (OM)	90%	”.
------------	-------------	-----	---	-----	----

(32) By striking subheadings 6211.49.10 through 6211.49.90 and inserting the following, with the article description for sub-

heading 6211.49.05 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for

subheading 6211.49.10 (as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act):

“	6211.49.05	Recreational performance outerwear	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	
		Other:				
	6211.49.10	Containing 70 percent or more by weight of silk or silk waste	1.2%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG)	35%	
	6211.49.41	Of wool or fine animal hair	12%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, P, PA, PE, SG) 4.8% (OM) 8% (AU)	58.5%	
	6211.49.90	Other	7.3%	Free (BH, CA, CL, CO, E, IL, JO, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, SG) 6.5% (AU) 2.9% (KR)	35%	”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 180th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 180th day.

SEC. 602. DUTY TREATMENT OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.

(a) DEFINITION OF PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—The Additional U.S. Notes to chapter

64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States are amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) For the purposes of subheadings 6402.91.42 and 6402.99.32, the term ‘protective active footwear’ means footwear (other than footwear described in Subheading Note 1) that is designed for outdoor activities, such as hiking shoes, trekking shoes, running shoes, and trail running shoes, the foregoing valued over \$24/pair and which provides protection against water that is imparted by

the use of a coated or laminated textile fabric.”.

(b) DUTY TREATMENT FOR PROTECTIVE ACTIVE FOOTWEAR.—Chapter 64 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By inserting after subheading 6402.91.40 the following new subheading, with the article description for subheading 6402.91.42 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.91.40:

“	6402.91.42	Protective active footwear (except footwear with waterproof molded bottoms, including bottoms comprising an outer sole and all or part of the upper and except footwear with insulation that provides protection against cold weather), whose height from the bottom of the outer sole to the top of the upper does not exceed 15.34 cm	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, E, IL, JO, KR, MA, MX, OM, P, PA, PE, R, SG)	35%	”.
---	------------	---	-----	--	-----	----

(2) By inserting immediately preceding subheading 6402.99.33 the following new sub-

heading, with the article description for subheading 6402.99.32 having the same degree of

indentation as the article description for subheading 6402.99.33:

“	6402.99.32	Protective active footwear	20%	Free (AU, BH, CA, CL, D, IL, JO, MA, MX, P) 1% (PA) 6% (OM) 6% (PE) 12% (CO) 20% (KR)	35%	”.
---	------------	----------------------------------	-----	--	-----	----

(c) STAGED RATE REDUCTIONS.—The staged reductions in special rates of duty proclaimed for subheading 6402.99.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act shall be applied to subheading 6402.99.32 of such Schedule, as added by subsection (b)(2), beginning in calendar year 2016.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall—

(1) take effect on the 15th day after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) apply to articles entered, or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption, on or after such 15th day.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. REPORT ON CONTRIBUTION OF TRADE PREFERENCE PROGRAMS TO REDUCING POVERTY AND ELIMINATING HUNGER.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report assessing the contribution of the trade preference programs of the United States, including the

Generalized System of Preferences under title V of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2461 et seq.), the African Growth and Opportunity Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.), and the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (19 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), to the reduction of poverty and the elimination of hunger.

TITLE VIII—OFFSETS

SEC. 801. CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13031(j)(3)(A) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)(A)) is

amended by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “July 7, 2025”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by striking “June 30, 2021” and inserting “June 30, 2025”.

SEC. 802. ADDITIONAL CUSTOMS USER FEES EXTENSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2024” and inserting “September 30, 2025”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) Fees may be charged under paragraphs (9) and (10) of subsection (a) during the period beginning on July 29, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025.”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 125 Stat. 460) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) **FURTHER ADDITIONAL PERIOD.**—For the period beginning on July 15, 2025, and ending on September 30, 2025, section 13031(a)(9) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(a)(9)) shall be applied and administered—

“(1) in subparagraph (A), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’; and

“(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by substituting ‘0.3464’ for ‘0.21’.”.

SEC. 803. TIME FOR PAYMENT OF CORPORATE ESTIMATED TAXES.

Notwithstanding section 6655 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of a corporation with assets of not less than \$1,000,000,000 (determined as of the end of the preceding taxable year)—

(1) the amount of any required installment of corporate estimated tax which is otherwise due in July, August, or September of 2020 shall be increased by 8 percent of such amount (determined without regard to any increase in such amount not contained in such Code); and

(2) the amount of the next required installment after an installment referred to in paragraph (1) shall be appropriately reduced to reflect the amount of the increase by reason of such paragraph.

SEC. 804. PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIRED TO CLAIM CERTAIN EDUCATION TAX BENEFITS.

(a) **AMERICAN OPPORTUNITY CREDIT, HOPE SCHOLARSHIP CREDIT, AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 25A(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(8) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no credit shall be allowed under this section unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.”.

(2) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—Section 25A(g)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (A), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(C) a statement described in paragraph (8) and received by such individual shall be treated as received by the taxpayer.”.

(b) **DEDUCTION FOR QUALIFIED TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—Section 222(d) of such Code is amended by redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

“(6) **PAYEE STATEMENT REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, no deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer receives a statement furnished under section 6050S(d) which contains all of the information required by paragraph (2) thereof.

“(B) **STATEMENT RECEIVED BY DEPENDENT.**—The receipt of the statement referred to in subparagraph (A) by an individual described in subsection (c)(3) shall be treated for purposes of subparagraph (A) as received by the taxpayer.”.

(c) **INFORMATION REQUIRED TO BE PROVIDED ON PAYEE STATEMENT.**—Section 6050S(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

“(2) the information required by subsection (b)(2).”.

(d) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 805. SPECIAL RULE FOR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS UNABLE TO COLLECT TINS OF INDIVIDUALS WITH RESPECT TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6724 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) **SPECIAL RULE FOR RETURNS OF EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS RELATED TO HIGHER EDUCATION TUITION AND RELATED EXPENSES.**—No penalty shall be imposed under section 6721 or 6722 solely by reason of failing to provide the TIN of an individual on a return or statement required by section 6050S(a)(1) if the eligible educational institution required to make such return contemporaneously makes a true and accurate certification under penalty of perjury (and in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary) that it has complied with standards promulgated by the Secretary for obtaining such individual’s TIN.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to returns required to be made, and statements required to be furnished, after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 806. PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO FILE CORRECT INFORMATION RETURNS AND PROVIDE PAYEE STATEMENTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6721(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(b) **REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.**—

(1) **CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.**—Section 6721(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(2) **FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.**—Section 6721(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; and

(B) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(C) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(c) **LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.**—Section 6721(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(3) in subparagraph (C)—

(A) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(B) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(d) **PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.**—Section 6721(e) of such Code is amended—

(1) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(2) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(e) **FAILURE TO FURNISH CORRECT PAYEE STATEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 6722(a)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(2) **REDUCTION WHERE CORRECTION IN SPECIFIED PERIOD.**—

(A) **CORRECTION WITHIN 30 DAYS.**—Section 6722(b)(1) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$30” and inserting “\$50”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”.

(B) **FAILURES CORRECTED ON OR BEFORE AUGUST 1.**—Section 6722(b)(2) of such Code is amended—

(i) by striking “\$60” and inserting “\$100”; and

(ii) by striking “\$100” (prior to amendment by clause (i)) and inserting “\$250”; and

(iii) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(3) **LOWER LIMITATION FOR PERSONS WITH GROSS RECEIPTS OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000,000.**—Section 6722(d)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking “\$500,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$1,500,000” and inserting “\$3,000,000”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)—

(i) by striking “\$75,000” and inserting “\$175,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$250,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(C) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by striking “\$200,000” and inserting “\$500,000”; and

(ii) by striking “\$500,000” (prior to amendment by subparagraph (A)) and inserting “\$1,500,000”.

(4) **PENALTY IN CASE OF INTENTIONAL DISREGARD.**—Section 6722(e) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$250” in paragraph (2) and inserting “\$500”; and

(B) by striking “\$1,500,000” in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting “\$3,000,000”.

(f) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to returns and statements required to be filed after December 31, 2015.

SEC. 807. CHILD TAX CREDIT NOT REFUNDABLE FOR TAXPAYERS ELECTING TO EXCLUDE FOREIGN EARNED INCOME FROM TAX.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 24(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(5) **EXCEPTION FOR TAXPAYERS EXCLUDING FOREIGN EARNED INCOME.**—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any taxpayer for any taxable year if such taxpayer elects to exclude any amount from gross income under section 911 for such taxable year.”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 808. COVERAGE AND PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.

(a) **COVERAGE.**—Section 1861(s)(2)(F) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395x(s)(2)(F)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, including such renal dialysis services furnished on or after January 1, 2017, by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under section 1881(b)(14) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in section 1834(r)(2))”.

(b) **PAYMENT.**—Section 1834 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395m) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(r) **PAYMENT FOR RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY.**—

“(1) **PAYMENT RATE.**—In the case of renal dialysis services (as defined in subparagraph (B) of section 1881(b)(14)) furnished under this part by a renal dialysis facility or provider of services paid under such section during a year (beginning with 2017) to an individual with acute kidney injury (as defined in paragraph (2)), the amount of payment under this part for such services shall be the base rate for renal dialysis services determined for such year under such section, as adjusted by any applicable geographic adjustment factor applied under subparagraph (D)(iv)(II) of such section and may be adjusted by the Secretary (on a budget neutral basis for payments under this paragraph) by any other adjustment factor under subparagraph (D) of such section.

“(2) **INDIVIDUAL WITH ACUTE KIDNEY INJURY DEFINED.**—In this subsection, the term ‘individual with acute kidney injury’ means an individual who has acute loss of renal function and does not receive renal dialysis services for which payment is made under section 1881(b)(14).”.

SA 2066. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2065 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for himself and Mr. HATCH) to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2067. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2068. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the Instructions

Strike “2 days” and insert “3 days”

SA 2069. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2068 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2067 proposed by Mr.

McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 1295, to extend the African Growth and Opportunity Act, the Generalized System of Preferences, the preferential duty treatment program for Haiti, and for other purposes; as follows:

In the amendment

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources' Subcommittee on Water and Power be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2 p.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Dead End, No Turn Around, Danger Ahead: Challenges to the Future of Highway Funding.”

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

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON REGULATORY AFFAIRS AND FEDERAL MANAGEMENT

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on June 18, 2015, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled, “Re-examining EPA's Management of the Renewable Fuel Standard Program.”

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016

AMENDMENT NO. 1474, AS MODIFIED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the passage of H.R. 1735, the Coons amendment No. 1474, which was agreed to, be modified by replacing the text therein with the text of Coons amendment No. 2058.

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

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve section 1204, relating to the National Guard State Partnership Program)

On page 599, after line 21, add the following:

(g) **ENHANCED SCOPE OF AUTHORITY.**—Subsection (a)(1) of such section, as amended by subsection (b)(1) of this section, is further amended by inserting after “activities described in paragraph (2)” the following: “, to support the security cooperation objectives of the United States.”.

(h) **PROCEDURES.**—Such section, as amended by subsections (b) through (f) of this section, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (c) through (g) as subsections (d) through (h), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection (c):

“(c) **COORDINATION OF ACTIVITIES.**—The Chief of the National Guard Bureau shall designate a director for each State and territory to be responsible for the coordination of activities under a program established under subsection (a) for such State or territory and reporting on activities under the program.”.

(i) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Paragraph (2)(B) of subsection (f) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (h)(1) of this section, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by inserting “or other government organizations” after “and security forces”;

(2) in clause (iv), by adding at the end before the period the following: “and country”;

(3) in clause (v), by striking “training” and inserting “activities”;

and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) An assessment of the extent to which the activities conducted during the previous year met the objectives described in clause (v).”.

ORDER FOR PRINTING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill as passed by the Senate be printed.

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

(The bill, H.R. 1735, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 22, at 5 p.m., the Senate proceed to executive session to the en bloc consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 156 and 124; that there be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed, and that following disposition of the nominations the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 94, S. 808.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 808) to establish the Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 808) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 808

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

- Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
- Sec. 2. References to title 49, United States Code.
- Sec. 3. Establishment of Surface Transportation Board as an independent establishment.
- Sec. 4. Surface Transportation Board membership.
- Sec. 5. Nonpublic collaborative discussions.
- Sec. 6. Reports.
- Sec. 7. Authorization of appropriations.
- Sec. 8. Agent in the District of Columbia.
- Sec. 9. Department of Transportation Inspector General authority.
- Sec. 10. Amendment to table of sections.
- Sec. 11. Procedures for rate cases.
- Sec. 12. Investigative authority.
- Sec. 13. Arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes.
- Sec. 14. Effect of proposals for rates from multiple origins and destinations.
- Sec. 15. Reports.
- Sec. 16. Criteria.
- Sec. 17. Construction.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD AS AN INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.

(a) **REDESIGNATION OF CHAPTER 7 OF TITLE 49, UNITED STATES CODE.**—Title 49 is amended—

- (1) by moving chapter 7 after chapter 11 in subtitle II;
- (2) by redesignating chapter 7 as chapter 13;
- (3) by redesignating sections 701 through 706 as sections 1301 through 1306, respectively;
- (4) by striking sections 725 and 727;
- (5) by redesignating sections 721 through 724 as sections 1321 through 1324, respectively; and

(6) by redesignating section 726 as section 1325.

(b) **INDEPENDENT ESTABLISHMENT.**—Section 1301, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Surface Transportation Board is an independent establishment of the United States Government.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) **ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**—Section 1303, as redesignated by subsection (a)(3), is amended—

(A) by striking subsections (a), (c), (f), and (g);

(B) by redesignating subsections (b), (d), and (e) as subsections (a), (b), and (c), respectively; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS TO CONGRESS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Board submits any budget estimate, budget request, supplemental budget estimate, or other budget information, legislative recommendation, prepared testimony for a congressional hearing, or comment on legislation to the President or to the Office of Management and Budget, the Board shall concurrently submit a copy of such document to—

“(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

“(2) **NO APPROVAL REQUIRED.**—No officer or agency of the United States has any authority to require the Board to submit budget estimates or requests, legislative recommendations, prepared testimony for congressional hearings, or comments on legislation to any officer or agency of the United States for approval, comments, or review before submitting such recommendations, testimony, or comments to Congress.”.

SEC. 4. SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD MEMBERSHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1301(b), as redesignated by subsection 3(a), is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1)—
- (A) by striking “3 members” and inserting “5 members”; and
- (B) by striking “2 members” and inserting “3 members”; and
- (2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

“(2) At all times—

“(A) at least 3 members of the Board shall be individuals with professional standing and demonstrated knowledge in the fields of transportation, transportation regulation, or economic regulation; and

“(B) at least 2 members shall be individuals with professional or business experience (including agriculture) in the private sector.”.

(b) **REPEAL OF OBSOLETE PROVISION.**—Section 1301(b), as amended by this section, is further amended—

- (1) by striking paragraph (4);
- (2) by redesignating paragraphs (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (4), (5), and (6), respectively; and

(3) in paragraph (4), as redesignated, by striking “who becomes a member of the Board pursuant to paragraph (4), or an individual”.

SEC. 5. NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.

Section 1303(a), as redesignated by subsections (a) and (c) of section 3, is amended to read as follows:

“(a) **OPEN MEETINGS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Board shall be deemed to be an agency for purposes of section 552b of title 5.

“(2) **NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding section 552b of title 5, a majority of the members may hold a meeting that is not open to public observation to discuss official agency business if—

“(i) no formal or informal vote or other official agency action is taken at the meeting;

“(ii) each individual present at the meeting is a member or an employee of the Board; and

“(iii) the General Counsel of the Board is present at the meeting.

“(B) **DISCLOSURE OF NONPUBLIC COLLABORATIVE DISCUSSIONS.**—Except as provided under subparagraph (C), not later than 2 business days after the conclusion of a meeting under subparagraph (A), the Board shall make available to the public, in a place easily accessible to the public—

“(i) a list of the individuals present at the meeting; and

“(ii) a summary of the matters discussed at the meeting, except for any matters the Board properly determines may be withheld from the public under section 552b(c) of title 5.

“(C) **SUMMARY.**—If the Board properly determines matters may be withheld from the public under section 555b(c) of title 5, the Board shall provide a summary with as much general information as possible on those matters withheld from the public.

“(D) **ONGOING PROCEEDINGS.**—If a discussion under subparagraph (A) directly relates to an ongoing proceeding before the Board, the Board shall make the disclosure under subparagraph (B) on the date of the final Board decision.

“(E) **PRESERVATION OF OPEN MEETINGS REQUIREMENTS FOR AGENCY ACTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to a meeting of the members other than that described in this paragraph.

“(F) **STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed—

“(i) to limit the applicability of section 552b of title 5 with respect to any information which is proposed to be withheld from the public under subparagraph (B)(ii); or

“(ii) to authorize the Board to withhold from any individual any record that is accessible to that individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code.”.

SEC. 6. REPORTS.

(a) **REPORTS.**—Section 1304, as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(1) by striking the section heading and inserting the following:

“**§ 1304. Reports**”;

(2) by inserting “(a) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—” before “The Board”;

(3) by striking “on its activities.” and inserting “on its activities, including each instance in which the Board has initiated an investigation on its own initiative under this chapter or subtitle IV.”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) **RATE CASE REVIEW METRICS.**—

“(1) **QUARTERLY REPORTS.**—The Board shall post a quarterly report of rail rate review cases pending or completed by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

“(A) summary information of the case, including the docket number, case name, commodity or commodities involved, and rate review guideline or guidelines used;

“(B) the date on which the rate review proceeding began;

“(C) the date for the completion of discovery;

“(D) the date for the completion of the evidentiary record;

“(E) the date for the submission of closing briefs;

“(F) the date on which the Board issued the final decision; and

“(G) a brief summary of the final decision;”

“(2) WEBSITE POSTING.—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board’s public website.”.

(b) COMPILATION OF COMPLAINTS AT SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1304, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) COMPLAINTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall establish and maintain a database of complaints received by the Board.

“(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Board shall post a quarterly report of formal and informal service complaints received by the Board during the previous quarter that includes—

“(A) the date on which the complaint was received by the Board;

“(B) a list of the type of each complaint;

“(C) the geographic region of each complaint; and

“(D) the resolution of each complaint, if appropriate.

“(3) WRITTEN CONSENT.—The quarterly report may identify a complainant that submitted an informal complaint only upon the written consent of the complainant.

“(4) WEBSITE POSTING.—Each quarterly report shall be posted on the Board’s public website.”.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 1305, as redesignated by section 3, is amended by striking paragraphs (1) through (3) and inserting the following:

“(1) \$33,000,000 for fiscal year 2016;

“(2) \$35,000,000 for fiscal year 2017;

“(3) \$35,500,000 for fiscal year 2018;

“(4) \$35,500,000 for fiscal year 2019; and

“(5) \$36,000,000 for fiscal year 2020.”.

SEC. 8. AGENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) DESIGNATION OF AGENT AND SERVICE OF NOTICE.—Section 1323, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in the District of Columbia.”; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking “in the District of Columbia”.

(b) SERVICE OF PROCESS IN COURT PROCEEDINGS.—Section 1324(a), as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended by striking “in the District of Columbia” each place such phrase appears.

SEC. 9. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION INSPECTOR GENERAL AUTHORITY.

Subchapter II of chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a)(2), is amended by inserting after section 1325, as redesignated by section 3(a)(6), the following:

“§ 1326. Authority of the Inspector General

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Inspector General of the Department of Transportation, in accordance with the mission of the Inspector General to prevent and detect fraud and abuse, shall have authority to review only the financial management, property management, and business operations of the Surface Transportation Board, including internal accounting and administrative control systems, to determine the Board’s compliance with applicable Federal laws, rules, and regulations.

“(b) DUTIES.—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General shall—

“(1) keep the Chairman of the Board, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives fully and currently informed about problems relating to administration of the internal accounting and administrative control systems of the Board;

“(2) issue findings and recommendations for actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1); and

“(3) submit periodic reports to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that describe any progress made in implementing actions to address the problems referred to in paragraph (1).

“(c) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Inspector General may exercise authorities granted to the Inspector General under subsections (a) and (b) of section 6 of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation for use by the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation such sums as may be necessary to cover expenses associated with activities pursuant to the authority exercised under this section.

“(2) REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENT.—In the absence of an appropriation under this subsection for an expense referred to in paragraph (1), the Inspector General and the Board shall have a reimbursement agreement to cover such expense.”.

SEC. 10. AMENDMENT TO TABLE OF SECTIONS.

The table of sections for chapter 13, as redesignated by section 3(a), is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 13—SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD

“I—ESTABLISHMENT

“Sec.

“1301. Establishment of Board

“1302. Functions.

“1303. Administrative provisions.

“1304. Reports.

“1305. Authorization of appropriations.

“1306. Reporting official action.

“II—ADMINISTRATIVE

“1321. Powers.

“1322. Board action.

“1323. Service of notice in Board proceedings.

“1324. Service of process in court proceedings.

“1325. Railroad-Shipper Transportation Advisory Council.

“1326. Authority of the Inspector General.”.

SEC. 11. PROCEDURES FOR RATE CASES.

(a) SIMPLIFIED PROCEDURE.—Section 10701(d)(3) is amended to read as follows:

“(3) The Board shall maintain 1 or more simplified and expedited methods for determining the reasonableness of challenged rates in those cases in which a full stand-alone cost presentation is too costly, given the value of the case.”.

(b) EXPEDITED HANDLING; RATE REVIEW TIMELINES.—Section 10704(d) is amended—

(1) by striking “(d) Within 9 months” and all that follows through “railroad rates.” and inserting the following:

“(d)(1) The Board shall maintain procedures to ensure the expeditious handling of challenges to the reasonableness of railroad rates.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2)(A) Except as provided under subparagraph (B), in a stand-alone cost rate challenge, the Board shall comply with the following timeline:

“(i) Discovery shall be completed not later than 150 days after the date on which the challenge is initiated.

“(ii) The development of the evidentiary record shall be completed not later than 155 days after the date on which discovery is completed under clause (i).

“(iii) The closing brief shall be submitted not later than 60 days after the date on

which the development of the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

“(iv) A final Board decision shall be issued not later than 180 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is completed under clause (ii).

“(B) The Board may extend a timeline under subparagraph (A) after a request from any party or in the interest of due process.”.

(c) PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall initiate a proceeding to assess procedures that are available to parties in litigation before courts to expedite such litigation and the potential application of any such procedures to rate cases.

(d) EXPIRED RAIL SERVICE CONTRACT LIMITATION.—Section 10709 is amended by striking subsection (h).

SEC. 12. INVESTIGATIVE AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO INITIATE INVESTIGATIONS.—Section 11701(a) is amended—

(1) by striking “only on complaint” and inserting “on the Board’s own initiative or upon receiving a complaint pursuant to subsection (b)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “If the Board finds a violation of this part in a proceeding brought on its own initiative, any remedy from such proceeding may only be applied prospectively.”.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD’S INITIATIVE.—Section 11701, as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) In any investigation commenced on the Board’s own initiative, the Board shall—

“(1) not later than 30 days after initiating the investigation, provide written notice to the parties under investigation, which shall state the basis for such investigation;

“(2) only investigate issues that are of national or regional significance;

“(3) permit the parties under investigation to file a written statement describing any or all facts and circumstances concerning a matter which may be the subject of such investigation;

“(4) make available to the parties under investigation and Board members—

“(A) any recommendations made as a result of the investigation; and

“(B) a summary of the findings that support such recommendations;

“(5) to the extent practicable, separate the investigative and decisionmaking functions of staff;

“(6) dismiss any investigation that is not concluded by the Board with administrative finality within 1 year after the date on which it was commenced; and

“(7) not later than 90 days after receiving the recommendations and summary of findings under paragraph (4)—

“(A) dismiss the investigation if no further action is warranted; or

“(B) initiate a proceeding to determine if a provision under this part has been violated.

“(e)(1) Any parties to an investigation against whom a violation is found as a result of an investigation begun on the Board’s own initiative may, not later than 60 days after the date of the order of the Board finding such a violation, institute an action in the United States court of appeals for the appropriate judicial circuit for de novo review of such order in accordance with chapter 7 of title 5.

“(2) The court—

“(A) shall have jurisdiction to enter a judgment affirming, modifying, or setting aside, in whole or in part, the order of the Board; and

“(B) may remand the proceeding to the Board for such further action as the court may direct.”.

(c) RULEMAKINGS FOR INVESTIGATIONS OF THE BOARD'S INITIATIVE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Board shall issue rules, after notice and comment rulemaking, for investigations commenced on its own initiative that—

(1) comply with the requirements of section 11701(d) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (b);

(2) satisfy due process requirements; and

(3) take into account ex parte constraints.

SEC. 13. ARBITRATION OF CERTAIN RAIL RATES AND PRACTICES DISPUTES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practices disputes

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization Act of 2015, the Board shall promulgate regulations to establish a voluntary and binding arbitration process to resolve rail rate and practice complaints subject to the jurisdiction of the Board.

“(b) COVERED DISPUTES.—The voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a)—

“(1) shall apply to disputes involving—

“(A) rates, demurrage, accessorial charges, misrouting, or mishandling of rail cars; or

“(B) a carrier's published rules and practices as applied to particular rail transportation;

“(2) shall not apply to disputes—

“(A) to obtain the grant, denial, stay, or revocation of any license, authorization, or exemption;

“(B) to prescribe for the future any conduct, rules, or results of general, industry-wide applicability;

“(C) to enforce a labor protective condition; or

“(D) that are solely between 2 or more rail carriers; and

“(3) shall not prevent parties from independently seeking or utilizing private arbitration services to resolve any disputes the parties may have.

“(c) ARBITRATION PROCEDURES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board—

“(A) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process established pursuant to subsection (a) available only to the relevant parties;

“(B) may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only—

“(i) after receiving the written consent to arbitrate from all relevant parties; and

“(ii) (I) after the filing of a written complaint; or

“(II) through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding;

“(C) with respect to rate disputes, may make the voluntary and binding arbitration process available only to the relevant parties if the rail carrier has market dominance (as determined under section 10707); and

“(D) may initiate the voluntary and binding arbitration process not later than 40 days after the date on which a written complaint is filed or through other procedures adopted by the Board in a rulemaking proceeding.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Initiation of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall preclude the Board from separately reviewing a complaint or dispute related to the same rail rate or practice in a covered dispute involving the same parties.

“(3) RATES.—In resolving a covered dispute involving the reasonableness of a rail carrier's rates, the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall consider the Board's methodologies for setting maximum lawful rates, giving due consideration to the need for differential pricing to permit a rail carrier to collect adequate revenues (as determined under section 10704(a)(2)).

“(d) ARBITRATION DECISIONS.—Any decision reached in an arbitration process under this section—

“(1) shall be consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

“(2) shall be in writing;

“(3) shall contain findings of fact and conclusions;

“(4) shall be binding upon the parties; and

“(5) shall not have any precedential effect in any other or subsequent arbitration dispute.

“(e) TIMELINES.—

“(1) SELECTION.—An arbitrator or panel of arbitrators shall be selected not later than 14 days after the date of the Board's decision to initiate arbitration.

“(2) EVIDENTIARY PROCESS.—The evidentiary process of the voluntary and binding arbitration process shall be completed not later than 90 days after the date on which the arbitration process is initiated unless—

“(A) a party requests an extension; and

“(B) the arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, grants such extension request.

“(3) DECISION.—The arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, as applicable, shall issue a decision not later than 30 days after the date on which the evidentiary record is closed.

“(4) EXTENSIONS.—The Board may extend any of the timelines under this subsection upon the agreement of all parties in the dispute.

“(f) ARBITRATORS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless otherwise agreed by all of the parties, an arbitration under this section shall be conducted by an arbitrator or panel of arbitrators, which shall be selected from a roster, maintained by the Board, of persons with rail transportation, economic regulation, professional or business experience, including agriculture, in the private sector.

“(2) INDEPENDENCE.—In an arbitration under this section, the arbitrators shall perform their duties with diligence, good faith, and in a manner consistent with the requirements of impartiality and independence.

“(3) SELECTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the parties cannot mutually agree on an arbitrator, or the lead arbitrator of a panel of arbitrators, the parties shall select the arbitrator or lead arbitrator from the roster by alternately striking names from the roster until only 1 name remains meeting the criteria set forth in paragraph (1).

“(B) PANEL OF ARBITRATORS.—If the parties agree to select a panel of arbitrators, instead of a single arbitrator, the panel shall be selected under this subsection as follows:

“(i) The parties to a dispute may mutually select 1 arbitrator from the roster to serve as the lead arbitrator of the panel of arbitrators.

“(ii) If the parties cannot mutually agree on a lead arbitrator, the parties shall select a lead arbitrator using the process described in subparagraph (A).

“(iii) In addition to the lead arbitrator selected under this subparagraph, each party to a dispute shall select 1 additional arbitrator from the roster, regardless of whether the other party struck out the arbitrator's name under subparagraph (A).

“(4) COST.—The parties shall share the costs incurred by the Board and arbitrators equally, with each party responsible for paying its own legal and other associated arbitration costs.

“(g) RELIEF.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3), an arbitral decision under this section may award the payment of damages or rate prescriptive relief.

“(2) PRACTICE DISPUTES.—The damage award for practice disputes may not exceed \$2,000,000.

“(3) RATE DISPUTES.—

“(A) MONETARY LIMIT.—The damage award for rate disputes, including any rate prescription, may not exceed \$25,000,000.

“(B) TIME LIMIT.—Any rate prescription shall be limited to not longer than 5 years from the date of the arbitral decision.

“(h) BOARD REVIEW.—If a party appeals a decision under this section to the Board, the Board may review the decision under this section to determine if—

“(1) the decision is consistent with sound principles of rail regulation economics;

“(2) a clear abuse of arbitral authority or discretion occurred;

“(3) the decision directly contravenes statutory authority; or

“(4) the award limitation under subsection (g) was violated.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for chapter 117 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11708. Voluntary arbitration of certain rail rates and practice disputes.”.

SEC. 14. EFFECT OF PROPOSALS FOR RATES FROM MULTIPLE ORIGINS AND DESTINATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall commence a study of rail transportation contract proposals containing multiple origin-to-destination movements.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after commencing the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall submit a report containing the results of the study to—

(1) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 15. REPORTS.

(a) REPORT ON RATE CASE METHODOLOGY.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit a report to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that—

(1) indicates whether current large rate case methodologies are sufficient, not unduly complex, and cost effective;

(2) indicates whether alternative methodologies exist, or could be developed, to streamline, expedite, and address the complexity of large rate cases; and

(3) only includes alternative methodologies, which exist or could be developed, that are consistent with sound economic principles.

(b) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Beginning not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board shall submit quarterly reports to the congressional committees referred to in section 14(b) that describes the Surface Transportation Board's progress toward addressing the issues raised in each unfinished regulatory proceeding, regardless of whether the proceeding is subject to a statutory or regulatory deadline.

SEC. 16. CRITERIA.

Section 10704(a)(2) is amended by inserting “for the infrastructure and investment needed to meet the present and future demand for rail services and” after “management.”.

SEC. 17. CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed to affect any suit commenced by or against the Surface Transportation Board, or any proceeding or challenge pending before the Surface Transportation Board, before the date of the enactment of this Act.

CONGRATULATING THE CHICAGO
BLACKHAWKS ON WINNING THE
2015 STANLEY CUP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 205, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 205) congratulating the Chicago Blackhawks on winning the 2015 Stanley Cup.

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 considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

CONGRATULATING THE GOLDEN
STATE WARRIORS FOR WINNING
THE 2015 NATIONAL BASKETBALL
ASSOCIATION CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 206, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 206) congratulating the Golden State Warriors for winning the 2015 National Basketball Association Championship.

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 considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 206) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

FILING DEADLINE—H.R. 2146 AND
H.R. 1295

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the filing

deadline for all first-degree amendments to both H.R. 2146 and H.R. 1295 be at 4 p.m., Monday, June 22.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 22,
2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business until 5 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JUNE 22, 2015, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 22, 2015, at 3 p.m.